May 23, 2013

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, June 5, 2013

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 5, 2013, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of June 5, 2013.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6144.

KDC/AD:ah

Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
June 5, 2013
9:30 a.m.

I Information
D Discussion
A Action
* Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Mr. AJ Willmer

II. FLAG SALUTE – Mr. Willmer

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on
March 6, 2013, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS – Secretary Mr. Keith D. Crafton

Newspaper Articles

- An April 27, 2013, article from the latimes.com-“Efforts to split
  Santa Monica – Malibu district gain new traction.”
  (Attachment 1)

- An April 30, 2013, article from the latimes.com-“L.A. County
  rejects Santa Clarita districts’ elections proposals.”
  (Attachment 2)

- A May 11, 2013, article from The Sacramento Bee-“Woodland
  considers district elections to comply with voting rights act.
  (Attachment 3)
Informational Correspondence

• A May 16, 2013, Local Agency Formation Commission Notice (LAFCO), Notice to Subjected/Interested Agencies, Annexation No. 2013-03 to the City of Santa Clarita (North Saugus). (act. (Attachment 4)

• A May 16, 2013, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies, Annexation No. 737 to County Sanitation District No. 21 (Attachment 5)

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

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

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition to form a Wiseburn USD.

VII. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA) AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES

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

VIII. UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMITTEE WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT

The Secretary will discuss the development of a LACOE-hosted website for the County Committee.

IX. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization. The County Committee may take action to support or oppose the legislation or provide comments to the authors. (Attachment 6)
X. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY USD I, D, A* REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (Attachment: "Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals") (Attachment 7)

XI. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY REORGANIZATION I, D, A* PROPOSALS EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school districts other than the Los Angeles USD. (Attachment: "Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD]") (Attachment 8)

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

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

Regular Meeting
March 6, 2013

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, March 6, 2013, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Chairperson Mr. AJ Willmer.

**Members Present**
Frank Bostrom
Maria Calix
Ted Edmiston
Owen H. Griffith
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz
Joel Peterson
Suzan T. Solomon
AJ Wilmer

**Members Absent**
Ben Allen
Joan Jakubowski

**Staff Present**
Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Eric Hass, Staff
Anna Heredia, Recording Secretary

Mr. Willmer led the flag salute.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Ms. Solomon that the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 9, 2013, be approved. Motion carried with one abstention.

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

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

Flag Salute

Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of January 9, 2013

Communications

Presentations from the Public
Mr. Crafton reported that the Wiseburn School District (SD) petition is scheduled to go to the State Board of Education (SBE) in May 2013. He added that Senate Bill 41, the trailer bill for the Wiseburn unification is in the Assembly and the first reading was held on March 4, 2013.

Dr. Deegan stated that when legislation was passed, the governor removed the unique revenue calculation from the legislation, so this is the reason why LACOE staff is working to arrive at a calculation that recognizes the uniqueness of the circumstances yet follows the normal pattern that we use to calculate these matters.

Mr. Willmer stated that the letter of support is still pending.

Dr. Deegan stated that part of what the letter of support will include is the revenue calculation.

Dr. Deegan stated that a public hearing is scheduled next week for them to finalize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) report. This public hearing is to present the final report that will be presented to the SBE. Dr. Deegan may attend this meeting.

Mr. Willmer requested that if Dr. Deegan attends this meeting, to please report on the meeting.

Mr. Crafton stated that a petition is being circulated within ABC Unified School District (USD) regarding trustee area voting, once it is done circulating, it will be presented to the County Committee.

Dr. Deegan added that ABC USD received a demand letter requesting review of trustee areas under the California Voting Rights Acts (CVRA). There was also a petition request submitted for a County Committee petition, that doesn’t address CVRA but requested trustee areas to be put in the district.

Mr. Keith D. Crafton stated that Downey Unified School District (USD) is requesting to update the trustee areas and to institute trustee area voting within Downey USD.

Dr. Deegan stated that it is a board petition in the form of its request. Downey USD has had trustee areas for many years and now the board has voted to add trustee area voting. Downey USD personnel will present their record of board action, board approval, seeking public input, and a demographics study prepared by a reputable consultant at the public hearing taking place following the County Committee meeting. The public hearing is set to begin at 11:00 a.m.
Mr. Crafton provided a print out of what he has been working on with the Los Angeles County Office of Education’s (LACOE) communications department, he stated that the County Committee website will have its own URL. He also provided samples of other County Committee websites for members to review. Items which will be included in the website are as follows: County Committee structure, reorganization process, list of members, minutes, meeting schedules, and any other information that is pertinent to the County Committee. Mr. Crafton added that County Committee staff will be in complete control of what is posted on the website. Mr. Crafton requested input from the County Committee members.

Mr. Willmer stated that the most important aspect is that staff will be in complete control of the website.

Dr. Deegan added that a historical library will be maintained, as well as current information.

Mr. Willmer would like to maintain all information so that the public may be able to search for events that have occurred in the past and documents that have been posted as well.

Dr. Deegan suggested that the website may go live and continue to be refined.

Mr. Willmer would encourage staff to have the website go live and continue to update. All members were in agreement.

Dr. Deegan stated that staff just learned about Assembly Bill 450 which addresses a timeline for the Los Angeles Community College Districts (CCD) to move to trustee areas.

Mr. Crafton stated there were no updates to Los Angeles USD reorganization proposals.

Mr. Crafton stated that there were no updates on Los Angeles County SD Reorganization Proposals Excluding Those Affecting the Los Angeles USD.
Discussion occurred regarding by laws and policies of the County Committee.

Mr. AJ Willmer suggested a sub-committee be formed in order to review the by laws and policies. The members of the sub-committee are as follows: Joel Peterson, Frank Bostrom and Maria Calix.

Staff was instructed to resend the doodle.com survey of meeting times to members who have not responded.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.
Efforts to split Santa Monica-Malibu district gain new traction

School board's decision to redistribute PTA funds to less wealthy schools is a turnoff for many in Malibu. Some in Santa Monica also see potential pluses in a breakup.

By Matt Stevens, Los Angeles Times

5:32 PM PDT, April 27, 2013

The PTA at Point Dume Elementary in Malibu is a fundraising machine. Parents collected about $2,100 per student in the 2009-10 school year, money that helped pay for music and art programs, as well as a dedicated marine science lab.

But now the Santa Monica-Malibu school board wants to funnel much of that money away and, in the name of educational equality, give it to other district campuses.

The move has sparked an effort in Malibu to secede from the district, igniting a battle between one wealthy community and its less wealthy neighbor that echoes across the state.

The district's effort to redistribute PTA money adds to the trend in California since the 1970s to equalize funding between rich and poor schools. Gov. Jerry Brown rolled out a new plan earlier this year that would radically alter the status quo, moving the lion's share of educational dollars to poor schools.

Some Malibu parents are just fed up.

"It's not fair," said Maria Kuznetsova, who has a 6-year-old son at Point Dume. "You don't want to donate to somebody else. You know how it goes. It disappears."

Still, secession is a hard idea to swallow for some in the community known as much for its liberal politics as its sandy beaches and Creamsicle sunsets.

Deborah Allen, who has two sons in the district and helps run Malibu High's booster club, said she has no problem with the policy that will send money her school raises to students who need it most.

"Some of the kids in Santa Monica, the only hot meal they get each day is lunch," Allen said. "So if half of my money, or whatever portion, goes to them, I'm OK with it."
Only in this awkward marriage between two beach cities could Santa Monica be considered the poor spouse. Its median household income is 27% higher than the rest of the county. Its ocean-front homes are the stuff of California dreams, although there are less affluent pockets inland.

The city's wealth, however, pales in comparison with Malibu, where median incomes, at $133,000 a year, are nearly double Santa Monica's.

When the Santa Monica school district first added a campus in Malibu more than 60 years ago, the joining of the two communities made sense. Santa Monica had an established system; Malibu was just a rustic beach town.

But over the decades, the two cities have grown — and grown apart. Malibu opened its own high school in 1992. It now has three elementary schools and about 2,000 students. Leaders of the separation movement say it's time the for city to make its own educational decisions for its schools.

The core of the problem is the mismatch between the wealth of Malibu, population 13,000, and the political power of its southern neighbor Santa Monica, population 90,000. Santa Monica has 10 schools and about 9,000 students. There hasn't been a Malibu resident on the school board since 2008.

In 2003, Malibu parents launched the first of at least three serious attempts to secede from the joint school district.

The latest effort was sparked in 2011, when the joint school board unanimously passed a policy that beginning in 2014 will bar PTAs from raising money for professional development or staff, such as instructional aides.

Instead, the district will funnel privately raised dollars into a foundation that will distribute the funds more equally among all schools. PTAs could still raise money for classroom items under the new plan.

The goal, Supt. Sandra Lyon said, was to ensure that "every student gets the best education we have to offer."

In a presentation to the school board, she showed how some PTAs in the district raised thousands of dollars per student for their schools while others brought in less than $100.

That PTA money had helped keep the district running during the recession. In addition to parcel taxes paid by area residents, PTAs contributed about $3 million to the $120-million general fund in the 2011-12 school year.

At Malibu's Point Dume, for example, the PTA has organized fundraising dinners that cost $100 or more per ticket, golf tournaments that charge $200 per player, book fairs and countless other
events. A "direct investment form" that is available online tries to make donations at levels between "$25,000" and "$3,000 per child" look easy.

Steven Bard, whose son goes to Malibu High, is one of many parents who have contributed. He's written checks and — along with his wife — poured in the volunteer hours.

He called the money redistribution scheme "ludicrous."

"The parents will just spend money on tutors and special programs for their own kids. The money will end up where they want it to in the end. People aren't dumb."

The picture is somewhat different in Santa Monica, with its diverse and urbanized populations. At schools with lower-income students, parents can't continually open up their wallets.

John Rogers, head of UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education and Access, said the conflict between the two cities springs from a situation of "scarcity for all."

"When we don't have enough," said Rogers, who has a son attending Santa Monica schools, "people are going to try to protect their own."

::

Education officials said creating a new Malibu district could take years. The idea has to pass through several county and state agencies before being voted on by residents in both communities.

Separation advocates in Malibu believe they have a better chance of succeeding this time around, in part because frustration has been brewing in Santa Monica as well.

Some Santa Monica residents and school board members have said they are tired of focusing time and energy on Malibu issues, such as whether football field lights were too jarring so close to the ocean. The superintendent has assembled a committee to explore breaking the district apart.

Because of several bond measures and parcel taxes passed in recent years, the fiscal future of Santa Monica schools hangs less on Malibu property values than it once did.

In addition, the funding plan proposed by Brown to distribute a greater percentage of state money to poorer schools could bolster the case for separation.

Santa Monica-Malibu stands to go from $6,147 per student to $9,058 per student if the governor's plan passes.

A Santa Monica-only district would probably get a similar, if not greater boost, and Malibu too would do fine on its own. In fact, the city is so wealthy that it could operate primarily on local
property tax revenues — without relying on state general funds. It could take in an additional $4.5 million annually on its own.

Santa Monica "will prosper ... and we'll prosper," said Craig Foster, president of the secession group, Advocates for Malibu Public Schools. "The money helps this make sense."

Eric Biren, a Santa Monica parent, said he generally supports the separation and understands the desire to keep what's yours.

Biren's daughter, Charlotte, graduated from Santa Monica High, where she played violin in the school's top orchestra. His son, Abe, is now a junior and plays bass. Biren said he has written checks to support the music program, taken tickets at concerts and worked backstage.

"As a parent, you want to fix your local school, but you don't want to have it all diluted and dispersed for the energy that you're putting in," he said. "It's a balance. It's a tricky moral question."

But after this many decades, there are some residents who are hesitant to break apart a touchy but still-working marriage that has brought benefits to both communities.

Some parents in Malibu have cherished the diversity of the joint district and opportunities to expose their children to a less-insular world down the highway.

As a district, Santa Monica-Malibu is among the few in the state with a racial makeup that is evenly split between white and nonwhite students.

If Malibu goes it alone, however, the new district would be 78% white.

"We always felt like we wanted our kids to be well-integrated, to feel like they're part of a community," said Agnes Gibson, who has a daughter attending Malibu High. "We like the interaction, the diversity."

matt.stevens@latimes.com
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L.A. County rejects Santa Clarita districts' elections proposal

Six school districts and a water district were seeking to consolidate elections to avoid possible voting rights lawsuits brought against other local governments.

By Abby Sewell, Los Angeles Times

8:07 PM PDT, April 30, 2013

Los Angeles County supervisors rejected a bid Tuesday from several Santa Clarita Valley school districts and a water district hoping to consolidate elections in a bid to avoid the kind of voting rights lawsuits that other local governments have been hit with.

The measure failed on a 2-2 vote, with Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas abstaining. County election officials opposed the change, arguing that shifting the districts to November even-year elections would exceed their ability to conduct elections.

An increasing number of cities and districts have been sued in recent years over allegations that their election rules violate the California Voting Rights Act by diluting the power of minority voters.

The cities of Compton and Modesto switched from at-large to district elections after unsuccessfully fighting costly voting rights suits. More recently, the city of Palmdale and the ABC Unified School District in southeastern Los Angeles County have been hit with similar complaints.

Gloria Mercado-Fortine, a board member with the William S. Hart Union High School District in Santa Clarita, said that system and the others that joined in the request — four feeder elementary school districts and the Santa Clarita Community College District — have not received a specific threat of litigation.

But she said the districts had received inquiries about their election systems and saw the writing on the wall in the lawsuit against neighboring Palmdale.

"It appears that it's coming right down the state, from north to south," she said. "We're trying to do the right thing here. We truly believe that we want to be very inclusive and increase participation."
The districts — all of which use at-large voting systems — commissioned a joint demographic study that found moving to by-district elections would not necessarily increase minority voting power because the minority population was "substantially dispersed." So instead they requested that the county allow them to consolidate their elections with the statewide general election in a bid to increase voter participation in their elections.

Newhall County Water District joined in the request.

The districts would not provide a copy of the demographic study, citing attorney-client privilege. The population of the Santa Clarita Valley was 60.7% white and 24.4% Latino in 2011, according to the college district.

Officials with the county registrar-recorder said that allowing the districts to move their elections might overload the county's voting system, which has limited room on each ballot. According to the office, large portions of the county are already at 75% capacity in even-year November elections.

The office is in the process of modernizing its system, but officials said the new one will not be in place in time for the November 2014 election.

Supervisors Michael D. Antonovich, whose district includes the Santa Clarita Valley, and Don Knabe sided with the school districts.

No governmental entity has successfully fought a lawsuit under the California Voting Rights Act to date. Rod Pacheco, a former Riverside County district attorney who has made a study of the act, said most cities and districts initially fought the suits vigorously but eventually settled.

"Government entities are starting to see the light and starting to make changes in their governance structure" to comply with the act before facing litigation, Pacheco said.

Paul Mitchell, whose firm, Redistricting Partners, did the study for the Santa Clarita school districts, said his company has fielded an increasing number of requests in recent years from governments interested in preemptively switching to by-district elections, and dozens throughout the state have made the change.

abby.sewell@latimes.com
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Woodland considers district elections to comply with voting rights act

dvsmith@sacbee.com

Published Saturday, May. 11, 2013

For much of Woodland’s history, there have been two constants: Its City Council members have always been elected citywide, and they have nearly always been white.

Though Latinos constitute almost half of Woodland's residents – enough to be a plurality – none currently sits on the council. Only three have served in the city's 142-year history.

While Woodland's elections are nonpartisan, all five councilmen are registered Republicans in a city where Democrats hold a 43.7 percent to 30.4 percent voter registration advantage.

"If you look at the demographics, (the City Council) clearly doesn't reflect the city of Woodland," said former Mayor Art Pimentel, one of the three past Latino council members and a registered Democrat. "That's problematic."

More than a decade after lawmakers passed the California Voting Rights Act, Woodland and other California governments are shedding at-large elections in favor of using neighborhood-based districts to diversify their leadership ranks.

The 2002 law prohibits at-large elections – commonplace in much of the state – if it is shown the contests disenfranchise minority voters. It also gives groups the ability to sue to compel cities to change their election systems.

California Watch, a nonprofit investigative news group, last year identified 13 California cities where either Latino or Asian residents make up a majority but have all-white city councils. That list did not include Woodland, where Hispanics fall just shy of a majority at 47 percent, according to U.S. census data.

In the San Joaquin Valley, the city of Modesto and school districts in Ceres, Madera and Hanford have paid out sizable settlements to avoid court fights over their at-large elections.

At least 77 school districts have applied to the California Department of Education to change their systems from at-large to district-based to comply with the state's Voting Rights Act, said
Joanna Cuevas Ingram, a voting rights fellow at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area.

"A lot of cities are confronting the issue," said Cuevas Ingram. "It's not only about increasing diversity, it's also about accountability. It's a good governance issue."

In an at-large election, voters select candidates from across a city or jurisdiction. In a district-based election, voters in a designated electoral area select a candidate who resides there.

At-large elections have been commonplace for years in California.

Tales of corrupt ward bosses, political machines and sweeping Tammany Hall-style influence over neighborhood elections in other states were fresh in the minds of early lawmakers.

But over time, concerns arose that at-large elections would allow higher-voting, wealthier, whiter electorates to trump poorer neighborhoods and those with large ethnic minority populations, said Paul Mitchell, president of Sacramento-based consultancy Redistricting Partners, which advises local governments on the voting rights act.

In Woodland, advocates for diversity say the long-standing contrast between the city's minority population and its council leadership demonstrates the need for change.

More than 26,000 of the city's 55,584 residents are Hispanic, according to U.S. census data. Supporters of district-based elections say concerns about underrepresentation have long played out at the ballot box.

Evelia Genera is among them. Genera was a Woodland Community College dean, Woodland school board member and principal at Woodland High School before retiring last year.

"I know the challenges people face in wanting to serve and run for office," Genera said. "But it's also about neighborhood representation. Ethically, we have a responsibility to the city of Woodland to make it more accountable."

**City leaders back switch**

Four current Woodland councilmen are practically neighbors, living within about a mile of each other in south Woodland.

According to 2010 census figures, four of the five council members live on blocks where fewer than 20 percent of residents are Hispanic. The fifth, Sean Denny, lives on a block with about 33 percent Hispanic residents.

Woodland leaders support the switch to district elections despite the likelihood that some council members would lose their seats because they live in close proximity. Last week, the council unanimously approved a committee recommendation to move to a district-based vote.
"We're of the firm belief that the intent of the (voting rights act), the requirements ... are that we form districts within the city," said Councilman William Marble, who together with Councilman Tom Stallard made up the committee that explored the issue and recommended the change.

Woodland has slated a ballot measure on the issue for June 2014, with the first district-based elections set for 2016. Public comment, drawing district maps and preparing ballot language will likely go deep into this year, Marble said.

"We're adamantly behind anything that opens up the electoral process," said Mark Pruner, chairman of the Yolo County Republican Central Committee. "All five (council members) are Republicans in a city where Democrats have the registration edge, all are duly elected, and all are doing the right thing. They're all behind opening up the process."

In cities and towns across the state, minority voters and legal advocates have used the California Voting Rights Act to press for more equal representation in city, school and community college governance, going to court to fight for district-based voting.

Woodland officials had already considered the legal and financial ramifications of not complying, made clear by the city attorney in March.

"I think the city is vulnerable" to a lawsuit, then-City Attorney Andrew Morris told the Woodland City Council at its March 19 meeting. "If there is a large minority population in the city and there is a history of relatively few minority council members, you're vulnerable."

Esparto Unified School District, west of Woodland, was among the latest to switch to district-based voting in 2012 to avoid costly litigation with the Lawyers' Committee over its at-large system.

The group has won judgments against a handful of Central Valley school districts and cities, including Modesto, the first city to be sued under the act in a 2004 landmark case that cleared the way for future challenges.

Modesto ultimately settled the case in 2008 for a reported $3 million after the U.S. Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court declined to review an appellate court decision against the city.

'It's the law'

The Woodland Joint Unified School District and the sprawling Yuba Community College District, which includes a Woodland campus, moved to district-based elections within the last two years.

Jesse Ortiz, a Woodland Joint Unified trustee, co-chaired the committee that drew the district's new trustee boundaries.
"I always come back to, 'It's the law,'" Ortiz said. He said results of district elections were immediate: more Latino and female candidates, and challenged seats in three trustee races for the first time in decades.

"From the standpoint of challengers, it worked. From the standpoint of diversity, it worked. We're turning out more women than before," Ortiz said. "It's very positive for the city of Woodland."

Sacramento moved to district-based elections in 1971, and former mayor and state assemblyman Phil Isenberg credits the switch for producing a diverse class of council members that year: Robert Matsui, Anne Rudin and minister and African American leader Rosenwald "Robbie" Robertson.

As Woodland's does today, the Sacramento City Council at the time lacked geographic diversity. In 1969, Manuel Ferrales became the first member who lived north of the American River and joined a council that included five white men from Land Park.

"I will not tell you that district elections solve all problems for all time," Isenberg said, "but most Americans believe they should have neighbors who represent them. It's a strong theme."

Proponents of at-large elections fret that in district-based elections, candidates can win with a thinner slice of votes and that elected leaders may prioritize the needs of their districts above those of the city.

"There's a concern that you create these little fiefdoms" by drawing districts, said Mitchell of Redistricting Partners.

In a city such as Woodland, where voter turnout is typically about 36 percent — about 9,000 of Woodland's roughly 25,000 registered voters — some also have concerns about voter turnout shrinking with district-based elections.

"There's a concern that the community's not politically engaged. It might take 10 years for an area to develop a political infrastructure," Mitchell said. "But that's what the law is trying to do: create a political voice."

Call The Bee's Darrell Smith, (916) 321-1040. Staff writer Phillip Reese contributed to this report.
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NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich
City of Santa Clarita - City Manager
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Los Angeles County Committee on School Dist. Organization
Sheriff Department – Enforcement Bureau
Saugus Union School District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Castaic Lake Water Agency
Newhall County Water District

SUBJECT: Annexation No. 2013-03 to the City of Santa Clarita (North Saugus)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been revised and received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County. The application involves approximately 826.23± acres of uninhabited, unincorporated territory. The subject territory is generally located north of Copperhill Drive, and adjacent to Blue Cloud Road with a portion of the site within the Angeles National Forest. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or District</th>
<th>Change of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita</td>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Los Angeles Vector Control District</td>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed jurisdictional changes may affect your agency. The submitted application, map and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit all written concerns and comments to the LAFCO office by June 17, 2013. Should you have any questions regarding this proposal, please contact this office at (626) 204-6500.

Date: May 16, 2013

Doug Dorado
Government Analyst

Enc:
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ANNEXATION NO. 2013-03 TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA (NORTH SAUGUS)

Those portions of Sections 30, 31 and 32, Township 5 North, Range 15 West together with those portions of Section 25, Township 5 North, Range 16 West, all of San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described in two parcels as follows:

Parcel A:
Beginning at the northwest corner of Section 36, Township 5 North, Range 16 West, San Bernardino Meridian being a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on January 31, 2013; thence

(L1) Leaving said city boundary and along the west line of the southwest quarter of said Section 25 North 00°13’42" East 2681.00 feet to the west quarter corner of said Section 25; thence
(L2) along the north line of said southwest quarter South 89°42’05" East 2659.58 feet to the center of said Section 25; thence
(L3) along the west line of the northeast quarter of said Section 25 North 00°14’40" East 2678.86 feet to the north quarter corner of said Section 25; thence
(L4) along the north line of said northeast quarter South 89°39’18" East 2660.34 feet to the northwest corner of said Section 30; thence
(L5) along the north line of the northwest quarter of said Section 30 South 88°22’27" East 2619.33 feet to the north quarter corner of said Section 30; thence
(L6) along the east line of the northwest quarter of said Section 30 South 00°45’08" West 2673.04 feet to the center of said Section 30; thence
Cloud Road (Private and Future Street) as shown on last said map, a radial line through said point bears North 50°33’29” East; thence
(C2) southeasterly along said curve and along the northeasterly line of said Parcel 4 and along the centerline of said Blue Cloud Road the following 7 curves and courses, through a central angle of 8°14’06” an arc distance of 50.30 feet; thence
(L3) tangent to said curve South 31°12’25” East 181.46 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 480.00 feet; thence
(C4) southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 12°20’32” an arc distance of 103.40 feet; thence
(L5) tangent to last said curve south 18°51’53” East 78.28 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 265.00 feet; thence
(C6) southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 22°00’59” an arc distance of 101.83 feet; thence
(L7) tangent to last said curve South 40°52’52” East 269.80 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 509.26 feet; thence
(C8) southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 17°21’58” an arc distance of 154.35 feet to the easterly line of said Parcel 4; thence
(L9) leaving said northeasterly line and said centerline of Blue Cloud Road and along the easterly line of said Parcel 4 South 00°30’27” West 228.58 feet to the northwesterly corner of Parcel Map No. 5827 as shown on map filed in Book 64 Page 17 of said Parcel Maps; thence
(L10) along the northerly line of said Parcel Map No. 5827 South 89°06’58” East 1332.88 feet to the west line of southwest quarter of said Section 32; thence
(L11) along last said west line North 00°25’38” East 667.42 feet to the west quarter corner of said Section 32; thence
(L12) along the north line of last said southwest quarter South 89°24’21” East 1333.22 feet to the easterly line of the west half of the southwest quarter of said Section 32 as described in deed recorded
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: 2013-03 (North Saugus Annexation)

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Santa Clarita
2. Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
3. 
4. 

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

1. Annexation and Sphere of Influence Amendment
2. Annexation
3. 
4. 

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

APPLICANT: City of Santa Clarita

TITLE: City Manager CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Kenneth W. Striplin

ADDRESS: 23920 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300

CITY: Santa Clarita STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 91355

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Patrick Leclair TELEPHONE: (661) 255-4349

E-MAIL ADDRESS: pleclair@santa-clarita.com

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
700 N. CENTRAL AVENUE, SUITE 445 GLENDALE, CA 91203
TELEPHONE (818) 254-2454 FAX (818) 254-2452
By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]  DATE: 4.29.13

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The proposed annexation area consists of approximately 827 acres which is located generally north of Copperhill Drive, east of Haskell Canyon Road, and north of the North Copperhill Annexation area (completed November 28, 2012) adjacent to the Saugus community. The majority of the annexation area is located within the Angeles National Forest and takes access off of Blue Cloud Road at Bouquet Canyon Road.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

827 acres or 1.29 sq. mi.

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 annexation includes approximately 827 acres of land including: a) 691 acres are in the Angeles National Forest (NF) with 273 acres held in public ownership by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) and the Angeles National Forest and the remaining 418 acres in the NF consist of developed filming ranches held in private ownership; and b) 138 acres held in private ownership outside of the NF and include a filming ranch and an animal training facility. The project site is served from Blue Cloud Road and an LADWP service road, both of which are graded private drives. This annexation area is immediately adjacent to the recently completed North Copperhill Annexation area.

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

The territory consists of varying topography including valleys, peaks, and flat, disturbed areas where development has occurred. The territory extends into the NF north of the City and consists of predominantly undisturbed areas consistent with the NF adjacent to the City.

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?

No development is proposed

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

0

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

9

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

The territory is surrounded predominantly to the north and east by the NF that does not include developed areas. To the south and west of the territory is developed portions of the North Copperhill annexation area that was completed in November 2012. The North Copperhill annexation area consists predominantly of single-family, detached residential homes in a traditional suburban design including residential collector streets with cul-de-sacs built into the topography of the area as appropriate.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The territory predominantly consists of land within the NF that is not likely to see any new development other than minor expansions to the existing filming operations in the annexation area. Private land holdings within the annexation area, but outside the NF, are developed and not likely to experience any further development.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

One existing single-family dwelling unit is located within the annexation area, but is currently being used as an animal training facility.

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

The proposed annexation would not impede the City's ability to achieve its regional housing goals. No development is proposed as part of the annexation and the City will continue its effort to meet its fair share of regional housing needs.

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

The project would not result in any negative impacts to lower-income communities. The proposal seeks to annex primarily undeveloped areas and the annexation boundary was determined based on natural and jurisdictional factors without regard to race, culture, or income.

**LAND USE AND ZONING**

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

$4,276,689 (LA Tax Assessor, April 2013)

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

Zoning designations within the annexation area consists of a mixture of Open Space and Residential Estate designated property. Land uses consist of a mix of filming ranches, open space, utility facilities, and an animal training facility.

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

There is no planned change in the land uses from the existing open space, utility facilities, filming ranches, or animal training uses.
4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city).

The territory has been prezoned consistent with the City’s General Plan including Open Space and Residential Estate designations and is consistent with county designations. The only difference upon annexation will be the inclusion of the City’s Movie Ranch Overlay Zone on the filming ranches within the annexation area.

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

North: Angeles National Forest and rural agricultural properties (County)
East: Angeles National Forest and rural agricultural properties (County)
South: A combination of open space, developed single-family homes, and suburban neighborhoods in Saugus/North Valencia part of the recent North Copperhill annexation (City of Santa Clarita)
West: A combination of open space in the County, along with open space in the City of Santa Clarita’s recently annexed North Copperhill annexation

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?

The territory includes property designated as Open Space - National Forest (OS-NF), Non-Urban 2 (NU2), and Non-Urban 3 (NU3).

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

The proposal is consistent with the City’s General Plan because it supports policies that direct growth into established areas while preventing sprawl into undeveloped areas without existing infrastructure. The proposal is also consistent with the County’s Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.

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

This proposal will not result in development of property now or in the future. The vast majority of the project area is located in the NF and will not permit for additional development, while the portions outside the NF have been previously developed, and are not anticipated for additional development.

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

Denial of this proposal would have no effect on development in the subject area. The established filming ranches would remain, public agencies would continue to own open space acreage, and public utility corridors would continue to operate.
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. The subject territory is not located in, nor is it proposed to be located in, a redevelopment area.

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

There are no active agricultural lands in the annexation area. Since the proposal is consistent with the proposed County land use designations and includes areas that are primarily developed or designated as open space, the proposal would not have any affect on agriculture or open space lands in the annexation area.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

In 2011, the owners of the filming ranches in the annexation area contacted the City to request annexation to the City of Santa Clarita. Subsequently, surveys were conducted to determine a logical boundary to the annexation. The proposed boundary includes the last developed parcels in this region of the City who desire to be a part of the City of Santa Clarita. The surrounding property is predominantly part of the Angeles National Forest and is not anticipated to be annexed to the City. The proposed boundary is a logical and appropriate extension of the City's current boundary and service area.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The annexation proposal would have no impact on adjacent areas. Agencies that provide services to adjacent areas, such as fire, police, and schools, would continue to do so regardless if the annexation is approved. No development is proposed, and no additional infrastructure or services would be required.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

Concerning social interests, the majority of residents who were surveyed support annexation. The annexation would bring existing filming operations to the city and would allow the portions in the NF to remain undisturbed. No known mutual economic interests would be affected.
c. The local government structure of the County:

The proposed annexation will result in a negotiated tax transfer agreement between the City of Santa Clarita and the County of Los Angeles to fund public services in the annexation area. The annexation would not negatively impact the County's government structure.

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.

Government services in the proposed annexation area are adequate. The County of Los Angeles provides fire and police protection to the area, and this service would not change with the annexation. Upon annexation, City-level police protection would be provided under the City's contract with the LA County Sheriff's Department. The annexation area is located in the Saugus Union and William S. Hart Union High School Districts. These districts would be unaffected by the annexation. Upon annexation, any future residents would pay resident rates for City recreational programs and would receive other City services, either directly or under contract.

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

The City currently possesses sufficient capacity to provide the full range of municipal services to serve this area once it is annexed. The territory would not require new fire or police facilities. The annexation would not require new recreation facilities, nor would the annexation change or impact the existing school districts that provide education services to the established neighborhoods. Given that the purpose of the proposed annexation is to bring existing filming ranches into the City, it is not anticipated that any new public facilities would be needed. The annexation would result in a negotiated tax transfer agreement between the City of Santa Clarita and the County of Los Angeles, the purpose of which would be to fund public services should any be required.

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?

Annexation of the North Saugus area will have little or no impact on the City's ability to provide adequate services and controls. Existing municipal services are adequate to serve the filming ranches. The purpose of the annexation is to bring established filming areas into the City. No development is proposed as part of this request nor would the annexation create the potential for future development or the need for additional government services.
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 City of Santa Clarita routinely evaluates the adequacy of government services as part of its annual budget process. An appropriate level of government services would be provided upon annexation to the City. Given that the proposed annexation area primarily contains established filming ranches and open space parcels, any increase in the demand for services would not be expected to be significant. There will be no need for service providers to increase capacity as the annexation would not result in additional residents beyond those who already reside in the annexation area.

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.

1) Open Space Preservation District: approximately $32 per year per single-family residence
2) Stormwater Facility Maintenance: approximately $23 per year per single-family residence
3) Landscape Maintenance District 2008-1: approximately $61 per year per single-family residence
4) Streetlight Maintenance District: approximately $73 per year per single-family residence

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   Yes ☐  Name of Agency  City of Santa Clarita  ☑ 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?

   There are no known communities of social or economic interest within the subject territory. The vast majority of the area consists of open space, utility corridors, and filming ranches.

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

   The annexation requires a Sphere of Influence amendment. The City has communicated with the County CEO's office via email, and has met with representatives of the County of Los Angeles' 5th District office to discuss the annexation and the proposed boundaries. Based on the last communication on April 22, 2013, there is no opposition to the proposed annexation and sphere of influence amendment applications.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   
   No. The City of Santa Clarita has no voted bonded debt.

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?
   
   Not applicable.

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?
   
   Not applicable.

4. In the case of detachment requests, does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt?
   
   Not applicable.

NOTIFICATION

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

   Name                  Address                                      Telephone
   __________________    ____________________________                ________
   __________________    ____________________________                ________
   __________________    ____________________________                ________

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

   Name                  Address                                      Telephone
   Patrick Leclaire     23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355 (661) 255-4330
   Jeff Hogan           23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355 (661) 255-4330
   __________________    ____________________________                ________
   __________________    ____________________________                ________
   __________________    ____________________________                ________
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION—ATTACHMENT “A”

Plan for Municipal Services

Pursuant to Government Code 56653, any local agency submitting an application for a change in organization must also submit a plan for providing services to the subject territory. Please provide information for provision of services. (*Special districts need only submit those pages of this application that apply.)

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

No new services will be provided as a result of the annexation of the North Saugus area. All municipal services, as described below, will continue without interruption. Since development is neither proposed nor would result from this request, the annexation would not require infrastructure enhancements or the need for new public services or facilities.

Fire and Emergency Services

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

The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides both fire protection and emergency medical services to the project area. Medical services are divided between basic life support (emergency medical technicains) and advanced life support (paramedics). The nearest fire station is Station 108 which is located at 28799 Rock Canyon Drive, south of the annexation territory.

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

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

The Los Angeles County Fire Department will continue to provide services at current levels. This request will have no impact on existing fire protection services in the proposed annexation area.

4. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? Services will continue without interruption.

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

The Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County is funded through a combination of the ad valorom tax and the special fire parcel tax. Construction of new facilities is financed by developer mitigation fees, although such fees do not apply to this annexation as no construction or development is proposed. No changes to property or mitigation fees will occur as a result of this annexation.

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

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

Flood control and storm water disposal services are currently provided by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

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

Services would continue to be provided by the Flood Control District and the County Department of Public Works. City Stormwater staff would also be involved, inspecting and maintaining non-County storm drain facilities.

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

Services would continue without interruption.

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

All parcels located within Los Angeles County are assessed a fee for flood control related services. These services are designed to maintain and protect the storm drain pipes and channels to ensure proper water flow. All parcels located within the City of Santa Clarita are assessed a storm water and urban runoff pollution control fee for NPDES related activities. These activities are designed to protect water quality. Following annexation property owners would be assessed this fee, currently $23 per year per single-family residence.

Library Services

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

The project area is currently served by the Los Angeles County Library System. The nearest County library facilities are located in Castaic.

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

Upon annexation, the City of Santa Clarita will provide library services to the area. The nearest City libraries are located in Valencia and Canyon Country, with the recently opened Newhall Library in Downtown Newhall. City libraries are open seven days a week and will provide a greater level of service to residents than they currently receive.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? **Upon effective date of annexation.**

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

   Library services are financed with funds from a portion of the ad valorem property tax. The City may also provide other monies for specific library projects at the direction of the City Council, such as the recent construction of the Newhall Library in Downtown Newhall.

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

   If yes, please give details.

   Not applicable.

---

**Park and Recreational Services**

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

   Current park services are provided by Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation and by the City of Santa Clarita. Park services at both County and City parks are currently available to residents regardless if they live within the City limits or in unincorporated areas.

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

   Upon annexation, residents will be served by the City of Santa Clarita for parks and recreation services, and would no longer be required to pay the fee for County residents in City programs. Further, residents are given priority to City recreation programs including the wide range of youth and adult sports and recreation programs.

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? **Upon effective date of annexation.**

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

   City Parks and recreation services are provided through general fund monies and program registration fees.

5. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [X] No
If yes, please give details.

Not Applicable.

Police Services

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

Current general police protection for the annexation area is provided by the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. The Santa Clarita Sheriff's station is located at 23740 Magic Mountain Parkway, Santa Clarita, CA. The station is staffed by 190 sworn officers, 40 sworn reserve officers, 35 civilian personnel, 58 volunteers, with 89 vehicles (67 patrol cars). Traffic patrol is overseen by the California Highway Patrol in the unincorporated County areas.

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

The City contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. In addition to basic law enforcement and traffic patrol services, the City works in conjunction with the Sheriff's Department to include a number of special community programs which serve City of Santa Clarita residents including a Graffiti Task Force, a CIT Team to build relationships between law enforcement and the community, and an extensive "youth-at-risk" program.

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

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

Upon annexation, police services for this area will be funded through the City of Santa Clarita general fund and transit fund monies under contract with the County Sheriff's Department and special City programs.

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

If yes, please give details.

Not applicable.
Road Maintenance Services

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

Currently, there are no publicly maintained roadways within the annexation.

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

Upon annexation, the City of Santa Clarita will be responsible to provide road maintenance services to the subject territory for any public streets installed in the future.

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

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

Funding for road maintenance comes from gas tax funds, Transportation Development Act dollars, the City’s general fund, and from miscellaneous grants, such as those for rubberized asphalt.

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

A typical requirement from the County during the tax transfer discussion is the withdrawal of public streets from County Road District #5. Easements for public streets will transfer from the County to the City upon annexation. There are no public streets within the annexation and any private and future streets would not be affected by the annexation.

Solid Waste Services

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

Varies based on the residential setting: 1. Single family homes and multifamily complexes with <4 units have an exclusive franchise agreement between the County and Baffi Waste Industries, Inc.; 2. Multifamily complexes with ≥5 units have a non-exclusive Commercial Franchise Agreement. 45 haulers compete for those services; and 3. PUDs are not bound by franchise agreements and can establish collection services with any hauler that has a solid waste hauling permit with the County of Los Angeles.

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

The City contracts with Waste Management/Blue Barrel to provide residential disposal service. Services include weekly trash pick-up, four free bulky item pick-ups per year, weekly curbside recycling, and green waste recycling.

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

Solid waste services are provided on a fee-for-service basis.

Special Assessment District Services

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

There are currently no special assessment districts.

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

Yes. Upon annexation, the subject territory will be assessed an annual stormwater and urban runoff pollution control fee, an open space and preservation district fee, a streetlight maintenance district fee, and an area-wide landscape maintenance district fee.

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

The following annual assessments are approximate and would be applied to the subject territory upon annexation: Open Space Preservation District - $32 per year per single-family home; Stormwater Facility Maintenance - $33 per single-family residence per year; Landscape Maintenance District - approximately $81 per year per single-family residence; and Street Light Maintenance District - $73 per year per single-family residence.

Street Lighting Services

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

Street lighting services are currently provided by the County of Los Angeles Street Lighting Districts LLA-1 and 1687. Upon annexation, the territory would be withdrawn/excluded from these districts.

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

Upon annexation, the Santa Clarita Streetlight Maintenance District No. 1 will provide services to the annexation territory. Streetlight facilities are owned and maintained by Southern California Edison. Energy and maintenance fees are paid to Edison by the District. The City contracts with the Los Angeles County Public Works Department for maintenance of City-owned lighting facilities (bridge lights, soffit lights, highway safety lights, etc.).

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

Streetlight services are financed by an assessment paid by property owners as part of their annual property taxes. The current assessment is $73 annually for a single-family home.
Water Services

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

   If yes, provide details.

   Not applicable.

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

   Approval of the annexation would not result in an increase in water usage because no development is proposed nor would result from this annexation.

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

   The subject territory is served by the Castaic Lake Water Agency and the Newhall County Water District. No change will occur to water availability or agency service areas as a result of this annexation. The existing water purveyors will continue to service their respective areas upon annexation.

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

   Applicable property owners will continue to pay a fee for water service. No changes to water fees will occur as a result of this annexation.

Wastewater Services

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

   The proposed annexation area is served by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts.

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

   The annexation will have no affect on existing wastewater services in the subject area.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? 

Services will continue without interruption.

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request? □ Yes □ No

If yes, provide details.

Not applicable.

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

Annexation will not affect wastewater services in the subject territory. Should parcels be annexed into the LA County Sanitation Districts in the future, wastewater services would be funded through an annual tax assessment and annexation fee.

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

If yes, provide details.

Not applicable.
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. 737 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 1.491± acres to the district. The subject territory has two parcels. Parcel 1 is located on the northeast corner of Moraine Avenue and Lamonette Street; Parcel 2 is located at the terminus of Moraine 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 Monday, June 17, 2013.

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

Date: May 16, 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-21-737

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: 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: April 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 571, Grid F5
Parcel 1 located on the northeast corner of Moraine Avenue and Lamonette Street, Parcel 2 located at the terminus of Moraine Avenue, all within the City of Claremont.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
1.491 acres or 0.002 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 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?
   7

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   7

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.
   5

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 $1,115,030.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential. The current zoning is Rural Residential, 1 dwelling unit per 35,000 sq. ft. [RR-35,000].

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 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 annexation is being 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 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 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 District’s services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☑ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

ANNEXATION NO. 737
FOR COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 21
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

That certain parcel of land being a portion of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 8 West, S.B.M., situated in the City of Claremont, of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, described as follows:

Parcel 1

Beginning at the intersection of the centerlines of Lamonette Street and Moraine Ave as shown on Tract No. 26820, filed in Book 701 pages 7 and 8 inclusive of Maps in the Office of the Recorder of said County, said intersection also being a point in the boundary of County Sanitation District No. 21 of said County as same existed on January 11th, 2013;

Thence, (L1) North 00°52′00″ West a distance of 156.46 feet along said centerline of Moraine Ave to the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 7 of said Tract;

Thence, (L2) North 89°08′00″ East a distance of 155.46 feet along the boundary of said Lot 7;

Thence, (L3) South 00°52′00″ East a distance of 158.10 feet to the centerline of said Lamonette Street;

Thence, (L4) South 89°44′19″ West a distance of 155.47 feet along said centerline of Lamonette Street to the Point of Beginning;

Containing 0.561 ± acres
Parcel 2

Beginning at a point on said centerline of Moraine Ave distant thereon North 00°52'00" West a distance of 311.66 feet, said point also being a point in the boundary of said County Sanitation District No. 21 of said County as same existed on January 11th, 2013;

Thence, (L5) North 37°37'01" East a distance of 201.62 feet along the boundary of Lot 9 of said Tract;

Thence, (L6) North 89°45'52" East a distance of 30.00 feet;

Thence, (L7) South 00°52'00" East a distance of 192.69 feet;

Thence, (L8) South 89°08'00" West a distance of 311.46 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 11 of said Tract;

Thence, (L9) North 00°52'00" West a distance of 196.12 feet along the boundary of said Lot 11;

Thence, (L10) North 89°45'52" East a distance of 30.00 feet;

Thence, (L11) South 38°59'04" East a distance of 204.12 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 0.930 ± acres

Total Containing 1.491 ± acres
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION  
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)  
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW - JUNE 2013

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Senate Bill 41/Wright  
INTRODUCTION DATE:  
12/12/12  
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
04/22/13: Approved by the Governor; chaptered by the Secretary of State.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill attached serves as clean-up legislation clarifying a provision from prior legislation authorizing the creation of the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD). Specifically, the bill removes a provision in the original legislation aimed at revising the revenue limit computation process for the new Wiseburn USD (when formed). The prior legislation would have required a revenue limit to be computed utilizing a blended formula including the revenue limit for both the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley Union High SD. Upon the removal of that provision via this bill, the revenue limit for the new Wiseburn USD will be calculated as mandated for all unifications.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
As this bill refines processes already approved through prior legislation, it will have no additional impact on the County Committee, the school district organization process or any local districts beyond those already impacted by the Wiseburn unification.

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

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Assembly Bill 450/  
Jones-Sawyer

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/19/13

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
04/25/13: In committee

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.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

June 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 May 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

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

June 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 May 21, 2013.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
no date set for the petition to be reviewed by the SBE at that time. The EIR contained in the revised petition was not yet been adopted by the SBE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On October 7, 2011, staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD that the Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs had communicated to Wiseburn SD that their boards have decided not to participate in any additional regional meetings, and that they were not in
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favor of the unification proposals reviewed to date (including the proposed legislation circulated by the Wiseburn SD). The three districts submitted an October 19, 2011, letter to the County Committee reiterating this decision. During the following week (October 10-14, 2011), staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD that they are continuing to hold discussions regarding a proposed agreement and possible legislation supporting unification. Staff requested that district or board representatives communicate any agreements and/or decisions in writing to the County Committee and to LACOE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

On June 11, 2012, Senate Bill 477 was amended by Senator Rod Wright to address the petition to create a Wiseburn USD. The bill language sought to create a Wiseburn USD (pending approval by the voters who resided within the Wiseburn SD), along with the creation of a revenue sharing JPA as described above. The Wiseburn SD requested that the County Committee submit a letter to the SBE expressing support of the pending local solution and legislation.

The amended version of SB 477 passed both the Senate and the Assembly. On September 28, 2012, the Governor signed the bill. He included a signing message advising the parties to introduce clean-up legislation that addresses concerns about the revenue limit formula for the new Wiseburn USD included in the legislation, as well as the commitment that the Centinela Valley Union HSD is supportive of the limited election area for the unification vote.

At the October 3, 2012 regular meeting, representatives from all five impacted districts appeared before the County Committee at its invitation. They provided an update on the clean-up legislation, how they are working together to develop articulation processes, and their commitment to continue to build on their local solution so that all districts and their students thrive. They alerted the County Committee to the fact that the JPA called the Local Classrooms Funding Authority (LCFA), which was formed upon approval by the boards of all five of the local districts, placed its first parcel tax measure on the November 6, 2012 ballot. The County Committee agreed to send a letter of support to the SBE, which was distributed on October 23, 2012.

On November 6, 2012, the LCFA ballot initiative was passed by voters from the five impacted districts. The Wiseburn SD is currently in discussions with the CDE regarding adoption of the CEQA report.

On December 5, 2012, staff met with representatives of the Wiseburn SD and their environmental consultants, Terry A. Hayes and Associates, along with a representative from the CDE, to review the procedures needed to facilitate the SBE’s adoption of the EIR previously developed for the Wiseburn unification petition. The environmental consultants will follow CEQA procedures and advise all parties on the steps necessary to align the adoption of the EIR with the SBE’s review of the unification petition.

On December 12, 2012, SB 41 was introduced to clean up the revenue limit aspect of the original legislation approving the Wiseburn unification. If passed, this urgency bill would take effect immediately and would allow for the unification petition to be agendized by the SBE. In light of this legislation, staff worked with LACOE financial staff to develop the blended revenue limit for the Wiseburn USD (when formed), in consultation with the CDE. Staff also assisted LACOE
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financial staff in the gathering of documents the CDE requested related to the Wiseburn SD and
the Centinela Valley UHSD.

At the January 9, 2013, meeting of the County Committee, the committee discussed its continued
support for the Wiseburn unification and directed staff to review the options for communicating
that support to the SBE prior to their consideration of the matter (currently expected to be in May
2013). At the February 6, 2013, meeting of the County Committee, staff provided an update on
the process. On March 21, 2013, the Wiseburn SD hosted a hearing on the final CEQA study,
presented by Terry Hayes and Associates (environmental consultants). On March 25, 2013,
LACOE staff concluded its analysis of the Blended Revenue Limit (BRL) for the proposed
Wiseburn USD and conveyed it to the CDE.

On April 22, 2013, the state legislature approved SB 41, the clean-up legislation, and was
approved by the Governor. On May 9, 2013, the SBE reviewed the petition, approved it and
adopted the EIR. Now the matter will move to an election, scheduled to be called in November
2013.

*Status: Legislation to facilitate formation of the Wiseburn USD approved by the
Governor; amendment to legislation approved by the legislature and Governor on
April 22, 2013; SBE reviewed and approved the petition and adopted the EIR on
May 9, 2013. An election will be called for November 2013.

Status Date: May 21, 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.

*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 petitioner,
Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal
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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
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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
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FORMAION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

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

FORMAION—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
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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
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