March 24, 2014

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary of the County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the April 2, 2014, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, April 2, 2014, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 7, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

Newspaper Articles

- A February 20, 2014, article from the Daily Pilot—“Bill would mandate council districts.” (Attachment 1)

- A February 28, 2014, article from the Glendale News-Press—“GCC hires firm to assist with redistricting.” (Attachment 2)

- A March 11, 2014, article from the Press-Telegram—“Embattled Centinela Valley school district Superintendent Jose Fernandez gives himself a pay cut.” (Attachment 3)

- A March 11, 2014, article from the Santa Clarita News—“Santa Clarita Votes to Settle California Voting Rights Act Lawsuit.” (Attachment 4)

- A March 12, 2014, article from the Glendale News-Press—“District looks for input from Sagebrush residents.” (Attachment 5)

• A March 18, 2014, article from Southern California Public Radio.org—“Judge won’t halt Whittier city election in voting rights dispute.” (Attachment 7)

**Informational Correspondence**

• A February 20, 2014, Local Agency Formation Commission Notice (LAFCO), File Reorganization No. 2014-01 to the City of Los Angeles (Amendment to the Los Angeles Sphere of Influence; Annexation of Area 1a, 3a, 3b, 3c; and detachment of Area 1b, 1c, 2, 3d, 3e, 3f) (Attachment 8)

**Legislative Review**

Attached would normally be a review of pending legislation related to school district organization, however, all of the recent bills that were tracked have been dropped, per the advisory given in the previous month’s packet. The next bill that is relevant to SDO matters will be followed after it is officially filed for consideration.

**School District Organization Proposals**

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

• “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals.” (Attachment 9)

• “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 10)

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

KDC/AD/EH:ah
Attachments
Bill would mandate council districts

Costa Mesa is among the cities that would be required to create geographic territories for representation.

By Jill Cowan
February 20, 2014

Legislation that could force Costa Mesa and other Orange County cities to implement geographic district-based city council elections is expected to be introduced in the state Assembly on Friday, according to a spokesman for Assemblyman Roger Hernandez (D-West Covina).

The bill would require general law cities — meaning they are not governed by charters — with populations of more than 100,000 to switch from citywide council elections to districts.

Hernandez said recently that his proposal addresses the state’s shifting demographics.

"Our communities are not homogeneous anymore," he said. "I believe the bill ... gives a lot of strength in bringing government closer together."

Orange, Fullerton and Garden Grove, as well as Norwalk, El Monte and Simi Valley in Los Angeles County, are among the 24 cities that would be affected, according to Hernandez’s office.

The move comes as municipalities around California face challenges to their at-large council election systems, which some say stifle diversity in local government.

Latinos, in particular, have struggled to gain representation — even in cities where they make up the majority, Hernandez said, citing Anaheim as an example. The most populous city in Orange County recently agreed to ask voters in November whether to draw council districts, settling a lawsuit that had accused the city of violating the California Voting Rights Act.

In Costa Mesa, where longtime resident Lee Ramos is vying to become the city’s first Latino council member in November, some officials have said creating council districts could prove divisive.

A committee appointed to work out the details of a proposed city charter in October dismissed a proposal to include districts in the proposal.
GCC hires firm to assist with redistricting

For now, there are no plans to change the college's current at-large voting system.

February 28, 2014| By Kelly Corrigan, kelly.corrigan@latimes.com

A law firm was recently hired by Glendale Community College officials to help the school on an “as-needed” basis with redistricting matters.

College officials began a discourse over redistricting a little over two years ago when consultants warned college officials in February 2012 that an at-large election process could leave the college vulnerable to lawsuits connected to the California Voting Rights Act.

The 2002 act aims to protect the voting clout of minority groups by mandating a district-based system in elections where the at-large process dilutes their votes.

In at-large elections, candidates can run and be elected regardless of their address within a district’s boundaries. A district-based system has candidates vie to represent specific geographic areas within the boundaries.

Following the consultants’ warnings, a lawsuit was filed against the Glendale Community College District in August 2012, alleging that the district was in violation of the voting rights act.

The suit was filed by attorney Michael Miller, who was volunteering at the college as a speech and debate coach at the time. The five plaintiffs in the case claimed African American, Asian, Latino, mixed race and Armenian descent.

The lawsuit alleged that the college’s “at-large” voting system “has produced a situation in which one highly motivated, politically sophisticated and well-financed ethnic
minority group” — identified by the plaintiffs as Armenian Americans — “effectively monopolizes membership on the board,” according to the lawsuit.

The five-member board of trustees included two Armenian Americans, two Anglos and one Latina — all of whom are still on the board.

However, that lawsuit was dismissed in 2013, and $802 was awarded in favor of the Glendale Community College District, according to court records.

Glendale Community College President/Supt. David Viar said college officials could consider changing its voting system from an at-large one to a district-based system if it appeared the district isn’t meeting the expectations of the voting rights law.

The law gained attention in the last few years in Anaheim where an at-large system produced an all-white city council in a city with a large Latino population. In November, city officials will hold an election to ask voters whether or not to create electoral districts in that city.

Viar said college officials are “interested in assuring in that it is meeting the law and that any changes that are occurring in our community are thought through... if changes need to be made and when,” he said.

“But in order [for the board] to do that, it needs to have an ongoing, thoughtful analysis following elections, and to see where we stand,” he added, saying college officials would “stay on top of the issue and assure it is meeting the law.”

The college will hold its next election of trustees in April 2015. In the most recent election in 2013, three current trustees — Ann Ransford, Anita Quinonez Gabrielian and Armine Hacopian — ran unopposed.

Hacopian said the board — which makes up a “diverse representation” — would “keep watching to see what are the needs of the district, and at that same time, meet the letter of the law to see if there is a gray area there,” she said.

Meanwhile, board members are staying informed on the voting rights law by attending workshops and conferences, she added.

“It will be a work in progress and constantly evolving,” she said.

Follow Kelly Corrigan on Twitter: @kellymcorrigan.
Kicking off a wild school board meeting that drew some 300 furious residents, Centinela Valley high school district Superintendent Jose Fernandez — who has come under intense scrutiny for a compensation package that amounted to $663,000 last year — announced he would voluntarily cut many of the perks embedded in his contract, bringing his salary to $295,000.

Although Fernandez said the amount of last year’s total compensation — which includes perks and benefits — has been exaggerated by the media, he nonetheless offered to forfeit a bevy of benefits, most notably the annual 9 percent raise embedded in his contract as a bonus for longevity.

“These are significant give-backs,” he said, over a rising chorus of jeers. “I hope they reassure the public and the board that I’m being reasonable.”

The five-member board and superintendent overseeing four high schools in Hawthorne and Lawndale have been buffeted by criticism that has only intensified since the Daily Breeze first reported on Fernandez’s compensation package on Feb. 9. In addition to his pay and benefits, Fernandez also took a $910,000, low-interest loan from the school district to purchase a home in affluent Ladera Heights for the same amount.

Last week, in response to the controversy, state Assemblyman Al Muratsuchi, D-Torrance, proposed a bill that seeks, among other things, to assign more responsibility to the Los Angeles County Office of Education to police excessive compensation packages for school leaders.
Fernandez’s gesture Tuesday night did little to quell public outrage over his employment contract, which was unanimously approved in 2009 by the five board members, four of whom remain on the panel.

Dozens of speakers — many of them students from Hawthorne, Leuzinger and Lawndale high schools — stepped up to the microphone in the Centinela Valley Center for the Arts in Lawndale and excoriated Fernandez and the board. Many called on them to resign.

“You serve us, because we have elected you to serve at our pleasure,” said Danielle Sevilla, a resident in the district. “Do not put this community through a costly and traumatic recall process. Do the right and honorable thing and step down.”

Several speakers came to the board bearing props. One student placed a broken-down computer upon the stage, saying it was from the computer lab at Leuzinger High.

In a surreal moment, early on in the meeting, a livid Lawndale resident named Jay Gould threw a fistful of dollar bills at the board on the stage, shouting that all they care about is money. For hours afterward, the dollar bills lay strewn across the stage after speaker after speaker took the microphone to lambaste the board.

“You are the only superintendent who doesn’t work the whole school year — you get 60 days of vacation, while the rest of us who pay your salary get two weeks,” said Hawthorne resident Kristel Lindner. “You can say all you want that you’ve done a great job, but buildings don’t teach students. Last school board meeting you said we should have come sooner and these problems could have been fixed sooner.”

Among the many students to address the board was Lawndale High student Fatima Alvarez.

“Our parents work two to three jobs to take care of us ... and they expect you to do your job,” she said to loud cheers. “It is not nice to be corrupt, it is not fair for us.”

Fernandez argued that the Daily Breeze was misleading by publishing the total amount of his compensation package in calendar year 2013, rather than the 2012-13 school year.

“It is very misleading,” he said. “I’m the victim of that.”

However, when the Daily Breeze asked officials from the Los Angeles County Office of Education for the total compensation of several area superintendents, the agency responded by sending W-2 forms for the calendar year 2013, saying that was the way the agency calculates total compensation. The total amounts for the leaders of Torrance, Redondo Beach and Palos Verdes school districts were all in the $200,000s. The total compensation for Fernandez exceeded $663,000.
Toward the beginning of the meeting Tuesday evening, Lorena Gonzalez — the newest member of the board — asked the audience why she doesn’t see any of them attend regular school board meetings to commend students for their academic accomplishments.

She was shouted down by the angry crowd and gave up on trying to finish her thought.

Several speakers later addressed the comment when addressing the board.

“Your comment, Ms. Gonzalez, is highly offensive to me,” said resident Melanie Bell. “I take it personally. I have a reason I’m not here. I was working and am trying to raise good citizens in this community.”

Gonzalez later apologized to that parent.

“You’re absolutely right, we cannot always be here,” said Gonzalez, a banking executive and a mother of four students who attended district schools. “I work 10-hour shifts as well.”

Gonzalez noted that she has been on the board just two years, though she did not point out that she wasn’t among the board members who approved Fernandez’s contract.

“There is a lot to learn,” she said. “It’s not an excuse, and I’m not excusing myself.”

In his comments, board member Hugo Rojas struck a contrite tone.

“I’m sorry to everyone that you have to be here, and that we have to be in this room dealing with this matter,” he said. “That is my apology to you.”

Like she did in the previous board meeting, President Maritza Molina came to Fernandez’s defense.

“I am pleased that Superintendent Fernandez is ready to voluntarily and unilaterally take the pay cuts he has outlined tonight,” she said. “This is a good sign that the superintendent is listening to the concerns of the public and of this board. It is a sign of progress and we will be carefully watching as he makes good on his promises.”

However, she added, the superintendent’s voluntary concessions are “not the end of the story...As far as I am concerned, all elements — let me repeat, all elements — of that compensation package must be on the table during our negotiations.”
Santa Clarita News

Santa Clarita Votes To Settle California Voting Rights Act Lawsuit
Tue, 03/11/2014

Santa Clarita officials settled a lawsuit over an alleged California Voting Rights Act violation Tuesday with a closed session vote.

The city is set to move City Council elections to even-numbered years and employ cumulative voting.

The decision was made in closed session before Tuesday's City Council meeting, but it's not going to affect the ballots that voters will have for the April 8 election, officials said.

"The settlement represents an opportunity for all Santa Clarita citizens to have an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice -- no longer will a bare majority be able to dominate 100 percent of the City Council," said Kevin Shenkman, the lawyer for the plaintiffs in the lawsuit, Jim Soliz and Rosemarie Sanchez-Fraser. "(Soliz and Sanchez-Fraser) should be commended for their efforts to make that a reality."

The end result will be that the two incumbents who would have been up for election in April 2016 -- Councilmen TimBen Boydston and Bob Kellar -- will be up for election November 2016.

Marsha McLean was the lone vote against the closed session vote.

"Sometimes you have to look at what's right and wrong, and you have to fight what's wrong," McLean said, adding she was not opposed to moving the elections, one of the terms of the settlement.

Voters will still get three votes, however, the move to cumulative voting, or weighted voting, gives voters the opportunity to vote for one candidate up to three times.

Both changes are expected to increase voter turnout, part of how alleged violations of the California Voting Rights Act have been remedied in the past.

Cumulative voting is the predominante means of balloting used to select a board of directors in corporate America.

In dozens of communities where cumulative voting is used, it's the result of lawsuits stemming from the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Fighting the lawsuit "would be very costly to the city," costing more than $1.5 million, according to city attorney Joe Montes in a statement read before Tuesday's City Council meeting.

The attorney's fees for the plaintiffs will be paid by Santa Clarita, which is expected to range between $400-600,000.

The settlement followed a six-hour negotiation, according to court documents.

While the Santa Clarita's attorney estimated a potential cost of $1.5 million to fight the California Voting Rights Act lawsuit, it actually could have been quite higher.
In a filing with a similar lawsuit against the city of Palmdale, the legal fees are expected to reach approximately $5 million, according to legal documents.

City Councilman TimBen Boydston said he voted for the settlement for "pragmatic reasons," because city officials could have spent millions fighting the lawsuit with nothing to show for it.

While that suit is still being appealed by Palmdale officials, a judge ruled against Palmdale officials in the initial ruling, and the fee filing is due within 60 days of the initial judgement.

No California Voting Rights Act lawsuit has been successfully been litigated by a defendant.

The Sulphur Springs School District has a closed session item that involves discussion of a similar lawsuit on its agenda.

"The City Council and staff also deserve praise for finding a resolution that will remedy the problem of minority vote dilution," Shenkman said.

Palmdale officials "recalcitrance" served as a stark contrast, Shenkman said, while also commending the work of Antonio Piazza, a world-renowned mediator who helped bring a quick resolution to the suit.
Following months of meetings and closed-door negotiations, Glendale Unified officials are seeking input from Sagebrush residents on whether the La Cañada area should be transferred to that city’s district.

The area has historically been served by Glendale Unified, although efforts on behalf of residents to transfer the territory to La Cañada Unified spans decades. A current proposal would allow for the transfer, but would allow parents to choose which district to send their children to during a six-year period.

Glendale Unified Supt. Dick Sheehan said school officials are going to make a push to attract a large crowd at the town hall meeting, scheduled for March 25.

“We wanted to make sure we had a negotiated settlement that would not be influenced by the town hall meeting. But the whole decision hinges on the town hall meeting,” he said, adding that “If the community overwhelmingly says, ‘We want to stay in Glendale,’ I think we would fight it.”

But if residents speak in favor of joining La Cañada Unified, Sheehan said he believes the Glendale school board “will grant them their wishes.”

“This is where truly our board wants to hear what their residents have to say,” he said.

When La Cañada incorporated in 1976, La Cañada Unified was already 15 years old. For reasons unknown to school officials today, the new city’s boundary did not line up with the school district, and students living in the Sagebrush area attend Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Middle School and Crescenta Valley High.

After Tuesday’s meeting, Glendale school board member Greg Krikorian said officials have had their eye on “the bigger picture” as they’ve negotiated with La Cañada school officials.

“Sometimes, we’ve got to look for common ground,” he said.

The most recent push echoes one made by Sagebrush residents in 1991. That year, a group filed a petition with the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, which voted to approve the transfer in 1992. Glendale Unified, however, filed an appeal with the California State Board of Education, which blocked the transfer.
Krikorian, who joined the Glendale school board in 2001, said former school board members told him about the divide that ensued.

“It broke up a lot of relationships in the neighborhoods. It caused a lot of hard feelings,” he said. “The key thing...being a leader in this role, is you look to crisis intervention, avoiding conflict. Sometimes conflicts are very costly even if you don’t go to court,” he said, adding that the ongoing issue would require a lot of time from both districts’ employees, and take from their focus on education.

“Now it’s time to hear the residents, and I want to take that and be very open,” he said.

During Tuesday’s La Cañada school board meeting, Supt. Wendy Sinette said she would speak at the town hall, and said discussions between the districts “have been positive with a strong spirit of cooperation.”

“Glendale has very real concerns, and we’ve worked to address those with regard to Measure K and Measure S. There is a proposal in place that would allow for financially based phase-in with regard to the bonds,” Sinette said.

Eva Lueck, who is chief business and financial officer for Glendale Unified, said the district is still “looking at how we might mitigate those impacts, should a transfer occur.”

In mid-February, the La Cañada Flintridge City Council met behind closed doors to negotiate with GUSD officials regarding the price of a parcel of land in the 4900 block of Oceanview Boulevard. The property, which leads to Mountain Avenue Elementary, is often used by students living in the Sagebrush area.

The city of La Cañada’s potential purchase of the property at a fair market value was first identified last fall as a potential bargaining chip.

Glendale Unified officials say 400 students living in La Cañada attend Glendale Unified schools, but La Cañada school officials have previously put that number at 260.

Glendale school board member Christine Walters said the school board has generally agreed that it wouldn’t keep students from attending Glendale schools if they wanted to.

“For me, it’s going to be very important to hear from the residents and the parents of that area to know how they feel about this and whether or not they want us to try to work something out or not,” she said.

Don Carp, a Sagebrush resident who sends his daughter to Mountain Avenue, said the transfer would make sense, and was pleased with Glendale school officials wanting to hear input from residents.

“As much as we support Mountain Avenue, it just seems to make so much more sense that we’re part of the La Cañada community. I just don’t feel that we have a voice in that big school district called Glendale. The Sagebrush area is such a small little sliver,” he said.

The town hall meeting will begin at 7 p.m. on March 25 in the auditorium of Crescenta Valley High School, located at 2900 Community Ave.
The Sulphur Springs School District board has reached a settlement agreement in the California Voting Rights Act lawsuit filed against it, the district’s superintendent said today.

“We have reached a settlement agreement and we’re still in the process of putting it writing,” said Superintendent Robert Nolet.

The agreement addresses the lawsuit’s claim that at-large elections in the Canyon Country school district dilute the Hispanic vote within the district.

Nolet said details of the agreement will likely be available for the public late Friday afternoon.

“One once we get it finalized, we’ll make it available,” he said.

On Tuesday, the Santa Clarita City Council announced it had reached a settlement agreement in another suit alleging Voting Rights Act violations due to an at-large election system. A third suit was filed against the Santa Clarita Community College District leveling the same allegation.

The city’s agreement proposes two separate efforts to make changes in city elections to deal with the lawsuit’s claim that at-large elections dilute the Hispanic vote.

The first plan calls for the city to approve an ordinance at some future meeting that would change the Santa Clarita City Council elections from every other year in April to every other year in November when statewide elections are held.
The change would take effect in the 2016 elections.

All three lawsuits claim at-large elections — those in which all voters in a district elect all five members of a school district or city governing board — deprive Hispanic voters of equal representation. All three seek to force the government agencies into dividing their district among sub-districts and having voters elect just one representative from each district.

Several Santa Clarita Valley school districts and the Newhall County Water District sought to consolidate their elections with county-run balloting in a bid to avoid such lawsuits, which have been filed against municipalities up and down California. The county declined their bid, saying its outdated voting system limits the number of items it can place on a single election ballot.
Judge won't halt Whittier city election in voting rights dispute
Sharon McNary | March 18th, 2014

A judge on Tuesday denied the Whittier Latino Coalition's request to halt an April election in the San Gabriel Valley city. The coalition sued the city last year alleging its at-large elections violate the California Voting Rights Act.

In his ruling, Superior Court Judge Michael Johnson said the coalition has a good chance at trial of proving its position that the city's at-large elections dilute the voting power of the city's Latino majority. The coalition wants the city council elected by district. But the judge ruled the coalition had not shown great harm would result from proceeding with the election.

Four candidates are running for two council seats on the April 8 ballot, including Mayor Bob Henderson, who has served on the council for decades, and Councilman Fernando Dutra. Only one Latino has won election to the Whittier City Council in more than a century, and another was appointed to office. Whittier's population is 66 percent Latino, though they represent less than half the city's registered voters.

The city argued against canceling the election because more than 1,100 votes have already been cast in early and mail-in balloting, said Assistant City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow.

The hearing pitted evidence from the coalition and city about the central issue in dispute — whether Latinos, who make up a majority of residents, can elect the representatives of their choice in Whittier under the city's at-large voting system.

In at-large elections, all voters cast ballots for all council seats. Under the California Voting Rights Act, local governments such as cities and school districts may be barred from holding at-large elections if plaintiffs prove the system leads to racially-polarized voting.

Both sides presented their evidence for and against the existence of such polarized voting. In his ruling, Johnson said the coalition had shown a reasonable probability that they would prove their case.

That pleased coalition attorney Rod Pacheco, who said the hearing functioned as a sort of preview of how the issue would play out at trial.
Barlow, who represented Whittier, said the judge's findings were not a prediction the coalition would win its case. She said it meant only that they had presented sufficient information for the case to move forward to trial where the city could challenge the coalition's experts and witnesses.

The next hearing in the case is April 18, three days after the election winners are to be sworn into office, Barlow said. In an attempt to address the coalition's complaints and settle the lawsuit, the City Council has placed a measure on the June 3 ballot that, if passed, would change the city charter to allow voters to select four council members from districts and a citywide mayor. The coalition does not support the measure, saying all five council members should be elected by district. The members would choose the mayor from among themselves, as is currently the case.
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

City of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office
Los Angeles County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Greater Los Angeles Vector Control District
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education

LAFCO File: Reorganization No. 2014-01 to the City of Los Angeles (Amendment to the Los Angeles Sphere of Influence; Annexation of Area 1a, 3a, 3b, 3c; and detachment of Area 1b, 1c, 2, 3d, 3e, 3f)

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 and detach approximately 32± acres of uninhabited territory to and from the City of Los Angeles. The project site is located northeast of the intersection of Lankershim Blvd. and US 101 Hollywood Freeway, in and adjacent to Los Angeles County unincorporated territory of Universal City.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by April 8, 2013.

Pursuant to Government Code section 56662(a) the Commission may make determinations upon the proposed reorganization without notice and hearing and may waive protest hearing if the affected territory is uninhabited and no affected local agency has submitted a written demand for notice and hearing during the 10-days following this notice. Furthermore, the proposal was accompanied by satisfactory proof that all the landowners within the affected territory have given their written consent to the propose reorganization.

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

Date: February 20, 2014

Doug Dorado
Government Analyst
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: Reorganization No. 2014-01

LAFCO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Los Angeles
2. County of Los Angeles
3. Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County
4. Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
5. Los Angeles Unified School District (Interested agency)

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

1. Detachment, Annexation, Sphere of Influence Amendment
2. Detachment, Annexation
3. Detachment, Annexation, Sphere of Influence Amendment
4. **No jurisdictional changes; but proposal area is entirely within district territory**
5. **proposal area entirely within LAUSD boundaries**

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: RESOLUTION

LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

APPLICANT: Universal Studios LLC

TITLE: NBCUniversal Evolution Plan

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Universal Studios LLC (Carmine Verdeny)

ADDRESS: 100 Universal City Plaza, 1280-8

CITY: Universal City

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 91608

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: George Mihlsten, Esq., Maria Hoye, Esq.

TELEPHONE: (213) 485-1234

E-MAIL ADDRESS: george.mihlsten@lw.com, maria.hoye@lw.com

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
80 S. LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 870 PASADENA, CA 91101
TELEPHONE: (626) 204-6500 FAX: (626) 204-6507
LAFCO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

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: 2/13/14

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The annexation/detachment proposal area consists of 3 separate areas totalling approximately 32 acres. The 32 acres are part of the approximately 400 acre Universal Studios and Theme Park property that is located partly in the City of Los Angeles and partly in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles. The property is located two miles north of Hollywood and 10 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles, in central Los Angeles County. The property is located approximately 1.5 miles south and east of the junction of U.S. Route 101 (Hollywood Freeway) and State Route 134 (Ventura Freeway) in the east San Fernando Valley, near the north end of the Cahuenga Pass. The Universal Studios and Theme Park property is generally bounded by the Los Angeles River to the north, Barham Boulevard to the east (except for a portion that borders the Hollywood Manor residential area), the Hollywood Freeway to the south, and Lankershim Boulevard to the west. Attached Figure 1 illustrates the proposal area.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

32 acres

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

☐ Yes

☒ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

   The proposal area includes 3 separate areas within the Universal Studios and Theme Park property. Area 1 (includes Areas 1a, 1b, and 1c) is approximately 0.7 acres at the northwest corner of the property along Lankershim Boulevard and the Los Angeles River, the majority of which is within the unincorporated County of Los Angeles. Area 1 is developed with a portion of two studio/studio office buildings; the balance of which are located in the City of Los Angeles. Area 2 is approximately 0.8 acres in the north-central portion of the property along River Road that is within the City of Los Angeles. Area 2 consists mostly of landscaping and small portions of studio and studio office buildings; the greater portions of these buildings are located in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles. Area 3 (includes Areas 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, and 3f) is approximately 30.6 acres in the south-west portion of the property along Universal Hollywood Drive, of which approximately 2.4 acres are currently in the unincorporated County and approximately 26.2 acres are currently in the City. The portions in the unincorporated County include a studio office building and vacant restaurant, which are planned for demolition, and landscaping and roadway. The City portion includes entertainment retail uses, surface parking, landscaping and roadway. There are no residential communities within the proposal area. Overall, the Universal Studios and Theme Park property is developed with studio, studio office, office, entertainment and entertainment retail uses. See attached Figure 1 delineating the 3 areas within the proposal area and attached Figures 2A and 2B showing the existing jurisdictional boundaries and proposed jurisdictional boundaries, respectively.

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

   The topography of Area 1 and Area 2 is relatively flat. Area 1 has an approximate elevation of 550 to 545 feet above mean sea level (msl), with a gentle surface gradient to the north. The topography of Area 2 ranges from approximately 540 to 535 feet above msl, also gently sloping to the north. The Los Angeles River borders Area 1 and Area 2 to the north and is channelized.

   The topography of Area 3 is varied. The northwestern portion adjacent to the lower studio lot and the intersection of Universal Hollywood Drive and Lankershim Boulevard (Area 3A) has an approximate elevation of 575 to 880 feet above msl. Continuing east and southeast along Universal Hollywood Drive the elevation gradually increases to about 780 feet above msl (Areas 3b through 3e, and a portion of Area 3f). Continuing further south along Universal Hollywood Drive the elevation gradually slopes down again to about 940 feet above msl to the south (at the southern end of WC Fields Drive) and about 710 feet above msl to the southeast (at the intersection of WC Fields Drive and Universal Studios Boulevard) (the southern portion of Area 3f). See attached Figure 3 illustrating the topography of the proposal area.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?  
   No residents.

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

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.  
   None.

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.  
   One.

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

   Area 1 is adjacent to other Universal Studios uses on the east and south, multi-family and single-family residences to the west, and the Los Angeles River and commercial and residential areas to the north. Area 2 is surrounded by Universal Studios to the east, south and west, and the Los Angeles River and a golf course and residences to the north. Area 3 is surrounded by commercial uses (studio, theme park, retail, office, and hotels) and is adjacent to the U.S. Route 101 (Hollywood) Freeway to the south and an MTA Metro station and City park to the west. See attached Figure 4 identifying the areas adjacent to the proposal area.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The proposal area is located within an existing urban area. The City and County approved the NBCUniversal Evolution Plan in late 2012 and early 2013, respectively, which provides for 2.67 million square feet of net new studio, office, entertainment, retail and hotel development on the overall Universal Studios and Theme Park property. In addition, various mixed use, office, residential and retail projects have been proposed in the area and are in various stages of planning and review.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

There are no existing dwelling units within the Project Site and no dwelling units are proposed.

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 proposal does not include housing, therefore, it will not expand the regional housing supply.

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

The proposal will allow the implementation of the NBCUniversal Evolution Plan on the existing developed studio and entertainment property located within a highly developed area in the Los Angeles region. Construction and operation of the Evolution Plan project will generate a substantial number of jobs with a range of employment opportunities. The variety of job opportunities within the entertainment industry provides important employment opportunities at the entry level for students, part-time workers and apprentice level workers, and serves as a possible career path to skilled, higher-wage positions. With regard to public services, the property is already served by existing public facilities and services and the project approvals include various project design features and mitigations measures that improve public services in the area.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

Approximately $32,915,333. This was calculated by determining, for each separate area of the proposal area (Areas 1a through Area 3), the ratio of the assessed land valuation of that separate area's associated APN(s) (using 2013-14 property tax assessments) to the overall land area of those associated APN(s) (using area calculations from Los Angeles County Assessor's Parcel Map). The land area of each separate area (see Exhibits A and B to the landowner petition) was then multiplied by the respective calculated ratio, resulting in an assessed land valuation for each separate area. The assessed land valuation for each separate area was added together to result in a total assessed land valuation of the subject territory.

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

In Area 1, the portion currently located within the City (Area 1a) has a Regional Commercial land use designation pursuant to the Sherman Oaks Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cathedral City Community Plan (the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan for the area) and is located in the I(2)C-1-SN zone (Qualified conditions, Commercial 2, High Density 1, Supplemental Use Sign District). Those portions of Area 1 located within the County (Areas 1b and 1c) have a SP (Specific Plan) land use and zoning designation and are governed by the Universal Studios Specific Plan. Area 2 is located within the City and has a Regional Commercial land use designation pursuant to the Sherman Oaks Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cathedral City Community Plan, and is located in the I(2)C-1-SN zone. In Area 3, those portions currently located within the City (Areas 3a, 3b, and 3c) have a Regional Commercial land use designation pursuant to the Sherman Oaks Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cathedral City Community Plan, and are located in the I(2)C-1-SN zone. Those portions of Area 3 located within the County (Areas 3a, 3c, and 3d) have a SP (Specific Plan) land use and zoning designation and are governed by the Universal Studios Specific Plan.

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

The City and County have each pre-designated the areas that would change jurisdictions pursuant to this proposal. In Area 1, those portions to be annexed to the City have been pre-designated Regional Commercial by the City and those areas to be detached to the County have been pre-designated SP (Specific Plan) land use by the County. Area 2 has been pre-designated SP (Specific Plan) land use by the County. In Area 3, those portions to be annexed to the City have been pre-designated Regional Commercial by the City and those to be detached to the County have been pre-designated SP (Specific Plan) land use by the County. Development within the proposal area will include studio, studio-office, entertainment, retail and hotel 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 City and County have each pre-designated the land use and pre-zoned those areas that would change jurisdictions as follows:

In Area 1, those areas to be annexed to the City have been pre-designated Regional Commercial land use and pre-zoned [Q]C2-1-SN by the City and those areas to be detached to the County have been pre-designated Specific Plan land use and pre-zoned SP zone by the County. Area 2 has been pre-designated Specific Plan land use and pre-zoned SP zone by the County. In Area 3, those areas to be annexed to the City have been pre-designated Regional Commercial land use and pre-zoned [Q]C2-1-SN by the City and those areas to be detached to the County have been pre-designated Specific Plan land use and pre-zoned SP zone by the County.

The City’s zone change ordinance (City Ordinance No. 182321) pre-zoning the areas that would be annexed to the City is attached to the application materials being submitted.

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

Area 1: To the north of Area 1 the Los Angeles River is designated Open Space with the adjacent areas further north designated Low Density Residential. To the east and south of Area 1 the Universal Studios and Theme Park property in the County is designated Specific Plan land use. The properties to the west of Area 1 are designated Commercial by which are Medium and Low Density Residential and Open Space properties.

Area 2: To the north of Area 2 the Los Angeles River and the golf club are designated Open Space with the adjacent areas further north designated Low Density Residential. Area 2 is surrounded to the east, south and west by the Universal Studios and Theme Park property designated Specific Plan land use.

Area 3: To the north and east of Area 3 is the Universal Studios and Theme Park property designated Specific Plan land use in the County areas and Regional Commercial land use in the City areas. The U.S. Route 101 (Hollywood) Freeway south of Area 3 is designated Public Facilities, and the properties along Calabasas Boulevard south of the 101 Freeway are designated General Commercial. The properties along the west side of Area 3 are designated Regional Commercial.

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

The portions of Area 1 and Area 3 that would be annexed into the City have been pre-designated Regional Commercial as part of the Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass Community Plan, consistent with the existing land use designation for those areas of the Universal Studios and Theme Park already within the City of Los Angeles.

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

The City and County each found the NBCUniversal Evolution Plan project and the associated land use entitlement actions approved by the City and the County, respectively, to be consistent with the respective City and County general plans including the County’s establishment of the Universal Studios (County) Specific Plan.

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

The overall NBCUniversal Evolution Plan project provides for the development of 2,363,000 gross new square feet of studio, studio office, office, entertainment, entertainment retail, and amphitheater uses, and two 500-room (450,000 square foot each) hotels, within the existing developed Universal Studios and Theme Park property. When accounting for the demolition of certain existing uses, the project would result in the development of 2,877,186 net new square feet of studio, studio office, office, entertainment, entertainment retail, amphitheater uses, and hotel uses. Development within the proposal area will include studio, studio office, entertainment, entertainment retail and two hotels. An illustrative conceptual plan for the Project is attached as Figure 5.

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

If the boundary adjustments were to not occur, the existing buildings in Area 1 and Area 2 would continue to be divided by the jurisdictional boundary (e.g., the news broadcast headquarters would be split between the City and County and the area proposed for a City hotel would be located mostly in the County). Area 2 would remain a silver of City property surrounded by development in the County. In Area 3, the existing and possibly future development would straddle City and County jurisdictional lines. Further, the jurisdictional boundaries would not follow planned land use patterns (e.g., the Theme Park and CityWalk would not be in one jurisdiction). An area proposed for Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical transmission equipment within Area 3 would remain in the City, which would not allow for the placement of the equipment at that location.
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?

The Project Site is not within a redevelopment project area nor proposed to be within a redevelopment project area upon completion of jurisdiction boundary changes.

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 designated agricultural lands within the proposal area. The Los Angeles River along the northern boundary of Area 1 and Area 2 is designated Open Space, however, the proposal does not affect the river.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

The proposed annexation/detachment actions would place existing structures that currently straddle the City and County within one jurisdiction. In addition, the proposed jurisdictional boundaries would follow existing and planned on-site land use patterns. Specifically, in Area 1, the proposal would place the existing building, which is being renovated for the headquarters for NBC Universal's west coast television operations that will house the Los Angeles bureaus of NBC News and Telemundo, and NBC4 LA and KVEA starting in February 2014, entirely in the City of Los Angeles rather than split between the City and the County. Area 2 would be detached into the County to allow it to rejoin the surrounding Universal Studios area already in the County. In Area 3 along Universal Hollywood Drive portions of the property would be annexed into the City to allow for a proposed hotel and administration office building to be located completely in the City, and portions of the property would be detached to the County to allow a small portion of CityWalk currently in the City to be unified with the majority of CityWalk that is located in the County, thus allowing CityWalk to be within one jurisdiction, provide a site in the County for a future hotel, additional CityWalk facilities, and provide suitable location within the County to house future Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical transmission equipment serving the County portions of the property.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The proposed action will not have any impact on adjacent areas; proposed development remains the same.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

The proposed action may have differing economic benefits to the City and County of Los Angeles in terms of allocation of tax revenues.
c. The local government structure of the County:

There would be no effect on the government structure of the County other than to increase the area of the property within the County by approximately 28 acres which would be within the Third Supervisorial District. There are no residents within the proposal area or the overall property so no change would occur to the voting population within the District.

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 property is currently served by existing City and County services. The City and County each found that with the existing services, and project design features and mitigation measures required of NBCUniversal by the NBCUniversal Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs adopted by the City and County, respectively, the impacts of the project to government services with and without the proposed annexation/detachment actions would be less than significant. See Attachment A (Plan for Municipal Services) for additional information.

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

See above.

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

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

See above.

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

See above.

**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 Los Angeles; Consolidated Fire Protection District of LA 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?

   The City and County of Los Angeles are the primary agencies with economic interests in the Project Site and immediately adjacent area. Communities immediately adjacent to the Project Site within the City of Los Angeles include: the Hollywood Manor and Hollywood Knolls residential communities east of the property; the Cahuenga Pass residential community south of the property and the Hollywood (101) freeway; the Studio City and Island Community residential communities west of the property; and the Toluca Lake and Toluca Estates Road residential communities north of the property and the Los Angeles River.

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).

   Not applicable.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

Yes, the City of Los Angeles has existing bonded debt. On property taxes for the 2013-2014 fiscal year, that bonded debt is paid by properties in the City by a tax levied upon taxable property in the City at the rate of 2.9754 cents upon each $100.00 of assessed valuation of the taxable property.

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

Those areas annexed into the City would be required to pay its fair share of existing City of Los Angeles bonded debt.

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

The Applicant (Universal Studios LLC) is the sole landowner in the proposal area and will be liable for existing indebtedness for those areas of the property annexed to the City of Los Angeles.

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

The Applicant is not aware of any such request.

NOTIFICATION  [Please also see Attachment B for additional information]

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>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>200 N Spring St., Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>500 W. Temple St., Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Fire Department</td>
<td>1320 N. Eastern Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90063</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>Corinne Verdery</td>
<td>100 Universal City Plaza, 1260-8, Universal City, CA 91608</td>
<td>(818) 777-5757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mihlsten</td>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins LLP, 355 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90071</td>
<td>(213) 485-1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Hoyer</td>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins LLP, 355 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90071</td>
<td>(213) 485-1234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

April 2014

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 March 24, 2014

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
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

April 2014

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 March 19, 2014.]

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

In May of 2001, the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization petitioned to form a Wiseburn USD from within the boundaries of the Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD). After approval by the County Committee and a long review period by the CDE and SBE, the petition was moved forward via successful legislation, the formation of two related joint power agencies, and final approval by the SBE on May 9, 2013. The voter approval of the proposal and the election of the first governing board for the Wiseburn USD occurred on November 5, 2013. Staff is working on logistics related to the launch of the unified district.

*Status: Proposal passed and first governing board elected November 5, 2013
Status Date: March 19, 2014

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 compliance of format and content. On June 19, 2012, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on June 20, 2012, for circulation.

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: June 20, 2012

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

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

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.
On March 7, 2006, staff forwarded the draft petition to the Registrar-Recorder for verification that the description of the proposed boundaries of the Altadena USD was sufficiently clear (so that registered voters residing within the proposed petition area could be identified with specificity). The Registrar-Recorder confirmed that the description was sufficient on March 10, 2006.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Formation—Malibu USD** (Currently lies within the boundaries of the Santa Monica-Malibu USD)

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

**Formation—Altadena USD** (Currently lies within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD)

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

**Formation—La Mirada USD** (Currently lies within the boundaries of the Norwalk – La Mirada USD)

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

**Proposed increase in the number of trustees from five to seven within the Pomona USD, retaining the at-large voting method**

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

**Proposed increase in the number of trustees from five to seven, the establishment of trustee areas, and the requirement of trustee area voting within the Mount San Antonio CCD**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

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

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

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/January 2013