July 25, 2013

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the August 7, 2013, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, August 7, 2013, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 4, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The following is an update of relevant information as of July 24, 2013.

Staff Activities

- On July 6-7, 2013, staff attended the annual conference in San Diego sponsored by ESRI, makers of electronic mapping software, in support of developing an internal capacity to create district and other unique maps to support the school district review of the school district organization process.

- Staff is continuing an update of the County Committee website, adding additional content and preparing a library of new articles that districts and members of the public may access.

Newspaper Articles

- A June 24, 2013, article from the Pasadena Star News—“La Canada district hopes to take Sagebrush students from Glendale.” (Attachment 1)

- A June 26, 2013, article from the MercuryNews.com—“Committee almost ready to redraw supervisor districts in San Mateo County.” (Attachment 2)
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• A June 28, 2013, article from the San Diego Union-Tribune-“South County group looks to revise rules with board.” (Attachment 3)

• A July 2, 2013, article from the Los Angeles Times-“Anaheim City Council approves controversial voting plan.” (Attachment 4)

• A July 5, 2013, article from SCVNews.com-“Local School Districts Also Hit with Voting-Rights Suits.” (Attachment 5)

• A July 10, 2013, article from the CAFW.ORG-“Anaheim voters to have hybrid election model next June.” (Attachment 6)

• A July 10, 2013, article from the Santa Clarita Signal-“UPDATE: Santa Clarita to fight Voting Rights Act lawsuit.” (Attachment 7)

• A July 16, 2013, article from the Whittier Daily News-“Whittier Latino Coalition puts Voting Rights Act lawsuit on hold.” (Attachment 8)

• A July 18, 2013, article from the Whittier Daily News-“Whittier gets more time in voting rights lawsuit threat.” (Attachment 9)

• A July 18, 2013, article from the Modesto Be-“Hughson, Empire school districts close to moving to geographic elections.” (Attachment 10)

• A July 19, 2013, article from the Press-Enterprise-“ALVORD: School board adopts trustee areas map.” (Attachment 11)

Informational Correspondence

• A July 15, 2013, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 1058 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County (Attachment 12)

• A July 15, 2013, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 738 to County Sanitation District No. 21 (Attachment 13)

• A July 15, 2013, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 1036 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County (Attachment 14)

• A July 15, 2013, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 1066 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County (Attachment 15)
• An article in the PolyTrends, Cal Poly Pomona magazine that highlights the honoring of County Committee member Frank Bostrom as a distinguished alumnus.

Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 17)

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 18)

• “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 19)

Please call me at (562) 922-6144 if you have any questions or concerns.

KDC/AD:ah
Attachments
La Canada district hopes to take Sagebrush students from Glendale

Sagebrush students at center of effort
By Libby Rainey
elizabeth.rainey@sgvn.com
@rainey_l on Twitter.com
Posted: 06/24/2013 08:06:21 PM PDT
Updated: 06/24/2013 08:07:37 PM PDT

Palm Crest Elementary located at 5025 Palm Drive in La Canada Monday, June 24, 2013, is the closest of La Canada's three elementary schools to the disputed Sagebrush area. (SGVN/Photo by Walt Mancini)

LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE - Residents and city officials have re-sparked efforts to bring students attending Glendale schools back to town, and they're hoping the La Canada Unified School Board will help make it happen.

A small area of town is serviced by Glendale Unified School District -- which means some students that live in La Canada have to go to Glendale for school. The dollars they represent also go to Glendale.

The City Council unanimously passed a resolution which supported incorporating the neighborhood -- known as the "Sagebrush area" -- into the district, which would bring those students, and dollars, back.

"Unification of our school system is something each City Council member embraces and supports," said Councilman Donald Voss at last week's school board meeting. "The principle purpose of the territory transfer is to achieve greater community cohesiveness."
These efforts put a long-contentious struggle between Glendale and La Canada Flintridge back on the table. The last battle to bring Sagebrush into the La Canada school district lasted six years and ended without success in 1997, according to school board President Scott Tracy.

The recent effort marks the third petition to change Sagebrush's designation, Tracy said.

Calls for comment made to the Glendale Unified District officials went unreturned.

The school board discussed the issue at a meeting last week, but has yet to take formal action. Representatives from La Canada Flintridge and Glendale are meeting next week to discuss the disputed territory, according to Tracy, and these negotiations could determine when the school board votes on the issue.

"There's pretty much agreement across the board that this is the right thing to do," said Andrew Blumenfeld, a school board member. "These are La Canada families and they should have access to La Canada schools."

Blumenfeld said the school board is pursuing an agreement between the Glendale and La Canada school districts. If the two districts can reach a consensus on what to do with the disputed area, the city should be able to avoid a lengthy and contentious process, he said.

Any attempt by La Canada to redistrict will be reviewed by the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization.

"If both parties can come to an agreement, it will be looked upon in a different light than if there's opposition," said Keith Crafton, assistant director of Regionalized Business Services for the L.A. County Office of Education.

La Canada has struggled to keep enrollment numbers up in recent years, and has allowed around 600 nonresident students to attend La Canada schools through a permit process as a result, according to Tracy. He said around 200 come from Glendale.

"Incorporating the Sagebrush area helps the district address declining enrollment issues and it supports the city's attempt to unify," Tracy said. "The optimal way would be to have two districts agree in some fashion."

Committee almost ready to redraw supervisor districts in San Mateo County

By Bonnie Eslinger

Daily News Staff Writer

Posted: 06/26/2013 09:23:53 PM PDT
Updated: 06/27/2013 12:25:18 AM PDT

A committee formed to review the boundaries of San Mateo County's five supervisorial districts next month will consider redrawning them to ensure the districts represent roughly the same number of people and don't weaken the voting power of any ethnic or racial group.

The redistricting effort is driven by a lawsuit settlement reached in February with a group of Asian and Latino voters who claimed the county's at-large system for electing supervisors marginalizes them. In November, 58.7 percent of voters approved ditching that system in favor of one that elects supervisors by district and is used by every other county in California.

To educate the public about redistricting and solicit comments, the county held four public meetings this month in four of the five districts. About 15 to 20 people showed up for the first two meetings, in San Mateo and Half Moon Bay, and about 60 people attended the session in Daly City, according to county spokesman Marshall Wilson.

About 35 people went to Tuesday's redistricting meeting in East Palo Alto. Julio Garcia, an East Palo Alto resident, said he has seen only one flier in the community about the meetings.

"We're very concerned about the lack of outreach to the community," Garcia said. "This is very serious for us."

Annie Loya, an East Palo Alto resident and an alternate on the nine-member committee that includes elected representatives as well as residents from each district, said the stakes are high.
"What happens if the community doesn't get involved in this process, what happens if the lines are drawn badly, and what does badly mean?" Loya asked.

Douglas Johnson, president of the county-commissioned National Demographics Corp., said boundary lines determine voting power.

"Ninety-five percent of the time a community wants to be kept together so it has as much voting power in the election for that one supervisor as possible and thus, theoretically, as much influence with that one supervisor as possible," he said.

At the start of Tuesday's meeting, Robert Rubin, one of the attorneys who sued the county on the basis that its at-large system violated the California Voting Rights Act, said he is disturbed that the county was introducing the redistricting process at the meetings without mentioning the lawsuit.

"The county was brought kicking and screaming to the table only because of the lawsuit," Rubin said.

The county has insisted that the at-large system does not discriminate against minority voters and argued that it's preferable because it forces the supervisors to be accountable to all county residents, not just those in their districts.

Near the end of the 90-minute meeting, Supervisor Adrienne Tissier encouraged attendees to spread the word about the redistricting effort.

She warned that those who "scream louder than others" tend to have more influence. "If you squeeze the balloon here, it's got to come out somewhere else," she said.

At the meeting in Daly City, residents pleaded for the committee not to divide the city. "We don't even know where they got that rumor," Tissier said. "We have drawn no maps."

Ultimately, Tissier said, the committee doesn't "have to change a thing if we don't want to." She said the Board of Supervisors will have final say after receiving the committee's recommendations.

Suggested boundary changes will be presented to the board in early fall and the district maps could be adopted by October or November, according to Johnson.

The next Supervisorial District Lines Advisory Committee meeting will be Thursday, July 11, at 6:30 p.m. in the Millbrae Community Center, 477 Lincoln Circle.

Email Bonnie Eslinger at beslinger@dailynewsgroup.com; follow her at twitter.com/bonnieeslinger.
South County group looks to revise rules with board

By Allison Sampite-Montecalvo 10:31 p.m. June 28, 2013

SOUTH COUNTY — A group of South County citizens is circulating petitions in hopes of getting measures on a 2014 ballot that would restrict Sweetwater school board members to two four-year terms and require that they be elected by voters from specific geographic areas within the school district, rather than from the entire district.

Gene Chavira, a member of Citizens for a Better Sweetwater, began collecting signatures pertaining to the Sweetwater Union High School District on June 17.

Chavira said the proposals, which have received support from various area organizations since the group formed earlier this year, are result of citizen feedback.

"The citizens feel that this is a good time to make these kinds of changes," he said. "Because of the current situation with the district there are a lot of people that want to do something. We’re hoping for more democracy and that the people will be better represented."

Sweetwater board President Jim Cartmill said Friday he wasn’t aware of the petitions.

"My first thought is in a democracy citizens have the right to petition their elected official for change," he said. "As an individual for change, I believe there are term limits. They are called elections and they are held every two years."

He said elections are the appropriate means to choose elected representatives and that term limits have the potential to thwart the will of voters.

Cartmill was elected around the same time numbered seats began, meaning candidates are elected by the community at-large.

"I think it’s a great compromise for having district seats," he said.

The Chula Vista Democratic Club endorsed the proposals a few months ago and held a meeting on the topic June 27.
“Our goal is to look to the future to see if we can work together as a broad South Bay community to improve our governing structures for the Sweetwater District,” club President Jose Preciado said.

Assemblywoman Lorena Gonzalez, D-San Diego, also has publicly endorsed both efforts.

“Since I’ve been elected probably the most phone calls I’ve received from constituents have to do with residents and parents and teachers … who just feel completely disempowered and that they have very little voice in what’s happening in the district,” she said.

The initiatives fall under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Office of Education. Once 1,000 signatures are gathered, the issues can be placed on the ballot if three of five county board of education members vote in favor of doing so.

The same proposals were attempted by a group for Sweetwater as well as the and Chula Vista Elementary School District in 2008 but was voted down by the board in a 3-2 vote.

At the time Robert Watkins, County Board of Education president, said the then-required 750 signatures to bring proposals before the board were not representative of the districts and suggested petitioners consider going directly to voters, an approach that requires signatures from 10 percent of registered voters in each district.

Gonzalez says the measure has the ability to return a sense of power to voters, adding there’s an obvious disconnect between the administration and parents and teachers.

“I think it was an issue then but it’s a bigger issue now,” Gonzalez said. “A lot of attention has been spotlighted on the school district. If it makes people feel more empowered I think it’s a positive step forward. This is one avenue I think there will be a lot of others. We’ve got to support voters’ decisions.”

The group has until mid December to collect 1,000 signatures.

“I’m very confident that we can get a 1,000 easily,” Chavira said.
A sharply divided Anaheim City Council on Tuesday night voted to change the way its members are elected.

Proponents say the new at-large voting proposal with residency requirements will ensure that the city’s diverse population is well-represented. But many who called for reforms contend that the plan falls short of moving toward fair representation for Latinos in city government.

Lack of representation was a focus of protests that rocked the city last year following the officer-involved shooting of two Latino men.

Political representation is also the subject of a lawsuit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of Latino residents. The suit alleges that the practice of electing council members at large violates the California Voting Rights Act.

Latinos make up nearly 53% of the city’s population but less than half of eligible voters. Only a few Latinos have ever been elected to the City Council. The city was incorporated in 1876.

Anaheim is the largest city in California that still elects leaders at large.

The measure approved in a 3-2 vote Tuesday followed months of study and debate. It maintains at-large voting but imposes residency requirements.

The council also decided to ask voters to permanently ratify the at-large measure and to decide whether to expand the number of council members from four to six, with the mayor elected at large. A measure that would have asked voters to decide whether the city should move toward a voting district system in which each district elects its own members was defeated 2 to 3.

Anaheim Mayor Tom Tait, who has advocated for voting districts, said the at-large change “confuses the issue.”

“I’m very disappointed to see this will be on the ballot,” he said.

Councilwoman Kris Murray, who proposed the successful measure, said voting districts would divide the city.
Murray lives in affluent Anaheim Hills, but added that she takes being an at large representative seriously. She said she focuses much of her attention beyond her own neighborhood, including the area known in Anaheim as the flatlands.

She noted work she has done in the Ponderosa area of Anaheim, in particular. During budget talks, she advocated an infusion of funds to improve and build parks and community spaces in those areas, and has worked with a computer company to build a computer lab for community use.

“I don’t believe we are six or eight Anahims; I believe we are one city,” she said. “I don’t represent Anaheim Hills. I represent the city of Anaheim.”

Murray and Councilwomen Lucille Kring and Gail Eastman voted in favor of the at-large measure. Mayor Tait and Councilman Jordan Brandman opposed.

paloma.esquivel@latimes.com

Copyright © 2013, Los Angeles Times
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**Local School Districts Also Hit with Voting-Rights Suits**

By Perry Smith, Hometownstation.com | Friday, Jul 5, 2013

Two local school districts have been hit with civil rights discrimination claims, which say at-large elections have denied Latino voters access, district officials said Friday.

College of the Canyons and the Sulphur Springs were served with nearly identical suits this week, claiming that the lack of district representation in local elections has denied Latino voters access to the political system.

Bruce Fortune, a trustee for the College of the Canyons governing board, called the lawsuit “unfortunate,” and said while districting may make sense in some regions, it wouldn’t benefit the greater good for the Santa Clarita Valley.

“I understand that they have their position and their point,” Fortune said, referring to Jim Soliz and Rosemarie Sanchez-Fraser, who are the plaintiffs in three separate lawsuits. “And in some communities, it’s probably very important that districting happen.

“But in our community, there are no really strong pockets in any race — the folks are spread throughout our valley,” Fortune said. “There are some areas, such as Newhall, that might have a higher percentage (of Latino voters). But, really, that population is valleywide.”

Kevin Shenkman, an attorney for Shenkman & Hughes, said his firm is representing the plaintiffs in all three suits; however, his firm is working with R. Rex Parris’ firm on the matter.

Fortune confirmed that Santa Clarita Community College District officials, who are responsible for the operations of a Canyon Country and Valencia campus, were served with the lawsuit July 3.

The lawsuits were served to the districts at the same time that the city was hit with a lawsuit of the same issue. R. Rex Parris, who runs the law firm listed on all three of the suits, is the mayor of Lancaster.

The papers were filed June 20, according to court documents.

Fortune’s wife, Gloria Mercado-Fortune, who is Hispanic, was board president last year for the William S. Hart Union High School District, and has served as an elected school official for more than 20 years, including her time on the Castaic Union School District board.
The Hart district, which is essentially a valleywide, 23,000-student district for junior highs and high schools, has not been hit with a lawsuit.

Mercado-Fortine is running for City Council next year, and said she doesn’t see access for Latinos or Latinas as a problem.

“Told you, the way our valley is, it’s becoming very diverse, but that diversity is spread out throughout the valley,” she said. “There’s not huge geographic areas that are populated by Latinos or other groups.

“I do feel that in our valley, having at-large elections, it really gives everybody an opportunity to vote for anyone that they want.”

Calls to the Sulphur Springs School District office were not immediately returned.

Valleymwide, education trustees from the various boards pitched in and conducted research on the logistics of districting, as far as how it would affect voter turnout, Mercado-Fortine said.

“The school districts came together. We really went all out,” Mercado-Fortine said. “We did the analysis that we needed to do. We spent a lot of money on that.”

The various school boards, which included COC’s governing board and Sulphur Springs, hired Redistricting Partners, a firm that specializes in the field of political demographics, among other areas, to conduct studies, said current Hart district board President Joe Messina.

“We did our homework, and we spent six to eight months researching this,” Messina said. “All the districts, including COC, and the results showed that districting would actually make the problem worse.”

The data showed districting essentially would further divide the Hispanic population, Messina said.

The Sulphur Springs School District lawsuit alleges that the district comprises a portion of the city of Santa Clarita with 56,256 residents, and 30.6 percent of the registered voters in that district are Latino.

“The Latino population located within the SSSD is geographically concentrated, particularly in the pockets of the Newhall and Canyon Country neighborhoods,” according to the lawsuit.

Suzan Solomon, a school board member for the Newhall School District, said, to her knowledge, her district has not yet been served with a similar lawsuit.

She declined to comment further on the suits, but acknowledged that, in abidance with the California Voting Rights Act of 2001, local districts hired Redistricting Partners, which came to the conclusions cited by Messina.
The school districts sought to increase valleywide voter turnout by moving the elections to even-numbered years, which coincide with national elections and generally produce more voters.

The county, citing inadequate equipment, voted 2-2 with one abstention on the matter, essentially leaving the elections unchanged.

“This suit should actually be against the county and not us, because we all voted to (move elections),” Messina said, “even though some of us don’t think this will work.”

For county Fifth District Supervisor Michael Antonovich, who supported moving the elections, the issue was a “no-brainer,” said Antonovich spokesman Tony Bell, who added that the supervisor’s vote was indicative of his support for his community.

“This was a common sense request from our local communities,” Bell said. “And the bureaucrats should have figured out a way to make it more cost effective for the county. And it ultimately would have saved more money for the school districts.”

For his part, Messina disagreed behind the ideology of the suits, arguing that, even if the suits are successful, district elections wouldn’t benefit voters or local districts. They also wouldn’t change the representation for other races, which are also represented in the Santa Clarita Valley by local officials.

“Shouldn’t the best person, no matter what race they are, win?” Messina said. “Isn’t that what we want?”
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Anaheim votes to have hybrid election model next June

07/10/2013 by Cheryl Getuiza

The city of Anaheim is home to the “Happiest Place on Earth,” but if you ask a majority of its residents they’ll probably tell you it’s far from happy.

A divided city council recently voted, 3-2, to put a hybrid election model on the ballot next June. Right now, the city council has at-large elections, meaning members are elected by the whole city, however those council members must now live in the district they represent.

“I see a lot of problems with this voting system. Number one, it’s clear that at-large elections, which is what Anaheim currently has, has a potential to discriminate,” said Dr. Fernando Guerra, Director of the Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles and a professor of Political Science and Chicana/o Studies.

Latinos make up 53 percent of the population, but “they are only about 30 percent of the voters. So if every Latino voted, that is eligible to vote, and has a system that is racially polarized, even though they’re half the population at 30 percent of the vote, they would not win one single seat. So the system, clearly, clearly discriminates.”

“What Anaheim has decided is a hybrid that does exist in other cities where there is a residency requirement where the candidate has to live in that district but yet again everybody in the city gets to vote for that person,” said Dr. Guerra.

There is yet another problem with the current system. Dr. Guerra points out there is “way over representation in some neighborhoods than others. Almost all of the council members come from Anaheim Hills as do most of the candidates.”

The council also voted, 2 to 3, against letting voters decide on district elections.

“There are plenty of cases where Latinos do not vote Latino. In largely Latino districts, overwhelming Latinos voted to elect a non-Latino cause they felt that person was a better representative.”

District elections, according to Dr. Guerra, would be one solution, but there there’s more the city could do.

“Even Disneyland has districts—you have your Tomorrowland, your Frontierland, so if it’s good for Disneyland, it ought to be good for Anaheim.”
"Number one change the at-large system to a district system, number two, you have to have fair
drawing of the lines."

Political misrepresentation in the city is the focus of a lawsuit filed by the American Civil Liberties
Union. The organization, representing the Latino residents, claim the at large violates the California
Voting Rights Act.

"This clearly violates the voting rights—it is diluting the votes of Latinos in the city. And the
information is overwhelming to show that. From a social science perspective there is no doubt that
the Latino vote is being diluted in Anaheim," said Dr. Guerra.

"To me, the ACLU will win this because it's a clear violation the problem is it will take time and
resources and it continues to create tension amongst the city.

"There's an old, old political adage, "power is never given, it is taken." Power either has to be taken
by the voters or the court system to say you can't have this unfair system."
UPDATE: Santa Clarita to fight Voting Rights Act lawsuit

By Lila Littlejohn, Signal City Editor
lila@signalscv.com, 661-287-5520
July 10, 2013

The Santa Clarita City Council has voted to fight back over a lawsuit alleging the city’s system for electing council members prevents Latino voters from having full access to the political process.

Following a special meeting Tuesday afternoon, City Attorney Joseph Montes said the council had agreed to “undertake defense” against the suit.

The suit, filed June 26, alleges the city’s at-large elections — which allow all voters in the city to select all five council members — dilutes the votes of Latino residents and denies them “effective political participation,” according to the complaint filed in Los Angeles County Superior Court.

The elections thus violate the 2001 California Voting Rights Act, the suit claims.

The lawsuit suggests that district-based elections — in which candidates would be elected to represent specific portions of the city — would better serve the will of Latino voters.

“The city had no prior notice of the allegations of a violation of the California Voting Rights Act, or that the action would be be filed,” Montes said in a statement issued Wednesday.

“The city’s legal team will be undertaking an analysis of the complaint, applicable law and relevant data to prepare a responsive pleading,” Montes said.
“That analysis will be presented to the City Council at a future closed session, so we are not at liberty to make any further statement at this time.”

Similar lawsuits were filed against the Santa Clarita Community College District and the Sulphur Springs School District.

According to the filing, Santa Clarita’s system of citywide balloting for council members effectively silences the Latino vote.

As evidence of this, the Los Angeles County Superior Court filing claims that no Latino candidate has been elected to the City Council, despite almost a third of the city’s population being Latino.

The lawsuit also alleges that City Council elections are “racially polarized,” with Latino voters supporting candidates of their choice and non-Latino candidates voting against them.

“Such polarized voting is legally significant in Santa Clarita’s City Council elections because it dilutes the opportunity of Latino voters to elect candidates of their choice,” the lawsuit states.
Whittier Daily News

The Whittier City Council includes, from left: Joe Vinatieri, Owen Newcomer, Cathy Warner and Mayor Bob Henderson.

The Whittier Latino Coalition is delaying its threatened lawsuit against the city over alleged violation of the California Voting Rights Act lawsuit, a spokesman said Tuesday.

The group had originally set July 17 as its deadline for the city to commit to district elections or face legal action.
Members of the coalition allege that the voting power of Whittier’s Latino majority population is diluted, and that the Latino community has been unable to elect a candidate of its choice because elections are held at-large. They prefer to elect council members from districts in the belief that Latino candidates would have a better chance to win. They also want city elections consolidated with Whittier’s school district and other elections in November.

Mayor Bob Henderson, in a previous interview, said residents of the city are fairly represented by an at-large city council and that there is no barrier to all eligible voters casting ballots on the city’s traditional election dates in April.

Coalition spokesman Louis Reyes says the group has agreed to a delay requested by the city.

In a combative letter to the city, Rod Pacheco — the former assemblyman and Riverside County District Attorney who now represents the Whittier Latino Coalition — accused the city of seeking unnecessary delays and concealing the results of a 2011 study of city voting patterns.

City Manager Jeff Collier said that Whittier will embark on a demographic study of voting patterns in an effort to supply the City Council with information on which they could base a decision.

Collier also retained attorney Marguerite Leone to advise the city, and she addressed the council in closed session last week. Her firm, Nelson Merksamser, represents the city of Anaheim, where the city council is also fighting residents’ challenge of at-large elections.

The coalition filed a Public Records Act request to obtain a study the city says it conducted after a 2011 request to switch to district elections. The coalition wants to see that study before embarking on a lawsuit.

Collier said no study was done. However, the city attorney in 2011 had done some research on the involvement of Whittier’s Latino voters in electing school board and state legislative representatives and sent it in a letter to the coalition.
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Whittier gets more time in voting rights lawsuit threat

By Peter Fullam, Staff Writer
@PeterFullam on Twitter

Posted: 07/18/2013 07:06:05 PM PDT
Updated: 07/18/2013 07:06:54 PM PDT

WHITTIER - A Latino group has agreed to give the city more time to respond to its request to change the city's at-large voting system to a district representation system.

The lawyer representing the Whittier Latino Coalition in a July 16 letter to Assistant City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow said his clients have agreed to delay filing a lawsuit claiming violations of the California Voting Rights Act.

Earlier, the group and the attorney threatened to sue the city if City Council did not act by July 17.

The letter was highly critical of the City Council citing numerous ways the Latino group considered the council was failing Latino voters. It was sent in response to a July 11 letter the city sent requesting the delay.

"You requested a meeting with us to discuss your request to delay," attorney Rod Pacheco wrote, noting the request was "couched" in "an extremely vague and opaque reference to 'resolution.'"

"After having listened to your words, the words of attorney Marguerite Mary Leoni of your newly hired law firm, and the words of the City Manager, Jeffery Collier, it is clear that no such sincere or meaningful resolution was proffered," Pacheco stated. "Instead, your request was simply to delay the matter further for an undefined and extensive period," wrote Pacheco, a former assemblyman and Riverside County district attorney.

The letters stem from a demand made by members of the Whittier Latino Coalition at a June 25 City Council meeting. About 100 people attended the meeting in support of a long line of
speakers who asked City Council to change the timing of elections and the at-large voting system. They said such changes would result in the election of more Latinos to City Council.

Since the city was incorporated in 1898, only one Latino has been elected to City Council. According to the 2010 census, 66 percent of Whittier's residents are Latinos.

The coalition and Pacheco, in a letter presented to the council at the meeting, also said the voting rules in Whittier are in violation of state and federal voting rights laws.

At-large voting is required by the City Charter, which can only be changed by an election.

Pacheco and the Whittier Latino Coalition gave the city until July 17 to adopt a resolution calling for a vote on the issue or face a lawsuit in state or federal court on behalf of three Whittier Latino residents.

If nothing is done by April 2014, Pacheco said he will seek to halt the elections or prevent them from being certified.

"The Whittier Latino Coalition is seeking to restore voting rights of the citizens of Whittier," said Louis R. Reyes, a spokesman for the coalition. "Our main interest is to fix a process that has disenfranchised voters, and we want the city to fix the process."

Pacheco's letter does not specify how long the Latino coalition will wait before filing a lawsuit.

"In spite of the significant deprivation they and others have suffered at the hands of the system your clients protect, our clients are willing to provide an additional amount of time in the hope that the council will put aside their own interests on behalf of the citizens they have sworn to represent," Pacheco's July 16 letter states. "We will hold our proposed filing of a complaint in abeyance for a reasonable period of time."

However, Reyes said the coalition is not in the mood to wait very long.

City Manager Jeff Collier said a response to Pacheco's letter was sent Wednesday, July 17.

"Despite some of the comments in his letter, our only desire is to provide the City Council with factual information in which to allow them to make a determination regarding the allegations of violations of the California Voting Rights Act," Collier stated in an email response to a Daily News.

"The City Council cannot just receive a demand letter at face value and place a Charter amendment on the ballot to change our election process. Rather, the City Council needs to have the facts in which to base a decision."
He said the city has retained experts to provide analysis of the question. City Council will review the report at their second meeting in August and at that time will be able to respond to the Whittier Latino Coalition's request, he said.

It is the second time in recent years the city has been accused of having election laws that prevent Latinos from being elected. In 2011, an Oakland law firm and a voting rights group threatened to sue the city. In response, Assistant City Attorney Barlow wrote a letter to the National Voting Rights Institute outlining the "steps the City has taken to ensure full participation by Latino and other minority voters."

She said an analysis of elections involving Whittier voters showed that 77 percent of the time at least one Latino candidate was successful.

"We believe these election statistics show that Latino candidates have a high rate of success," Barlow wrote.

Pacheco's four-page letter cited work done by Whittier College professor Eric Lindgren that found racial polarization has occurred in Whittier City Council races.

Lindgren did not respond to telephone inquiries by press time, but a college spokeswoman said a radio KPCC-FM (89.3) interview with Lindgren on the issue is available on the college's website.

In it he says Whittier is one of dozens of California cities that are "ripe for challenges of their at-large elections."

"There are nine cities I identified that have majority-minority populations with zero representation on city councils, and Whittier is one of those," Lindgren said on KPCC.
Hughson, Empire school districts close to moving to geographic elections

Published: July 18, 2013

By Nan Austin — naustin@modbee.com

The Hughson Unified and Empire Union school districts are one meeting closer to electing school board members by geographic area, a move meant to guarantee representation for minority communities.

In separate meetings Tuesday, both received unanimous votes by the Stanislaus County Committee on School District Organization, making a total of four districts approved within a year.

"We just hit the tip of the iceberg," committee member Judi Luna said after the meeting. The Stanislaus County Office of Education committee also rules on school district mergers and other organizational changes.

Waiting in the wings are other districts that have just begun the process, said Latino Roundtable President Maggie Mejia.

Mejia's group started the process with letters warning of potentially costly legal action under the California Voting Rights Act if districts did not switch.

The boards of Riverbank Unified, Stanislaus Union, Newman-Crows Landing, Salida Union and Waterford also approved splitting their districts. "I think we've come a long way since we sent the letters in February," Mejia said at the Hughson meeting.

Hughson Unified split the district into five areas, with one seat to cover a rural area stretching from Hickman to La Grange and one seat serving roughly a half-mile square in central Hughson. The population is about the same in all five areas, which cover Hughson and all the elementary districts feeding into Hughson High, said Superintendent Brian Beck.

"From our standpoint, we get compliant, give people opportunity (for representation) and potentially save money for the district, so it's a win-win-win," Beck told the committee.

Before the vote, committee member Marsha Waggoner said the splits could cause problems in attracting enough interested residents to fill the board. "It is a concern because a lot of people don't get involved until there's a problem that affects themselves," she said. "Hughson is a community, so hopefully you will draw people in."
Hughson Unified will have time to lay out contingency plans for empty seats, Beck said. A companion board resolution changed the election cycle to even years, lengthening the terms of all sitting trustees by a year. Trustees will run by area starting in 2014.

Empire Union's election will proceed as scheduled, with three at-large seats to be decided in November. In 2015, the first by-area trustees will be elected. Five partitions split the district's 25-square-mile territory.

Dave Garcia, beginning his first year as Empire superintendent, and Empire trustees who came to the meeting said the process went smoothly. The district consulted its bargaining units as well as site councils of its four elementary and one middle school in creating the maps and making the switch.

"We had a lot of questions, a lot of concerns at the beginning," said Board President Loretta Stein.

Board Clerk Carole Dovichi said existing board members live in all the trustee areas. "We're pretty well spread," she said.

District lawyer Nevin Trehan said the point was to avoid costly lawsuits that no agency has won. The city of Modesto agreed to pay a $3 million settlement over by-area elections in 2007. "The board just wanted to get out in front of any potential litigation," Trehan said.

Patterson Unified and Turlock Unified switches to by-area elections were approved in 2012. Both are electing by-area trustees in November. Ceres Unified switched soon after the Modesto lawsuit settled, becoming the first Stanislaus County district to hold by-area elections.

Modesto City Schools has yet to take action. Riverbank Unified and Keyes Union districts are starting the process. Keyes Superintendent Cynthia Schaefer said her board is planning for elections by area in 2015.

Officially, Tuesday's vote was to recommend the state Board of Education grant a waiver to the district allowing it to bypass having voters approve the election change, in essence an election about electing. In 2012 the state board granted waivers to 53 districts — including Turlock Unified and Escalon Unified. In 2011, only six districts sought such waivers.

State board approvals of such waivers have become routine, making Tuesday's decisions the last practical hurdle for districts, said Chet Quaide, attorney for the Stanislaus County Office of Education.

Bee education reporter Nan Austin can be reached at naustin@modbee.com or (209) 578-2339, on Twitter, @NanAustin, www.modbee.com/education.
The Press-Enterprise

ALVORD: School board adopts trustee areas map

BY DAYNA STRAEHLEY, STAFF WRITER

Published: July 19, 2013; 04:39 PM

Alvord Unified School District has divided itself into trustee areas from which all new board members will be elected beginning in November 2014.

The board approved a map from five possibilities in what board President Art Kaspereen called an emotional session Thursday night, July 18.

"In every scenario, someone was pitted against someone else," Kaspereen said.

Board member Ben Johnson, who lives in southwest Riverside, would run against board Carolyn Wilson, who lives in east Corona, if both seek re-election in 2016, he said.

Consultants who prepared the maps attempted to balance population and the population of citizens old enough to vote. Where incumbents live was not a primary consideration.

Kaspereen, a retired Alvord High School counselor, had also lived in the new Trustee Area 5 near Johnson until a few months ago. He said his son, who now works for Alvord as a school counselor after being laid off in another district, couldn't find a place to live for his family. So the son moved into his parents’ house and the board president and his wife found a place to rent in the Riverwalk neighborhood of Riverside, in the new Trustee Area 1.
ALVORD TRUSTEES: The map shows trustee areas from which future board members for Alvord Unified School District will be elected and where they must live.

No current board member lives in Trustee Area 2, which covers the northern part of the Arlanza neighborhood in Riverside.
Trustee Area 1 includes the La Sierra Hills and La Sierra Acres neighborhoods and part of La Sierra in Riverside. Riverwalk Parkway runs through part of Trustee Area 1 and part of Trustee Area 4.

Longtime board member Greg Kraft lives in Trustee Area 4, which covers part of La Sierra and most of the La Sierra South neighborhood in Riverside.

Trustee Area 5 includes the portions of the city of Corona in Alvord, the remainder of La Sierra South and the unincorporated communities of Lake Hills and the part of Home Gardens in Alvord.

The district is dividing itself into trustee areas to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act and the California Voting Rights Act. The total population between the district's largest and smallest trustee areas is less than 5 percent.

In two trustee areas, 2 and 3, in the adopted map, a majority of citizens old enough to vote are Latinos, a consideration in the school district where 78 percent of students are Latino.

Follow Dayna Straehley on Twitter: @dstraehley_PE and watch for her posts on the Inland Schools blog: http://blog.pe.com/category/education/
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
Castaic Lake Water Agency
City of Santa Clarita
Sulphur Springs Union Elementary
William S. Hart School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 1058 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 3.043± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Sand Canyon Road approximately 400 feet north of Comet 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 Thursday, August 15, 2013.

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

Date: July 15, 2013

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-1058

1. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County
   1. Annexation

2.____________________________________________________  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: 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: [Signature]  DATE: June 25, 2013

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 4552, Grid C3
Located on Sand Canyon Road approximately 400 feet north of Comet Way, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
3.043 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 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?
   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 $548,165.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential. The current zoning is Residential Very Low Density 1 dwelling unit per gross acre (Santa Clarita) [RVL].

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).
   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 SCVSS is 28.1 mgd. On January 29, 1998, the Boards of Directors of District 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 SCVSS service area through the year 2015 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2015 Plan allows the capacity of the SCVSS 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. 1058 shown thus ————————————

Boundary of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District
Prior to Annexation No. 1058 shown thus ————————————
Prior Annexations shown thus ————————————
Area of Annexation ———————————— 3.043 Acres

EXHIBIT "B"

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER
CHIEF ENGINEER & GENERAL MANAGER

ANNEXATION NO. 1058
TO SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT

Recorded: T.G.4552, C2
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
City of Claremont
Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Claremont Unified School District

LAFCO File:  Annexation No. 738 to County Sanitation District No. 21

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 4.035± acres to the district. The subject territory is located at the southwest intersection of Baseline Road and Monte Vista Avenue, all within the City of Claremont.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Thursday, August 15, 2013.

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

Date:    July 15, 2013

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-21-738

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. County Sanitation District No. 21 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. 21 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: dkg@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 28, 2013

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 571, Grid F7
Located at the southwest intersection of Baseline Road and Monte Vista Avenue, all within the City of Claremont.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
4.035 acres or 0.006 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 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?  
   200

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 $3,236,700.

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.

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 50 proposed condominiums.
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. 21 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. 21 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>
</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>
Annexation No. 738 shown thus

Boundary of Sanitation District No. 21 prior to Annexation No. 738 shown thus

Prior Annexations shown thus

Area of Annexation: 4.035 Acres

0.006 Square Miles
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
Castaic Lake Water Agency
City of Santa Clarita
Sulphur Springs Union Elementary
City of Santa Clarita
William S. Hart School District

LAFCO File: Annexion No. 1036 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexion listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 7.392± acres to the district. The subject territory has two Parcels. Parcel 1 is located on Sand Canyon Road at its intersection with Comet Way, Parcel 2 is located on Sand Canyon Road approximately 400 feet south of Comet 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 Thursday, August 15, 2013.

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

Date: July 15, 2013

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-1036

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: 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: [Signature]

DATE: June 26, 2013

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 4552, Grid D3
Parcel 1 located on Sand Canyon Road at its intersection with Comet Way, Parcel 2 located on Sand Canyon Road approximately 400 feet south of Comet Way, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

7.392 acres or 0.011 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 three single-family homes including one horse stable 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?
   6

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   6

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   3
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:
   3 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 $1,809,659.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential and vacant residential. The current zoning is Residential Estate-2 acres minimum lot size [RE] and Residential Very Low Density 1 dwelling unit per gross acre (Santa Clarita) [RVL].

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.

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>
</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
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Castaic Lake Water Agency
Castaic Union Elementary
William S. Hart School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 1066 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 197.956± acres to the district. The subject territory is located south of Harp Canyon Road at the east and west sides of Romero Canyon Road, all within the unincorporated area of Los Angeles.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Thursday, August 15, 2013.

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

Date: July 15, 2013

Paul A. Novak
Executive Officer
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATON/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-1066

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

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

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 L. Allen  
**DATE:** June 24, 2013

**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 4369, Grid B6
Located south of Harp Canyon Road at the east and west sides of Romero Canyon Road, all within unincorporated area of Los Angeles County.

**TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:**
197.956 acres or 0.309 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 fairly hilly terrain bisected by two parallel north-south trending canyons.

**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 $1,178,683.

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 Heavy Agricultural, 2 acre minimum lot size [A-2-2].

3. What is the proposed planned land use of the subject area?
   The proposed land use is public use (high school)

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 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 proposed high school.
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 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>
<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>
UNWRAPPING the GIFT

Every donation shares a common thread – someone who was moved to help advance the university’s mission.
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Distinguished Alumni Honored

Front row, from left: Rebecca Summers, Martial R. Thirsk, Scott D. Kerby and Paul Kramer.
Back row: Martin J. Colombatto, A. Barry Hirschfeld, Frank Bostrom, President Michael Ortiz, Terri N. Deerr and Dan Stark.

College of Education & Integrative Studies

Rebecca Summers

The daughter of teachers and granddaughter of a school administrator, Rebecca Summers says teaching is in her blood.

That passion has made a world of difference. Since becoming principal in 2008, Summers has moved Whitcomb Continuation High School in Glendora from an underperforming campus to a California Modal Continuation High School.

She credits the personal attention she received at Cal Poly Pomona, where she was a single mother of three boys while earning a master's degree in educational leadership in 2008.

Her youngest son is a Cal Poly Pomona student now, and she has since remarried. But one thing remains unchanged.

"I have never lost my passion for teaching and learning and connecting with kids of all ages," she says.
College of Engineering
Martin J. Colombatto

MARTIN J. COLOMBATTO ARRIVED AT CAL POLY POMONA "looking for something that combined theory and application."

After earning a bachelor's degree in engineering technology in 1982, Colombatto worked as a field sales engineer for Texas Instruments and then in sales, marketing and management with several other companies. Currently, he serves on the board for Clariphy Communications and Lucenta Corp.

In 2012, he and his wife, Stefanie, contributed to the College of Engineering to refurbish an electronics lab.

"I was really happy to do that given how much those labs contributed to my education," he says.

College of Business Administration
A. Barry Hirschfeld

A. BARRY HIRSCHFELD HAS BEEN AN entrepreneur since he was younger in Colorado, selling motorized bicycles, go-carts, fireworks and Christmas trees.

Hirschfeld earned a business administration degree from Cal Poly Pomona in 1964 and a master's in management from the University of Denver in 1966. He built a successful real estate development company and ran the family printing company. Like his father and grandfather, he is a member of the Colorado Business Hall of Fame.

Hirschfeld and his wife, Arlene, are generous philanthropists. "I was exposed at an early age by my grandfather to help others," he says. "He said you need to do something more than just business, something for a greater good."

College of Agriculture
Dan Stark

In 1981, DAN STARK EARNED A BACHELOR'S degree in agricultural business management and was captain of the Intercollegiate Horse Show Team. He managed a Disney horse ranch for seven years.

"The time at Disney allowed me to acquire professional experience in the entertainment/hospitality/tourism industry, which led me to other career opportunities," he recalls.

Stark has worked for a Las Vegas gaming company, becoming vice president of corporate marketing and promoting the company at rodeo events. Currently, he is an independent executive consultant with Gaming Market Advisors.
ATTACHMENT 17

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-AUGUST 2013

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 450/ Jones-Sawyer
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/19/13
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 05/24/13: In committee, set for a second hearing.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) to establish seven trustee areas by July 1, 2014, with vacancies filled at subsequent elections via trustee-area voting. Four of the seats will expire June 30, 2015, and the other three seats will expire June 30, 2017.

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

Given the significant lead time before the next election (June 2015) of four of the expiring future-trustees, activity isn’t expected lest it be forced via petition. The other three future-trustee seats won’t expire until June 2017.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

☒ Watch Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
☐ Approve County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
AMENDMENTS REQUIRED
If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for amendments to the bill language, suggested alternative language is attached.

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6144.

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
2013 County Committee Members

First Supervisorial District
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz

Second Supervisorial District
Maria M. Calix
Joan Jakubowski

Third Supervisorial District
Ben Allen, Vice Chairperson
AJ Willmer, Chairperson

Fourth Supervisorial District
Frank Bostrom
Owen H. Griffith

Fifth Supervisorial District
Joel Peterson
Suzan T. Solomon

At Large
Ted Edmiston

**************
Keith D. Crafton
Secretary
(562) 922-8144

Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
c/o Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway, Downey, CA 90242-2890
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Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

August 2013

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 22, 2013.

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 nine months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Inner City Unified School District/July 2012

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

August 2013

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of July 22, 2013.]

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

In May of 2001, the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization petitioned to form a Wiseburn USD from within the boundaries of the Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD). After approval by the County Committee and a long review period by the CDE and SBE, the petition was moved forward via successful legislation, the formation of two related joint power agencies, and final approval by the SBE on May 9, 2013. The final step to form a Wiseburn USD is a local area election scheduled for November 5, 2013.

*Status: Election scheduled for November 5, 2013
Status Date: July 22, 2013

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE ABC USD

On January 18, 2013, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to establish trustee areas, and trustee area voting within the ABC USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. Charles Ara. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On February 21, 2013, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on February 27, 2013, for circulation.
Cancellation of the August 7, 2013, Regular Meeting of
the County Committee
July 25, 2013
Page 2

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: April 10, 2013

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 petitioners, 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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; chief petitioners may gather additional signatures.
Status Date: December 5, 2011

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

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.
Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 7,000 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: October 2, 2006
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

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

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

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

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

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/November 2011
Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Glendale USD to La Canada USD/May 2013
- Pasadena USD to La Canada USD/April 2013
- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/January 2013