September 21, 2012

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, October 3, 2012

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 3, 2012, 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 October 3, 2012.

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
October 3, 2012
9:30 a.m.

I Information
D Discussion
A Action
* Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix

II. FLAG SALUTE—Ms. Calix

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on
June 6, 2012, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS—Secretary Mr. Keith Crafton

Newspaper Article

- An August 31, 2012, article from the Glendale News Presss-“Suit
challenges voting system.” (Attachment 1)

- A September 1, 2012, article from the UT San Diego-“Candidate moves
into new trustee area.” (Attachment 2)

- A September 17, 2012, article from the The Press Enterprise-“Riverside:
School board adopts trustee area map in spite of opposition.”
(Attachment 3)

Informational Correspondence

- A September 13, 2012, Local Agency Formation Commission Notice
(LAFCO), Resolution No. 2012-12-Protest Resolution Ordering City of
Santa Clarita Annexation No: 2011-20 (Vista Canyon/Fair Oaks/Jakes
Way) (Attachment 4)

- A September 13, 2012, LAFCO Notice of Completion: Palmdale
Resolution No. 2012-43RMD-Making Determinations and Approving
and Ordering City of Palmdale Annexation No. 2011-09 (Attachment 5)
• A September 19, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies, Annexation No. 375 to County Sanitation District No. 14 (Attachment 6)

• A September 19, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies, Annexation No. 323 to County Sanitation District No. 14 (Attachment 7)

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, including a review of recent agreements and legislative action. Representatives from the impacted districts will participate in a discussion.

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. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR NEW OFFICERS

Ms. Calix will appoint a Nominating Committee to recommend candidates to fill the positions of chairperson and vice chairperson for the 2013 year. The Nominating Committee will present its report at the January 2013 regular meeting, at which time the County Committee will vote on the recommendations provided.

IX. EVALUATION OF THE SECRETARY AND STAFF TO THE COUNTY COMMITTEE

Each member of the County Committee will be requested to complete a performance evaluation form concerning the secretary and staff to the County Committee. Ms. Calix will appoint a three-person Evaluation Committee who will receive the completed evaluation forms from the members, and consolidate the information into an evaluation report. The report will be presented to the County Committee for discussion/approval at a regular meeting designated by the chairperson.
X. 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 8)

XI. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

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

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

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

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

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

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting
June 6, 2012

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, June 6, 2012, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. by Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix who asked Suzan Solomon to lead the flag salute.

Members Present

Ben Allen
Maria Calix
Ted Edmiston
Owen H. Griffith
Joan Jakubowski
John Nunez
Suzan T. Solomon
AJ Wilmer

Members Absent

Frank Bostrom
Maurice Kunkel
Frank Ogaz

Staff Present

Matt Spies, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Mary Bracamontes, Recording Secretary
Anna Heredia, Recording Secretary

It was MOVED by AJ Wilmer and SECONDED by Ms. Solomon that the minutes of the regular meeting held on May 6, 2012, be approved with two abstentions, Mr. Nunez and Ms. Jakubowski. Correction was made regarding an error on the date of the minutes.

Mr. Spies 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.

Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 6, 2012

Communications

Presentations from the Public
Mr. Spies stated that he received an email from Mr. John Mendoza in which he implies that suing the County Committee for denying the petition is likely. As a result of the emerging potential legal action against the County Committee, Mr. Spies advised that the committee go into a closed session for discussion with in-house legal counsel regarding the implications of Mr. Mendoza’s threat. This action would require a unanimous vote. All were in favor and moved to closed session at 9:51 a.m. The County Committee reconvened at 10:32 a.m.

Mr. Spies stated that they are at the point in the process that the County Committee has to make a decision to vote. Mr. Spies called on Dr. Allison Deegan to provide an overview of the report that staff has prepared for consideration in the decision making of the County Committee. Dr. Deegan’s report gives background information regarding the petition that was received on August 18, 2010 from Chief Petitioner, John Mendoza to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Pomona Unified School District (USD).

The areas in which Dr. Deegan reported include the following: Introduction, Process to Establish Trustee Areas Pursuant to the Education Code (ED)(including Initiation of Proposal, Election Process, Development of Trustee Area Boundary Maps, and Transaction of Incumbent Board Members); Summary of Characteristics of the School Districts within Los Angeles County, Background, The California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) (including The Madera Unified Case, Description of the Law and the CVRA in Los Angeles County); Information related to Pomona USD (specifically pertaining to Local Elections, School District Elections); Information Related to the Cities of Pomona and Diamond Bar.

Questions arose regarding the statistics of the voter turnout and it was determined that there was an error in the calculation of the school board elections. AJ Wilmer stated that the raw data is accurate and that is what should be looked at, however he did request a revised report reflecting the numbers to match the raw data. Also included in the report is the powerpoint from Pomona USD which has been presented to the County Committee and at public hearings.

The final item Dr. Deegan discussed is the communication from Chief Petitioner, John Mendoza which includes a letter specifically addressing the County Committee in which he states his disappointment in the expected denial of the petition together with multiple attachments and emails from him.
The Chief Petitioner, John Mendoza was not present.

The Committee called on Kasey Haws to discuss the petition. Mr. Haws stated that he is pleased with the effort Pomona USD has made in studying their district. He stated that with regards to the CVRA, based on the diversity of the Board, he feels that any allegation of a CVRA violation would not be valid. AJ Wilmer raised a concern regarding the Chief Petitioners allegation of non-representation in the lower socio-economic areas.

Mr. Haws introduced Mr. Fernando Meza, the Administrative Director of Pomona USD who presented on the matter. Mr. Meza stated that the lower socio-economic areas that John Mendoza was most concerned about are the areas which have received the most bond money for modernization and construction. With reference to growth and education, he stated that 96% of the elementary schools have had positive growth in their API scores between 2007-2011, on an average increase of 30-80 points. Mr. Meza continued by stating that the board is actively involved in the community with special emphasis on the lower socio-economic areas. Mr. Haws concluded by stating that in order to petition for change you need to show that there is some way that the situation will improve and that people are not happy, and he feels that this is not the case with the Pomona USD Board.

John Nuñez made a motion to Approve the Proposal to Increase the Number of Trustees from Five to Seven, and to Establish trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting Within the Pomona USD. Motion failed due to lack of a second on the motion.

Ben Allen made a motion to Deny the Proposal to Increase the Number of Trustees from Five to Seven, and to Establish trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting Within the Pomona USD, seconded by Suzan Solomon. The motion passed.

Matt Spies stated that based on information he received from Tom Johnstone, the Superintendent of Wiseburn School District, all five districts have passed resolutions endorsing the parcel tax Joint Powers Authority (JPA). Once the agreement is completed he will send it to Committee members via email. The County Committee agreed to send a letter of support to the California State Board of Education (SBE).

None
Matt Spies stated that at some point the Committee needs to bring back and acknowledge that there is nothing left to do with reference to the Mount San Antonio Community College District (CCD) petition.

A letter was sent to the Superintendent in support of making Allison Deegan the County Committee secretary. John Nunez made a motion to support this appointment to County Committee Secretary and seconded by Suzan Solomon. The motion passed.

The County Committee thanked Matt Spies and Mary Bracamontes for their work on the County Committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.
Suit challenges voting system

Action alleges that Armenian Americans currently dominate GCC board.

August 31, 2012 | By Kelly Corrigan, kelly.corrigan@latimes.com

A group of voters who claim Armenian Americans have become so “politically sophisticated and well-financed” that they’ve monopolized the Glendale Community College Board of Trustees has filed a lawsuit seeking a change in how elections are carried out.

The lawsuit, filed in Los Angeles Superior Court on Aug. 15, alleges that the district is in violation of the California Voting Rights Act. It comes after months of discourse about altering the way college trustees are elected from the current at-large method to a district-based model.

The college’s existing at-large 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 currently includes two Armenian Americans, two Anglos and one Latina.

“We feel pretty good about the representation we have on the board,” said College Board President Armine Hacopian. “We already have a very diversified board of trustees, which is the purpose of the [suit].”

The lawsuit was filed by attorney Michael Miller, a volunteer speech and debate coach at the college who is representing five plaintiffs in the case who claim Armenian, mixed-race, Latino, Asian and African-American descent.

In at-large elections, such as those in Glendale, candidates can run and be elected regardless of their address within overall school district boundaries. In a district-based system, candidates compete to represent specific geographic areas within the district’s boundaries.

“We treat all the students the same,” Hacopian said. “Giving one group of people more attention and the other groups not — it’s unethical,” she said.

Passed in 2002, the CVRA seeks to protect the voting clout of minority groups by mandating a district-based system in elections where the at-large process dilutes their vote.

The law has gained increased attention during the last year, especially amid protests in Anaheim where an at-large system has produced an all-white city council in a city with a large Latino population.
Last November, a redistricting consultant warned Glendale Community College officials that there were enough examples of racially polarized voting to make the district vulnerable to litigation.

“It’s the job of the trustees to interpret the analysis we provided and work with their own counsel to determine their own election system,” said Paul Mitchell, a consultant with Redistricting Partners. “There’s nothing in this lawsuit that sheds new light on that need to transition.”

Glendale News-Press

Copyright 2012 Glendale News-Press
Candidate moves into new trustee area

Fragozo rents apartment to run for Escondido school board under new election system

By Michelle Breier

Saturday, September 1, 2012

ESCONDIDO — Escondido voters will go to the polls Nov. 6 to choose two new K-8 school board members, but not all residents will have a say in who is elected.

The Escondido Union School District’s change from at-large elections to voting by trustee area means only residents in trustee areas with open seats will vote on candidates. The election change was prompted by lawsuits filed against school districts around the state alleging violations of the California Voting Rights Act of 2002.

The Voting Rights Act says that an at-large election system may be challenged if analysis shows minority representation is restricted. Escondido is 48 percent Latino.

The city’s high school district also approved by-trustee area voting. A city charter on the November ballot includes a proposal to create City Council district elections.

The K-8 board approved a trustee area boundary map dividing the city into five districts. One district, Area 1, is a required “majority minority” Latino district in the urban core of the city.

Candidates must be living and registered to vote in the district for which they are running when they pull candidacy papers, the Registrar of Voters Office said.

A “residence” for voting purposes means a person’s domicile, the “place in which his or her habitation is fixed, wherein the person has the intention of remaining, and to which, whenever he or she is absent, the person has the intention of returning,” an election official said. At a given time, a person may have only one domicile.

One candidate apparently has taken dramatic action to run in Trustee Area 1.

Jose Fragozo, who has run twice before for the K-8 board, said he moved from his large Hidden Meadows home in north Escondido to a studio apartment near Central Elementary in Old
Escondido near downtown. He announced his new address at a school board meeting July 26. Hidden Meadows is in Area 5, and Fragozo would have to wait until 2014 to run for that seat.

Asked about his Hidden Meadows home, Fragozo said, “It’s my place in the country.” He said his two college-student sons occupy the home, and he and his wife, an Escondido teacher, are living in the apartment.

Fragozo said he moved to run in Area 1, rather than wait to run in Area 5, because “we need the change now. I don’t want to wait another two years.” He said parents urged him to run for the central district school board seat.

Fragozo’s move has raised eyebrows in the community.

“Mr. Fragozo’s sudden new address raises many serious questions and concerns,” said Linda Woods, who has served on the school board 22 years and lives in Area 5. “It certainly challenges the spirit and intent of having trustee area elections. It appears that it will now be up to the voters in Area 1 to decide if someone who moves into their area, for the sole purpose of seeking election, is the best person to represent them.”

Councilwoman Olga Diaz, who supports voting by district area for City Council elections, said she tried to advise Fragozo “against moving and running to represent the voters of a district he did not live in prior to the candidate filing period.”

“I have been a strong advocate for Jose in the past, but I believe he is violating the spirit of district elections and cannot support his current candidacy based on that,” Diaz said.

For his part, Fragozo said, “There’s really nothing wrong with it. It’s my choice.”

michelle.breier@uniontrib.com • (760) 752-6762 • @UTSDbreier

© Copyright 2012 The San Diego Union-Tribune, LLC. An MLIM LLC Company. All rights reserved.
RIVERSIDE: School board adopts trustee area map in spite of opposition

DAYNA STRAEHLEY/STAFF PHOTO

The Riverside Unified School District board votes unanimously for trustee area map Scenario I.

BY DAYNA STRAEHLEY The Press Enterprise

Published: 17 September 2012 09:30 PM

In what board members called a compromise that didn’t please everyone, a map dividing Riverside Unified School District into five trustee areas was unanimously adopted Monday night.

The board on a 5-0 vote adopted the map in Scenario I in spite of 11 people — Hispanic community representatives and their supporters — speaking on Monday, Sept. 17, in favor of Scenario J.

The board deadlocked on map J two weeks ago with one member absent.

Board member Chuck Beaty moved to adopt Scenario I after explaining his opposition to Scenario J.

Map J would have included the west part of downtown in his district extending south along the west part of the school district to cover much of the Victoria Grove neighborhood.

Some supporters of Scenario J grumbled in the back of the board room and one woman booed.

Beaty’s previous motion to adopt the boundaries in Scenario K died for a lack of a second.
Scenarios I and J both have a slight majority of Latino citizens old enough to vote living in Trustee Area 3, although that majority is slightly smaller, 50.6 percent, in Scenario I.

Under Scenario I, school board President Gayle Cloud lives in Trustee Area 3. In Scenario J, board member Kathy Allavie lives in Area 3.

In both maps, Trustee Area 3 includes the Casa Blanca and Eastside neighborhoods and the Highgrove area at the north end of the district.

Scenario J divides Trustee Area 3 and Area 5 at Highway 60 west of Highway 91. In Scenario I, that boundary is Third Street and University Avenue so Trustee Area 3 includes Fairmount Park and part of downtown.

Gilberto Esquivel, president of the League of United Latino American Citizens, said Scenario J was the only map that truly represents the Latino community, which other speakers said is defined by language, religion, culture and educational needs, as well as a history of being denied elected representation.

"By crossing Highway 91, you’re destroying the Eastside," Esquivel said in opposing Scenario I. “That to us is a slap in the face.”

In July, Deputy Superintendent Mike Fine met with residents, who had hired an attorney and demographer who proposed the Area 3 in Scenario J. He said after the vote that Scenario I meets all their concerns except that it is currently represented by Cloud, who will be up for re-election in three years, and not Allavie, who will be up for re-election next year and whom some speakers at previous meetings said they believe understands their concerns.

Beaty and Cloud had opposed Scenario J two weeks ago.

Board member Patricia Lock-Dawson missed that meeting because her mother died.

On Monday, Beaty and Cloud both said they didn’t want to divide neighborhoods at the south end of the school district and cross freeways.

Beaty, who came to Riverside in the 1970s as principal of North High, now in Trustee Area 3, said district resources were not fairly distributed then to that school and neighborhood. But he said North gets more equitable consideration now, although “there are still some there who hang on to what I call the ‘poor me syndrome,’ ” Beaty said.

The school district was threatened with a lawsuit under the California Voting Rights Act by San Francisco civil rights attorney Robert Rubin. Under that law, districts with at-large elections can be sued if black or Hispanic voters have not been represented by the candidates of their choice in past elections. Districts or cities served with such a suit are liable for plaintiff’s legal fees and have no defense if they have at-large elections, Inland school district officials have said.
The Riverside board voted June 18 to move from at-large elections to a system in which board members are elected from geographic areas. The board has looked at 11 maps presented by district administrators since May.

Follow Dayna Straehley on Twitter: @dstraehley_PE and watch for her posts on the Inland Schools blog: http://blog.pe.com/schools/

Copyright 2011 The Press Enterprise. All rights reserve. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: CITY OF SANTA CLARITA

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Santa Clarita when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on September 11, 2012, as Instrument No. 20121357938:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2012-12 – PROTEST RESOLUTION ORDERING CITY OF SANTA CLARITA ANNEXATION NO. 2011-20 (Vista Canyon/ FairOaks/ JakesWay)

Number of Registered Voters: 5,344           Acres: 2.437 acres

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES: Unless otherwise specified, these changes are effective on the date shown above:

Annexation to:
The City of Santa Clarita

Detachment from:
County Road District No.5
County Lighting and Maintenance District 1687
County Public Library System
County Lighting District LLA-1

DATED: September 13, 2012
Distribution for City of Santa Clarita No. 2011-20

COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER
ANIMAL CONTROL
AUDITOR-Tax Section
CONSUMER AFFAIRS
FORESTER-FIRE WARDEN
HEALTH SERVICES-Solid Waste
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE- Leasing & Revenue
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE-Pipeline Franchises
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE-Space Management
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION-Glock Grants
INTERNAL SERVICES-911 Plans & Est.
LIBRARY-Admin. Services
PARKS & RECREATION-Mgmt. Serv.
PUBLIC WORKS-Mapping Services
REGIONAL PLANNING-Mapping Services, Room 1101
REGISTRAR-RECORDER
SHERIFF-Contract Law
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-Bus Lic.
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-Utility Tax

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL — TAX DIRECTOR
RAND-MCNALLY
SBE LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
EXHIBIT "A"

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-20 TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
"VISTA CANYON/FAIROAKS/JAKES WAY"

Those portions of Sections 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 34, and 35 in Township 4 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian together with a portion of Section 2 in Township 3 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian, all in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as a whole as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of said Section 28 being a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on January 31, 2011; thence along said City Boundary the following courses and curves:

(L1) South 89°04′33″ West 2634.89 feet; thence
(L2) North 00°14′39″ West 2570.31 feet; thence
(L3) South 88°08′59″ East 26.80 feet; thence
(L4) North 46°27′40″ East 392.66 feet; thence
(L5) North 03°35′19″ East 272.19 feet; thence
(L6) North 39°38′15″ West 503.81 feet; thence
(L7) North 60°07′45″ West 232.07 feet; thence
(L8) North 71°19′50″ West 102.46 feet; thence
(L9) North 56°13′23″ West 231.31 feet; thence
(L10) North 76°56′40″ West 542.10 feet; thence
(L11) North 68°16′54″ West 118.05 feet; thence
(L12) North 89°06′27″ East 1117.06 feet; thence
(L13) North 00°10′33″ West 1316.51 feet; thence
(L14) South 85°56′51″ West 454.84 feet to the centerline of Sierra Highway as shown on map of Tract No. 43510 filed in book 1078 pages 93 to 99, inclusive of Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said county; thence
(L15) along said centerline North 40°03’07” East 284.70 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 3500.00 feet; thence 
(C16) continuing northeasterly along said centerline and said curve through a central angle of 11°25’02” an arc distance of 697.44 feet to the beginning of a tangent compound curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 2750.00 feet; thence 
(C17) continuing northeasterly along said centerline and last said curve through a central angle of 01°01’09” an arc distance of 48.92 feet; thence 
(L18) leaving said centerline and non-tangent to last said curve South 66°38’44” East 202.97 feet; thence 
(L19) North 07°37’56” East 129.91 feet; thence 
(L20) North 66°38’44” West 161.31 feet to a point on said centerline of Sierra Highway on said curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 2750.00 feet, a radial line through said point bears North 64°59’38” West; thence 
(C21) northeasterly along said centerline and last said curve through a central angle of 04°36’32” an arc distance of 221.21 feet; thence 
(L22) continuing along said centerline and tangent to last said curve North 20°23’50” East 231.44 feet; thence 
(L23) leaving said centerline North 89°16’02” East 2270.20 feet; thence 
(L24) North 00°07’40” West 557.93 feet to a point at the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 9700.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 03°41’25” West; thence 
(C25) easterly along last said curve through a central angle of 05°23’37” an arc distance of 913.12 feet; thence 
(L26) non-tangent to last said curve South 89°59’09” East 802.71 feet to a point on the centerline of the Antelope Valley Freeway (State Highway 14) on a curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 3000.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears South 55°53’44” East; thence
(C27) northeasterly along last said centerline and last said curve through a central angle of 26°46’51” an arc distance of 1402.24 feet; thence

(L28) continuing along last said centerline and tangent to last said curve North 60°53’07” East 4430.00 feet; thence

(L29) leaving last said centerline South 00°30’36” West 1241.76 feet to a point at the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 1200.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 02°06’19” West; thence

(C30) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 08°53’18” an arc distance of 186.16 feet; thence

(L31) non-tangent to last said curve South 02°48’40” East 800.41 feet; thence

(L32) South 57°48’40” East 204.70 feet to a point at the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 2914.83 feet, a radial line through last said point bears South 23°12’26” East; thence

(C33) southwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of 00°44’49” an arc distance of 38.00 feet; thence

(L34) non-tangent to last said curve South 00°30’36” West 274.44 feet; thence

(L35) North 89°47’00” East 1713.73 feet; thence

(L36) South 23°08’22” West 631.01 feet; thence

(L37) South 89°42’25” West 158.00 feet; thence

(L38) South 00°35’25” West 983.76 feet; thence

(L39) North 89°42’51” East 109.14 feet to a point at the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 1820.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 82°33’06” East; thence

(C40) southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 11°46’59” an arc distance of 374.29 feet; thence

(L41) tangent to last said curve South 19°13’53” East 120.44 feet; thence

(L42) North 89°38’30” East 110.05 feet; thence

(L43) South 00°35’25” West 182.50 feet; thence

(L44) South 89°38’30” West 350.00 feet; thence
(L45) South 00°35'25" West 402.50 feet; thence
(L46) South 00°01'27" West 5260.30 feet; thence
(L47) South 06°36'02" East 5029.37 feet; thence
(L48) North 88°59'50" East 1514.44 feet to a point of intersection with the centerline of Placerita Canyon Road as shown on County Surveyor's Map No. B-2283 sheet 2 (CSB 2283-2) on file in the office of the Director of Public Works of said county, said point being at the point of cusp at the easterly terminus of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 500.00 feet; thence
(C49) southwesterly along last said centerline and along last said curve the following 6 courses, through a central angle of 36°17'40" an arc distance of 316.73 feet; thence
(L50) tangent to last said curve South 52°42'10" West 101.75 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 800.00 feet; thence
(C51) southwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of 16°03'00" an arc distance of 224.10 feet; thence
(L52) tangent to last said curve South 68°45'10" West 165.73 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence
(C53) southwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of 17°49'10" an arc distance of 311.01 feet; thence
(L54) tangent to last said curve South 50°56'00" West 684.39 feet to a point on the easterly boundary of Parcel Map No. 7096 as shown on map filed in Book 108 pages 33 and 34 inclusive, of Parcel Maps, in said office of the County Recorder; thence
(L55) along last said easterly boundary South 00°36'27" West 219.37 feet to the southerly boundary of said Parcel Map No. 7096; thence
(L56) along last said southerly boundary North 89°30'04" West 667.02 feet to the point of intersection with the westerly line of the east half of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said Section 2 as described in document recorded July 12, 2007 as instrument no.
20071654941 of Official Records, in said office of the County Recorder; thence

(L57) along last said westerly line South 00°28′55″ West 318.70 feet to the point of intersection with said centerline of Placerita Canyon Road, being a point on a curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1500.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 32°21′34″ West; thence

(C58) southwesterly along last said centerline and along last said curve through a central angle of 27°11′33″ an arc distance of 711.90 feet to the point of intersection with the westerly line of the land described in document recorded June 07, 2006 as instrument no. 06-1253118 of said Official Records; thence

(L59) along last said westerly line South 00°21′14″ West 774.87 feet to the north line of the southwest quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L60) along last said north line South 89°13′10″ East 1328.21 feet to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L61) along the east line of last said southwest quarter South 00°36′27″ West 1347.98 feet to the northeasterly corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L62) along the southerly line of parcel B as described in document recorded August 25, 2004 as instrument no. 04-2190843, of said Official Records, North 89°16′42″ West 1338.38 feet to the easterly line of parcel C as described in said document recorded August 25, 2004; thence

(L63) along last said easterly line South 01°02′22″ West 1349.36 feet to the southerly line of the southwest quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L64) along last said southerly line North 89°20′10″ West 1348.56 feet to the southwest corner of said Section 2; thence

(L65) along the westerly line of the southwest quarter of said Section 2 North 01°20′15″ East 2701.64 feet to the west quarter corner of said Section 2 being an angle point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on January 31, 2011; thence

(L66) along said City Boundary the following 8 courses, North 00°05′30″ East 2362.51 feet; thence
(L67) North 05°54'27" West 1349.89 feet; thence
(L68) North 89°53'14" East 1333.12 feet; thence
(L69) North 06°14'20" West 1239.98 feet; thence
(L70) North 06°14'08" West 1240.26 feet; thence
(L71) South 89°47'09" West 2632.95 feet; thence
(L72) North 05°32'23" West 1231.99 feet; thence
(L73) South 89°38'56" West 3921.73 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 2437.24 acres, more or less.
PORTIONS OF SECTIONS 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35
T4N, R15W, S.B.M.

PORTION OF SECTION 2
T3N, R15W, S.B.M.

LEGEND

BOUNDARY OF THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
AS EXISTED ON JANUARY 31, 2011

A

B

C

D

E

F

SCALE: 1" = 3000'
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: PALMDALE
(Uninhabited Territory)

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Palmdale when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on September 11, 2012, as Instrument No. 20121357939:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2012-43RMD – MAKING DETERMINATIONS AND APPROVING AND ORDERING CITY OF PALMDALE ANNEXATION NO. 2011-09

Number of Registered Voters: 0                              Acres: 44 acres

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES: Unless otherwise specified, these changes are effective on the date shown above:

Annexation to:
The City of Palmdale

Detachment from:
County Road District No.5
County Lighting and Maintenance District 1687
County Lighting District LLA-1

DATED: September 13, 2012
Distribution for City of Palmdale No. 2011-09

COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER
ANIMAL CONTROL
AUDITOR-Tax Section
CONSUMER AFFAIRS
FORESTER-FIRE WARDEN
HEALTH SERVICES-Solid Waste
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE- Leasing & Revenue
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE-Pipeline Franchises
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE-Space Management
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION-Glock Grants
INTERNAL SERVICES-911 Plans & Est.
LIBRARY-Admin. Services
PARKS & RECREATION-Mgmt. Serv.
PUBLIC WORKS-Mapping Services
REGIONAL PLANNING-Mapping Services, Room 1101
REGRISTRAR-RECORDER
SHERIFF-Contract Law
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-Bus Lic.
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-Utility Tax

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL - TAX DIRECTOR
RAND-MCNALLY
SBE LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
EXHIBIT "A"

CITY OF PALMDALE

ANNEXATION 2011-09

That portion of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of Section 14, Township 5 North, Range 11 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, described as follows:

COMMENCING at the North Sixteenth Corner of said Northwest Quarter of Section, being a corner of the existing boundary of the City of Palmdale as same existed on September 23, 2011, in said County and State;

THENCE (L1) North $89^\circ39'53"$ East, 118.83 feet, along the north line of said South Half of the Northwest Quarter of Section 14 and along said existing City boundary to its intersection with the centerline of Pearblossom Highway (State Highway 138), the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE continuing along said north line and said existing City boundary, (L2) North $89^\circ39'53"$ East, 2,333.24 feet;

THENCE leaving said north line and said existing City boundary, (L3) South $06^\circ54'04"$ West, 329.71 feet;

THENCE (L4) South $27^\circ34'42"$ West, 237.07 feet;

THENCE (L5) South $13^\circ58'06"$ West, 123.70 feet;
THENCE (L6) South 16°47'26" West, 344.83 feet;

THENCE (L7) South 20°57'54" East, 307.17 feet to the aforementioned centerline of Pearblossom Highway;

THENCE along said centerline of Pearblossom Highway the following five courses:

THENCE (L8) North 83°37'34" West, 26.30 feet;

THENCE (L9) North 83°49'19" West, 609.67 feet to the beginning of a (C10) non-tangent 1,800 foot radius curve concave to the northeast, a radial line bears North 06°09'57" East, from last said course;

THENCE northwesterly along said curve through a central angle of 55°14'19", and an arc length of 1735.38 feet;

THENCE (L11) North 28°36'13" West, 189.88 feet;

THENCE (L12) North 28°58'11" West, 111.46 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 47.72 acres, more or less.

For assessment purposes only. This description of land is not a legal property description as defined in the Subdivision Map Act and may not be used as the basis for an offer for sale of the land described.
This legal description was prepared by me or under my direction.

BY:  
Brian D. Glidden, L.S. 7727

Dated: 5/22/12
EXHIBIT "B"
CITY OF PALMDALE
ANNEXATION 2011–09

BEING A PORTION OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF
SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 11 WEST,
SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN
IN THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

OF PALMDALE
N 3050–028–015
N. LINE S. 1/2, N.W. 1/4 SEC. 14

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
(UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY)

APN 3050–028–003

APN 3050–028–007

E. LINE N.W. 1/4 SEC. 14

APN 3050–028–013 (POR)

HIGHWAY 138

SCALE: 1"=300'

COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>DELTA</th>
<th>RADIUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>118.83</td>
<td>N89°39'53&quot;E</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>2333.24</td>
<td>N89°39'53&quot;E</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>329.71</td>
<td>S06°54'04&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>237.07</td>
<td>S27°34'42&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>123.70</td>
<td>S13°58'06&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>344.83</td>
<td>S16°47'26&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>307.17</td>
<td>S20°57'54&quot;E</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>N83°37'34&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>609.67</td>
<td>N83°49'19&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>1735.38</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>55°14'19&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>189.88</td>
<td>N28°36'13&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>111.46</td>
<td>N28°58'11&quot;W</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

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

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 375 to County Sanitation District No. 14

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 129.557± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Joshua Ranch Road approximately 300 feet north of Elizabeth Lake Road, all within the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, October 22, 2012.

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

Date: September 19, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-14-375

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

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

2. ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

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

1. Annexation

2. ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 14
   of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.org

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

SIGNATURE: John Doe DATE: May 30, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4195, Grids A5, 6
Located on Joshua Ranch Road approximately 300 feet north of Elizabeth Lake Road, all within the City of Palmdale.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

129.557 acres or 0.202 square miles

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   222

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

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

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:  
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?  
The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $3,892,356.

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

3. What is the proposed planned land use of the subject area?  
The proposed land use is 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 vacant to the north, south, east & west.

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).  
The territory is being developed to include 86 proposed single-family homes.
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?

Yes. The proposal area contains 49.46 acres of dedicated open space.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

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

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

   a. Adjacent areas:

      N/A

   b. Mutual social and economic interests:

      N/A

   c. The local government structure of the County:

      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

   The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant (LWRP). The LWRP has a design capacity of 16 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 13.9 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant 2020 Facilities Plan.

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

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.
The current permitted capacity of the LWRP is 16 mgd. On June 16, 2004, the Board of Directors of District No. 14 approved the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plan 2020 Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2020 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the LWRP service area through the year 2020 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2020 plan allows the capacity of the LWRP to increase to 26 mgd by 2020.

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

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   Yes ☐ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County  No ☒ Subsequent to the Commission’s approval of Sphere of Influence Amendment No. 2012-14, Annexation 14-375 will then be within District No. 14’s SOI.

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 323 to County Sanitation District No. 14

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 261.062± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Elizabeth Lake Road approximately 3 ¾ miles west of the Antelope Valley Freeway, all within the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, October 22, 2012.

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

Date: September 19, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-14-323

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

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

2. ____________________________

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

1. Annexation

2. ____________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 14
   of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.org

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]
DATE: April 26, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4194, Grid J6; and Page 4195, Grids A5-7; B6-7; C7
Located on Elizabeth Lake Road approximately 3 3/4 miles west of the Antelope Valley Freeway, all within the City of Palmdale.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

261.062 acres or 0.408 square miles

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

☐ Yes    ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   350

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   2
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $12,042,762.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   The territory is being developed to include 112 proposed single-family homes.
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?
    Yes. The proposal area contains 187.42 acres of dedicated open space.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.
   All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 14 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

1. Estimate the present cost and describe the adequacy of government services and controls in the area.
   The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant (LWRP). The LWRP has a design capacity of 16 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 13.9 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
   Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant 2020 Facilities Plan.

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

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.
   The current permitted capacity of the LWRP is 16 mgd. On June 16, 2004, the Board of Directors of District No. 14 approved the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plan 2020 Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2020 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the LWRP service area through the year 2020 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2020 plan allows the capacity of the LWRP to increase to 26 mgd by 2020.

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

---

**SPHERE OF INFLUENCE**

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   
   **Yes [ ] No [x]** Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County. Subsequent to the Commission’s approval of Sphere of Influence Amendment No. 2012-14, Annexation 14-323 will then be within District No. 14’s SOI.

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

---

**BONDED INDEBTNESS**

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

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

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

**NOTIFICATION**

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

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

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

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

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER
STEPHEN R. NAQUIN
CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

ANNEXATION NO. 323
TO
SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT

Area of Annexation: 261.062 Acres
0.408 Square Miles

Annexation No. 323 shown thus:
Boundary of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District prior to Annexation No. 323 shown thus:
Prior Annexations shown thus:

Recorded:

AEG/LAS/MAY 10, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3206 064 001 - 047</td>
<td>Parcel Numbers: 3206 064 001 - 047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206 065 001 - 022</td>
<td>Parcel Numbers: 3206 065 001 - 022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206 066 001 - 007</td>
<td>Parcel Numbers: 3206 066 001 - 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206 066 000 - 010</td>
<td>Parcel Numbers: 3206 066 000 - 010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206 067 001 - 041</td>
<td>Parcel Numbers: 3206 067 001 - 041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COURSE DATA

- **(L1)** N 89°49'00" W 705.48'
- **(L2)** N 00°05'21" E 135.27'
- **(L3)** N 69°54'17" E 61.44'
- **(L4)** R = 40.00' L = 58.58' D = 83°54'43"
- **(L5)** N 15°44'20" W 116.45'
- **(L6)** S 89°54'39" E 573.62'
- **(L7)** N 68°14'18" E 55.92'
- **(L8)** N 33°46'39" W 36.50'
- **(L9)** N 56°13'21" E 54.00'
- **(L10)** S 33°46'39" E 59.33'
- **(L11)** N 56°13'21" E 126.21'
- **(L12)** S 33°46'39" E 80.48'
- **(L13)** S 41°36'46" E 71.95'
- **(L14)** S 49°50'45" E 71.87'
- **(L15)** S 42°47'13" E 70.64'
- **(L16)** S 56°15'15" E 76.01'
- **(L17)** S 61°15'47" E 79.01'
- **(L18)** S 61°31'23" E 400.00'
- **(L19)** S 52°32'11" E 76.78'
- **(L20)** S 11°18'36" E 24.64'
- **(L21)** S 22°42'10" E 93.48'
- **(L22)** R = 323.00' L = 356.38' D = 63°34'18"
- **(L23)** S 50°14'13" E 129.10'
- **(L24)** S 07°15'18" E 30.38'
- **(L25)** R = 730.50' L = 261.38' D = 20°30'04"
- **(L26)** S 15°31'03" W 6.87'
- **(L27)** S 74°50'45" W 257.70'
- **(L28)** S 59°30'28" W 323.30'
- **(L29)** S 58°09'38" W 90.65'
- **(L30)** S 50°11'37" W 100.92'
- **(L31)** S 41°53'50" W 93.58'
- **(L32)** S 45°01'07" W 152.95'
- **(L33)** R = 477.00' L = 98.70' D = 11°51'22"
- **(L34)** S 67°25'21" W 149.97'
- **(L35)** S 17°57'44" W 100.90'
- **(L36)** S 08°43'50" W 100.92'
- **(L37)** S 00°57'19" W 90.60'
- **(L38)** S 00°07'46" E 81.34'
- **(L39)** S 77°28'48" E 153.71'
- **(L40)** S 00°07'46" E 31.57'
- **(L41)** R = 477.00' L = 134.98' D = 16°12'49"
- **(L42)** N 64°00'06" W 163.15'
- **(L43)** N 30°35'02" E 191.51'
- **(L44)** N 36°12'18" E 89.16'
- **(L45)** N 53°43'58" W 288.35'
- **(L46)** N 36°16'02" E 66.00'
- **(L47)** S 53°43'58" W 288.39'
- **(L48)** N 36°16'02" E 16.80'
- **(L49)** S 72°38'44" E 162.07'

### EXHIBIT "B"

**COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 14 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.**

**OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER**

**STEPHEN R. MAGNIN**

**CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER**

**ANNEXATION NO. 323**

**TO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 14**

**Recorded:**

AEJ/EAQ/MAY 10, 2011
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-OCTOBER 2012

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 477/Wright
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11
Amended 06/11/12
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 09/06/12: Enrolled and presented to the Governor.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill specifies the manner in which the liability for taxation, bonding capacity, permitted use of existing bond proceeds, and the allocation of authorized but unsold bonds, will be administered among the Wiseburn School District (SD) and the Centinela Valley Union High School District (UHSD) after the Wiseburn SD is reorganized to form the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD). Under this bill, after the formation of the Wiseburn USD, the Centinela Valley UHSD shall retain the right to bond based on the assessed valuation of all non-residential property within the Wiseburn USD. Residential property within the Wiseburn USD will remain part of that district’s bonding capacity assessed valuation. In addition, the Wiseburn USD will receive a payment of $4,000,000 from the Centinela Valley UHSD for approved but unissued bonds, and will retain liability for bonds issued before January 2012.

The bill authorizes the creation of the Local Public Schools Funding Authority (LPSFA), a joint powers authority created by the Centinela Valley UHSD and the Wiseburn SD (and post-reorganization, by the Wiseburn USD) to issue bonds pursuant to laws governing the issuance of school facilities construction bonds by school districts.

This bill would also determine the blended revenue limit per average daily attendance (ADA) for the newly formed Wiseburn USD upon reorganization.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill will impact the Wiseburn SD, which will cease to exist and become the Wiseburn USD after reorganization. It will also impact the Centinela Valley UHSD, as it alters that district’s physical territory. Potential financial impacts on the Centinela Valley UHSD are addressed directly in the legislation.

This bill may also impact the Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox SDs, given that their territories are also part of the Centinela Valley UHSD. However, those districts have formed an additional joint powers authority to address any potential impacts.

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 Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6144.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

October 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of September 21, 2012.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• 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)

October 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of September 21, 2012.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

At the March 6, 2012, meeting, Wiseburn SD Superintendent Dr. Tom Johnston addressed the County Committee and explained the status of the district’s negotiations on legislation with the Centinela Valley UHSD. Dr. Johnston stated that no agreement was finalized at this point and that he would keep staff informed. Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent of the Lawndale SD, also addressed the County Committee. She stated that her district had not been included in the negotiations and was not supportive of them if critical concerns of the feeder districts could not be addressed. The County Committee reviewed several documents, including recent drafts of the legislation and rationale behind it, as well as the response of the Wiseburn SD to the prior letter circulated by the other feeder districts in opposition 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 require specific legislation, as proposed earlier this year. District representatives stated that all of their boards had already approved the agreements or were scheduled to do so that week.

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

On June 11, 2012, Senate Bill 477 was amended by Senator Rod Wright to address the petition to create a Wiseburn USD. The bill language currently seeks to create a Wiseburn USD (pending approval by the voters who currently reside 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. On June 29, 2012, the County Committee sent a letter to the SBE expressing support.

The amended version of SB 477 passed both the Senate and the Assembly and as of September 21, 2012, it was enrolled and awaiting the Governor’s signature. Staff requested that the districts keep them informed of any progress and to report back to the County Committee when more is known about the unification petition and related legislation (including agendizing a reviewing of the petition before the SBE). The districts were invited to address the County Committee at its October 3, 2012 meeting to provide an update. In addition, the other JPA, called the Local Classrooms Funding Authority (LCFA), was formed upon approval by the boards of all five of the local districts. The LCFA placed its first parcel tax measure on the upcoming November 6, 2012 ballot.

**Status:** Petition on hold at the SBE; Centinela Valley UHSD, and Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs participating in LCFA JPA; legislation to facilitate formation of the Wiseburn USD awaiting Governor’s signature. Districts to update the County Committee at the next meeting.

**Status Date:** September 21, 2012

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

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

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, requesting some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 6,100 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD, based

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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,

* Indicates update from previous summary.
staff from the Registrar-Recorder’s office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

Status: Petition currently in circulation.

Status Date: February 21, 2008

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: May 11, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

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

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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

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

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.