March 26, 2012

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the April 4, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, April 4, 2012, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 2, 2012.

The following is an update of relevant information as of March 23, 2012.

Staff Activities

- Staff has been working with the Los Angeles County Office of Education legal counsel to assess the impact of the recent California Voting Rights Act court decision related to the Madera County Office of Education and the Madera Unified School District. This decision may also impact the County Committee, the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, and the outstanding petitions in both Pomona Unified School District and Mount San Antonio Community College District.

Correspondence

- A March 22, 2012, letter from Citizens for a Unified Wiseburn School District addressed to Ms. Maria Calix, Chairperson of the County Committee, regarding the Wiseburn Unification Plan. (Attachment 1)

Newspaper Articles

- A February 2012, article from Fagen, Friedman & Fulbright F3 NewsFlash- "Court of Appeal Upholds Reduced Attorney Fees and Provides Guidance on Potential Liability of County in CVRA Lawsuit." (Attachment 2)
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- A February 28, 2012, article from the Glendale News Press—“Consultants warn Glendale Community College of lawsuits over election process.” (Attachment 3)

- A February 29, 2012, article from the Diamond Bar Patch—“Pomona Unified Could Change the Way Trustees are Elected.” (Attachment 4)

- A February 29, 2012, article from the Los Angeles Times—“Compton settles Latino voting rights lawsuit.” (Attachment 5)

- A March 9, 2012, article from the Pasadena Weekly—“Drawn into a fight: Preliminary PUSD district maps pit sitting board members against each other.” (Attachment 6)

- A March 9, 2012, article from the California Watch—“White-dominated boards face legal threats over racial makeup.” (Attachment 7)


- A March 12, 2012, article from the UT San Diego—“High school district OKs trustee-area map.” (Attachment 9)

Informational Correspondence


- A March 5, 2012, LAFCO Notice to All Affected Agencies concerning the City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13 (Los Angeles County/Orange County Boundary Adjustment). (Attachment 11)

- A March 20, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies concerning Annexation No. 28 to County Sanitation District No. 16. (Attachment 12)

- A March 20, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies concerning Annexation No. 291 to County Sanitation District No. 15. (Attachment 13)

- A March 20, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies concerning Annexation No. 52 to County Sanitation District No. 18. (Attachment 14)

- A March 22, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies concerning Annexation No. 414 to County Sanitation District No. 22. (Attachment 15)
Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 16)

School District Organization Proposals

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

- “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals.” (Attachment 17)

- “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 18)

Please call me at (562) 922-6336 if you have any questions or concerns.

MFS/AD:alh
Attachments
March 22, 2012

Maria M. Calix, Chairperson
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
c/o Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Dear Ms. Calix,

Wiseburn Unification Plan

This letter is to confirm that the Chief Petitioners and the membership of the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District support the current Wiseburn Unification Plan. This letter also disputes several arcane notions that this Plan is anything but a method to achieve the unification for which this community has advocated incessantly since its birth more than eleven years ago. We applaud the leadership and creativity put forth by Wiseburn School District and Centinela Valley Union High School District (CVUHSD) to pull this issue off of life support to ensure the long-lasting success of children within the Centinela Valley region.

We respect and commend Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Lennox elementary school districts for providing optimal elementary educational programs amidst the current fiscal climate. We wish them the best in their future endeavors and are happy to see specific provisions appropriated to further enhance their operations. We understand the concerns that the elementary districts may have regarding the financial future of CVUHSD. It is for that reason Wiseburn and CVUHSD have worked diligently to carefully devise a plan that would assure financial security for CVUHSD as well as the elementary feeder districts. The issues that each elementary district has regarding the Joint Powers Authority and their claim to any benefits are based on their relationship with the High School District into which they feed. Such issues should not impact progress of the proposed unification plan.

The beauty of the current Wiseburn Unification plan is simple. Although seemingly more complicated because it is new and addresses long-term irreconcilable differences, it is efficient and puts a relatively expeditious end to an infinite stand-off. Rather than run around the State Board of Education (SBE), this plan assures Wiseburn's Unification goes to the SBE in a timely manner with all necessary requirements met. As such, the only votes needed are of those residents making an unorthodox compromise by agreeing to continue paying on past CVUHSD bonds, Wiseburn residents.

http://www.sites.google.com/site/unifywisburn
We strongly urge that your Committee continue its support of the Wiseburn Unification petition as a revitalized and powerful strategy to achieve educational aptitude and fiscal equity for the high school students and public education institutions within the Centinela Valley region, respectively.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact us as specified below.

Sincerely,

Lydia Rodriguez  
Chief Petitioner  
5164 W. 131st Street  
Hawthorne, CA 90250  
Phone (310) 676-8052

Linda Cuesta  
Chief Petitioner  
5521 W. 124th Street  
Hawthorne, CA 90250  
Phone (310) 536-9614

Shavonda Webber-Christmas  
Chief Petitioner  
5131 W. 139th Street  
Hawthorne, CA 90250  
Phone (310) 644-7507

C:  
Tom Johnstone, Superintendent, Wiseburn School District  
Senator Curren Price  
Senator Roderick D. Wright  
Assemblymember Steven Bradford  
Assemblymember Betsy Butler  
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Los Angeles County Superintendent Dr. Arturo Delgado  
State Superintendent Tom Torlakson  
California State of Board of Education – All Board Members  
Jose A. Fernandez, Superintendent, Centinela Valley Union High School District  
Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent, Lawndale School District  
Helen Morgan, Superintendent, Hawthorne School District  
Fred Navarro, Superintendent, Lennox School District  
Education Legal Alliance
Court of Appeal Upholds Reduced Attorney Fees and Provides Guidance on Potential Liability of County in CVRA Lawsuit

A California Court of Appeal has issued an important decision on the California Voting Rights Act (Elections Code §§ 14025, et seq.) (“CVRA”). In *Rey v. Madera Unified School District* (February 28, 2012, F061532) ___ Cal.Rptr.3d ___, [2012 WL 615668], a California Court of Appeal upheld a trial court’s decision to reduce attorneys’ fees claimed by prevailing plaintiffs who brought a CVRA lawsuit against the Madera Unified School District from over $1 million dollars to $162,500. Additionally, the Court of Appeal upheld the trial court’s decision that the local County Committee on School District Organization was not liable under the CVRA based on the facts of the case, and consequently was not responsible for the payment of any attorneys’ fees to the plaintiffs.

To date, there are very few cases that address the important issue of CVRA compliance due to the fact no case on the merits of a CVRA claim has been litigated all the way through at the trial court level. The *Rey v. Madera Unified School District* case addresses the right of a prevailing plaintiff to collect reasonable attorneys’ fees and expert witness fees in a CVRA lawsuit. (Elections Code § 14030.) Here, the plaintiffs brought a lawsuit claiming the district’s use of an “at-large” election system resulted in racially polarized voting in violation of the CVRA. Although the district immediately took steps to approve a transition to a “by-trustee area” election system and finalized the implementation of the new election system, plaintiffs filed their initial fee motion seeking over $1 million in attorneys’ fees. At a hearing, the trial court declared the amount of the fee request to be “patently unreasonable.” At a later date, the trial court awarded a reduced amount of $162,500 to the plaintiffs. The trial court justified the reduced amount by stating the number of attorneys working on the case resulted in duplicative billing and the hourly rates charged were not in line with the “reasonable” rate of the Central Valley. Although the district is still required to pay a significant amount in attorneys’ fees, the Court of Appeal decision illustrates that attorneys’ fees awarded to a prevailing plaintiff in a CVRA case must indeed be “reasonable.”

The plaintiffs in the *Rey v. Madera Unified School District* case also named the local County Committee on School District Organization as a defendant. As background, when a school district approves a transition to a “by-trustee area” election system, it is subject to final approval by the local County Committee on School District Organization (“County Committee”). (Education Code § 5019(c)(2).) Moreover, a County Committee also has the authority to require a school district to transition to a “by-trustee area” election system. (Education Code § 5019(a).) For these reasons, plaintiffs argued that the County Committee should also be liable for the claimed CVRA violation and the payment of attorneys’ fees since it has the power to initiate a change in the election system of a school district. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of the County Committee and held it was not responsible for the payment of any attorneys’ fees to plaintiffs. The Court of Appeal affirmed the decision.

In its decision, the Court of Appeal confirmed that CVRA liability only applies to a party “having taken some sort of affirmative action with respect to the election.” Here, the Court of Appeal explained the County Committee had no role in “ordering, calling, conducting or otherwise carrying out” the district’s elections; instead, such duties rest with the county superintendent of schools and the school district. The
Court of Appeal further explained that the County Committee does not have an “affirmative” duty to ensure that racially polarized voting is not occurring in districts under its jurisdiction. However, based on the language of the decision, a County Committee may become liable in the event it receives a demand letter directly requesting the County Committee to take action.

The lessons of this important decision appear to be the following: (1) a prevailing plaintiff will only be able to collect “reasonable” attorneys’ fees; (2) while a County Committee does not have an affirmative duty to ensure CVRA compliance of districts within its jurisdiction, liability may arise if it receives a specific demand letter requesting the County Committee take action; and (3) any party that has a role in ordering, calling, conducting or otherwise carrying out the elections of a public entity may be liable under the CVRA.

This decision is subject to appeal by either side. Thus, we will continue to monitor any developments closely. If you have any questions concerning compliance with the California Voting Rights Act or this decision, please call one of our six offices.

_F3 NewsFlash prepared by Peter K. Fagen and Gregory Rodriguez._
Peter is a partner in the F3 San Diego office.
Greg is an associate in the F3 Oakland office.

This F3 NewsFlash is a summary only and not legal advice. We recommend that you consult with legal counsel to determine how this decision may apply to your specific facts and circumstances. Information on a free NewsFlash subscription can be found at www.fagenfriedman.com.

As part of the E-ducation™ Professional Development Series hosted by ACSA and F3, we offer webinars on various topics. You can find the information on the ACSA website at www.acsa.org/e-ducation.

Keep up to the minute on the latest updates, NewsFlashes, and legal news by following F3 on Twitter:@F3Law.
Consultants warn Glendale Community College of lawsuits over election process

Data analysis shows signs of racially polarized voting through at-large system.

By Megan O’Neil, megan.oneil@latimes.com

6:00 PM PST, February 28, 2012

In the fourth presentation in as many months, election consultants again warned Glendale Community College officials this week that examples of racially polarized voting in their at-large election process could leave them vulnerable to a lawsuit alleging violations of the California Voting Rights Act.

“The base analysis from the first presentation and the memo I believe still hold true — that there is enough evidence of racially polarized voting for the board to be concerned,” said Paul Mitchell, of the consulting firm Redistricting Partners. “Really, the next phase of discussion on that is to discuss the level of concern you have with your attorney.”

The assertion came despite ongoing skepticism expressed by board of trustees members, who have questioned everything from the elections studied in the analysis to the statistical significance of the results.

Glendale Community College and the Glendale Unified School District in November jointly commissioned a $35,000 study exploring whether they should change from “at-large” to “district-based” systems. At the heart of the debate is the California Voting Rights Act, which compels elected bodies to use districts in situations where an at-large system dilutes the voting power of minority groups.

Cerritos Community College was sued in September in the first of what is expected to be a wave of similar lawsuits alleging violations of the act. An election study could help the districts stay ahead of the curve by determining whether they need to make a change, or serve as defensive evidence if they are sued, according to Mary Dowell, legal counsel for Glendale Community College.

The Glendale study includes analysis of dozens of local elections and candidates during the last decade and shows numerous examples of racially polarized voting, especially among Armenians, Mitchell said. Possible options include making a transition to a five-district or a seven-district system, he said.

“If you go to seven trustee areas you would have 30,000 people per district,” Mitchell said. “Instead of just having two districts below the 134 Freeway, essentially you would have almost three. It would...
allow you to relieve some of the pressure in the area here around the college where...you basically had many of the incumbents in one area."

Switching from an at-large to a district-based system would be a complicated and costly change for a body such as the Glendale Community College Board of Trustees, which traditionally piggybacks on the K-12 school board and City Council elections, said board of trustees President Anita Gabrielian.

"We would have to either fund it ourselves and stop partnering with them, or make sure that it is the right methodology for all three," Gabrielian said. "It is a difficult choice, and an expensive alternative to pursue."

Trustee Tony Tartaglia pointed out that Glendale voters have elected several Armenian and Latino candidates to City Council, the college board of trustees and the K-12 district school board in recent years.

But individuals who might sue Glendale Community College for violations of the California Voting Rights Act would not be dissuaded by a few elections in which racially polarized voting was not a factor, Mitchell said. A handful of examples in which it was present would be enough.

"There has not been a case that has been won based on a district pushing back and saying, "We have examples of races that weren’t polarized,"" Mitchell said. "That has not been a successful way to refute a CVRA claim."

Redistricting Partners has contracted Matt Barreto, a researcher at the University of Washington and the foremost expert on racial voting patterns, to further analyze the Glendale election data and address trustees’ doubts, Mitchell said. That research will be presented in the coming weeks.

"I believe the math shows racially polarized voting, especially in the Armenian community," Mitchell said. "It shows, I think, weaker racially polarized voting from the Latino community. The challenge is what to do with that in a city that the CVRA was not tailor-made for."
DiamondBarPatch

Editor Catherine Garcia:

Pomona Unified Could Change the Way Trustees are Elected

A petition has been filed that asks to change the current number of Board of Education trustees from five at-large to five to seven from designated areas.

By Catherine Garcia

February 29, 2012

Credit Darren Fishell

The way trustees are chosen for the Pomona Unified School District Board of Education could be changing soon.

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organizations recently received a petition from a Pomona resident, asking to change the current number of trustees from five at-large members to five to seven members from designated areas (also known as "trustee areas"). The petition cited the California Voting Rights Act, which prohibits racially polarized voting.

Currently, the five members of the board are allowed to live anywhere within PUSD boundaries, and represent all schools. If it goes to a trustee area system, the board member must reside within the boundaries of the area represented, is elected by voters in the area, and will only represent the schools and students within that area.

Earlier this month, the district held three community meetings to ask for feedback from PUSD parents.

"We wanted to get input as to how to draw the boundaries, and ask questions like, 'Do you wish to maintain the at-large method,' 'Do you prefer trustee areas,'" said Leslie Barnes, the district's chief financial officer. "We asked if they would also like to remain
with five board members or go to seven, and what areas they feel are important to keep together as boundaries are drawn. We turn that into a demographer and have them give us some options.”

About 120 people attended the three meetings, with the largest crowd in Diamond Bar.

“When it came to the folks who came out, it was really a mixed bag, with different responses,” said Superintendent Richard Martinez. “Some supported trustee areas, others wanted to continue at-large. We did get a sense from those who did attend in the Diamond Bar area that they were very much in favor of leaving things as they are. They were very complimentary of the board, and even those in favor of trustee areas were complimentary of the board.”

The next step is for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organizations to hold a public hearing on the petition. If the committee rules in favor of the petitioner, PUSD will have the opportunity to create its own trustee areas. If those areas are accepted, the district can then hold an election to get voter approval of the trustee area maps, or apply for a waiver of the election with the state. In most cases, the state approves the waiver and trustee areas go into affect during the next election of Board of Education members.

“My understanding is the county committee won’t be meeting on this matter until late March or early April, giving the district an opportunity to do all of this work: have hearings, collect information, work with the demographer,” Martinez said.

According to Barnes, the Pomona Unified School District isn't the only one facing this in the state. In some districts, when the petition isn't approved, lawsuits are filed, with districts responsible for legal fees, as well as possible settlements in the millions.

“If you take it to a vote and it’s voted down, it doesn’t necessarily mean it is free of lawsuits,” Barnes said.

The district also has an online questionnaire that residents are asked to take, available here.
Compton settles Latino voting rights lawsuit
February 29, 2012 | 10:00 am

The city of Compton has reached a settlement with two Latinas who sued the city saying its election system vi
Plaintiffs Felicitas Gonzalez and Flora Ruiz sued the city in 2010, saying that the city's at-large council electio
case had been scheduled to go to trial in May.
The population of Compton, historically a black stronghold, is now about two-thirds Latino, but Latinos are a that no Latino candidate has ever been elected to Compton’s City Council and blame the city’s at-large voting
They sought to force a change to district elections, which would allow for the creation of at least one district w
Under the settlement announced at Tuesday night’s Compton City Council meeting, the city has agreed to pla allow voters to decide whether to make the switch to district elections. If the measure fails in June, it will go o If the measure passes, the plaintiffs will have the right to review the proposed district boundaries.
City Atty. Craig Cornwell said the city’s position has been that the election system is legal and that changing to residents under the charter, but said city officials agreed to the settlement partially because the plaintiffs had increase voter turnout.
The city’s elections have been consistently characterized by low voter turnout, with less than 10% of registered "The common goal of wanting to increase voter turnout has led to this settlement," Cornwell told the council ’ litigated case over to the citizens for a determination on how the city will move forward, and this is such a cas Gav Grunfeld, an attorney for the plaintiffs, said they were also pleased.
"This has been a long, hard litigation and we’re very happy that it’s ending in this productive way," she said. Under the settlement, the city will pay the plaintiffs’ attorney fees. The amount has not been determined.

RELATED:

Suit seeks to open Compton to Latino voters
Lawsuit alleging Compton elections unfair to Latinos going to trial

-- Abby Sewell

Photo: The city of Compton has settled a voting rights lawsuit brought by two Latinas. Credit: Gina Ferazzi
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Drawn into a fight

Preliminary PUSD district maps pit sitting board members against each other

By André Coleman 03/09/2012

New maps of the Pasadena Unified School District outlining geographic districts for Board of Education seats could pit two sitting board members against each other in a future election.

According to the proposed maps first unveiled Saturday at a community meeting in Altadena, Board members Tom Selinske, who was re-elected in April, and Kim Kenne, who was elected to the board the previous month, would be in the same district, forcing the two to face off if they were to remain on the school board.

Selinske and Kenne typically vote on opposite sides of most issues, with Selinske often siding with the board majority, which includes Board President Renatta Cooper and members Ed Honowitz and Elizabeth Pomeroy. Kenne usually votes with Board members Scott Phelps and Ramon Miramontes on most issues put before the board.

Currently, the seven-member school board is chosen in at-large elections conducted in Altadena, Pasadena and Sierra Madre, the three communities served by PUSD. Despite a heavy Latino and African-American student population, five of the current board members are white. Board President Renatta Cooper, who is African American, and Latino Board member Ramon Miramontes are the board’s only minority members.

According to the maps, neither Altadena nor Sierra Madre will get its own district. Instead, Altadena — where residents in the early 2000s signed petitions to start their own school district — would constitute the majority in two of the districts. Sierra Madre would be in a district that includes unincorporated parts of Pasadena.

School board members, elected every two years to four-year terms, are scheduled to discuss the maps at a meeting on March 27. If the district adopts the maps, it would be placed on the June primary ballot and used, if approved, in 2013.

“I think that the committee has worked very hard, and I am impressed with the amount of community input in the process,” Cooper told the Weekly.
Each of the proposed districts, which are drawn based on income, education and ethnicity, contain about 29,000 people.

The change would allow neighborhood residents to vote on school board members to represent their specific areas or districts, much the same way City Council members are currently elected. Those changes are designed to provide more minority inclusion in elections and could stave off potential lawsuits under the California Voting Rights Act of 2000, which prohibits "racially polarized" elections that impair the election of minorities.

However, geographic districts may not bring true neighborhood representation to the school board. Many parents send their children to schools outside of the neighborhoods in which they reside.

Copyright Southland Publishing 2012. All Rights Reserved. Login | Register
White-dominated boards face legal threats over racial makeup

March 9, 2012 | Will Evans, California Watch

Compton City Councilwoman Janna Zurita owes her Hispanic last name to a grandmother from Spain, whom she never met. Zurita considers her mother black and said her father "wants to be black" even though he "looks Latino."

Zurita, the mayor pro tem of Compton, sometimes jokes with her sister about their racial roots.

"She always tells me I look just like a Mexican: flat booty, straight hair. You know, just all kind of - how Mexicans used to look. You know, now they have big booties," Zurita said in a legal deposition in November. "You know, little jokes about it."

While Zurita takes a sometimes-playful approach to her racial identity, it became the serious subject of a recent lawsuit under the California Voting Rights Act. In January, a judge ruled that a trial would be necessary to figure out whether Zurita could be considered Latina and whether that means Latinos have a voice on the council. The city settled the suit late last month.

The legal gymnastics in Compton illustrate California's far-reaching law, which bars local governments from diluting the voting strength of minorities. The law has become the foundation of a burgeoning onslaught of legal threats that could upend the racial makeup of elected bodies throughout the state.
Armed with 2010 census data, a network of attorneys is increasingly targeting local governments – from cities and school boards to hospital and community college districts – for not reflecting the demographics of their constituents.

While the dispute in Compton, where Zurita's race was under question, pitted Latino residents against the city's traditionally black leadership, other cases seek to increase minority representation on elected boards that are dominated by whites.

"We're seeing the fastest change in how California organizes local government since the Progressives of the early 20th century," said Douglas Johnson of the Rose Institute of State and Local Government at Claremont McKenna College, who has been critical of the law. "The law is extremely expansive. Every local government in California should be looking into this."

Particularly striking against this backdrop are the 13 cities in California where all-white councils preside over communities where either Latinos or Asians make up the majority of residents. Several are clustered in the Los Angeles area, like Whittier and Arcadia, but they range from Tulalake, on the Oregon border, to Holtville, near the Mexican border.**

Another 21 cities have Latino majorities and only one minority on city council.

Such cities can make especially attractive targets for civil rights lawyers, who see the stark disparities as evidence of a systemic problem.

"These are the cities that should recognize that they are low-hanging fruit for groups who might want to bring lawsuits," said Paul Mitchell of Redistricting Partners, a Sacramento-based consulting firm that works with local governments to determine their vulnerability under the law.

California Watch was able to identify the 34 cities with data from Redistricting Partners and another consulting group, GrassrootsLab. But the cities represent one end of a spectrum. Numerous other communities, with smaller minority populations or more diversity on the city
council, also could be subject to a suit under the California Voting Rights Act, which was passed in 2002 and signed by Gov. Gray Davis.

The law prohibits local governments from holding at-large elections – in which the entire community votes for a slate of candidates – if that system weakens the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice.

An elected board can be found in violation if voting statistics show the community polarized along racial lines. That happens, for example, when Latinos vote more than their white neighbors for Latino candidates.

Cities, school districts and other elected boards that violate the act can be forced to divide their communities with district elections, in which different areas elect their own representatives. That way, districts with a high concentration of minorities could more easily elect one of their own.

A law so rooted in race inevitably leads to thorny questions about racial politics and the murky, subjective cauldron of ethnic identity. Should the race of a city councilmember even matter? And, in a state where the lines are increasingly blurred, who can determine a councilmember’s race other than the council member?

In Compton, lawyers representing two Latina residents argued that Zurita is not Latina. Zurita, on the other hand, pointed to her election as evidence that Latinos are represented. But even she seemed conflicted during her deposition, at one point saying that she is Latina, at another point that she isn’t.

Asked point-blank by an opposing lawyer, Zurita replied, “I don’t think there is any pure races.” The brouhaha over Zurita’s race “raises an issue that I believe is silent in the legislation, which is, how are you calculating ethnicity?” said Compton City Attorney Craig J. Cornwell. “Is it people who have Latino ancestry? Is it how a person self-identifies themselves?”

The U.S. Census doesn’t provide clear answers, because it considers being Hispanic or Latino separate from race. On government forms, Zurita sometimes marks black, sometimes “other” and couldn’t remember if she ever marked Latino.

Adding to the confusion, Zurita later referred to her Spanish grandmother as Mexican. The attorney sought to clarify: “So she was from Spain, but her heritage was Mexican?”

“Well,” Zurita replied, “you know, I don’t know. All this Mexican, third generation, fourth generation, Latina, Latino – I just kind of refer to the group as Mexican.”

Regardless, Zurita maintained that she represents all residents of Compton, where 65 percent of the population is Hispanic.

“I don’t even think race, you know,” she said. “I don’t look at race.”
In a settlement last month, Compton agreed to let voters decide whether to change to district elections. If voters shoot it down on the June ballot, the city will put it to another vote in November. Compton also agreed to pay the opposing attorneys' fees.

California's law is grounded in the idea that minorities sometimes vote differently from the rest of the population and that at-large elections, where the majority rules, can unfairly dilute their influence. The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld that underlying notion in cases interpreting the federal Voting Rights Act.

Indeed, in many parts of the state, including throughout Los Angeles County, Californians do tend to vote for candidates of their same race, according to research by Matt Barreto, who served as an independent expert to the state redistricting commission. Barreto also consults for lawyers suing under the law.

The California law makes it much easier to challenge at-large elections than under the federal Voting Rights Act. Plus, the state law puts local governments at a disadvantage: If they lose a lawsuit, they have to pay the other side's attorney's fees, but not the other way around.

The act was drafted by Joaquin Avila, a Seattle-based voting rights attorney, and Robert Rubin, who until recently was legal director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area. The duo has gone on to sue school districts and cities, raking up millions of dollars and sparking accusations that they are in it for the money.

Rubin, now in private practice, said the money from his share of legal settlements went to the nonprofit civil rights organization where he worked. He said governments saddled with huge legal costs have only themselves to blame for not following the law.

"We're going to continue to be aggressive," Rubin said. "We intend to enforce this until it doesn't need enforcement anymore."

Legal threats quicken

A series of court victories and settlements has created a ripple effect in which many school districts are switching to district elections voluntarily rather than face expensive lawsuits. Since 2009, nearly 70 school boards applied with the state Board of Education to make the switch, the majority of them just this year.
At the same time, lawyers have ratcheted up their legal threats in the last two years, shooting off letters to cities such as Visalia, Santa Clara, West Covina and Whittier.

In 2010, law co-authors Rubin and Avila sued the Central Valley city of Tulare.

The suit argued that even though Tulare then had a Latino councilman, he wasn’t the “candidate of choice of Latino voters.” Another councilman, David Macedo, said in an interview that he identifies as Hispanic because of his Portuguese ancestry, but doesn’t consider himself Latino.

Tulare settled for $225,000, which went to the plaintiff’s lawyers, and will hold a vote this year on switching to district elections. Macedo said he would encourage residents to approve the switch because, given the law, “one way or another, that’s the way it’s headed.”

Rubin, Avila and affiliated attorneys have directed the legal offensive so far. But labor unions and other groups also could use the law as a weapon in disputes with cities and school boards.

The first such case came in December, when the State Building & Construction Trades Council of California sued the city of Escondido, in San Diego County, alleging that at-large elections leave Latinos without fair representation. The union targeted Escondido because officials there have been trying to lower wages on public construction projects.

Cites push back

Some cities aren’t giving in easily.

An attorney for the city of Whittier fired back with a letter to Avila saying it was not violating minorities’ rights. She noted that many “prominent” Latinos had endorsed white council members.

Victor Lopez, who died in 2002, was the only Latino elected to the Whittier City Council and has a school auditorium named for him. His son, Doug, was later appointed to serve out another term. Others have run and lost, but Doug Lopez isn’t troubled.

"If a Hispanic ran who was very competent and qualified, they’d run away with it," said Lopez, now a real estate developer in San Luis Obispo. "Do you need minority representation? I don’t think so. You just need good representation."
Retired engineer Jose Maldonado ran for the Montclair City Council in 2010 but lost to two white incumbents.

In nearby Montclair, an Inland Empire city known for its shopping plaza, the Latino population grew from 60 percent to 70 percent over the last decade. Retired engineer Jose Maldonado ran for city council in 2010 because he was upset with how the police treated Latinos. He thought there should be a Latino voice on the council.

"We Latinos," he said in an interview, "we think different."

Maldonado came within a few hundred votes, but lost to two white incumbents. One of them has served on the council since 1978. Maldonado likes the idea of district elections. He attributes his loss to a lack of resources in challenging an entrenched power structure.

"You can't go against the establishment," he said.

Before that, in 2004, conservative activist Ben Lopez tried to win a seat in the small suburb. Lopez said council incumbents recruited another Latino candidate in order to "split the Latin vote."

But the other Latino candidate, Manny Martinez, said he was recruited by council members who simply wanted another alternative to Lopez on the ballot. In the end, Lopez and Martinez both lost. Martinez said it wasn’t about race.

"It’s just a matter of the right candidate at the right time," said Martinez, who was appointed to a city council advisory committee. "There doesn’t seem to be any old boys network preventing Latinos from getting elected."

Martinez said current Councilman J. John Dutrey has a Spanish background. Dutrey goes by John, but his name is listed on ballots as Javier "John" Dutrey.

Political participation
The Montclair City Council does not include a minority representative, though Latinos make up about 70 percent of the population.

Some residents in Latino or Asian communities are immigrants who can't legally vote. Others lack a strong culture of voting, say some aspiring candidates.

Cities have tried to blame low turnout among minorities for their lack of representation.

"I think you will agree with me that if people do not vote, that speaks volumes about their desire to elect a particular candidate," an attorney for the city of Visalia wrote to Rubin, the civil rights attorney.

Rubin dismissed the argument, blaming a history of discrimination for discouraging political participation. Visalia recently decided to put a change to district elections on the November ballot.

Mayor Jerry Brittsan of Holtville, where 82 percent of the 5,939 residents are Hispanic, said Latinos "just refuse to participate." The city, in Imperial County, sits 10 miles north of Mexico.

"The Mexicans in this area – this is a border town – they just don't trust whites," Brittsan said. "They don't trust authority. The only people they do trust are the firemen."

Bianca Padilla Legaspi, who won a seat on the Holtville council in 2006, disagreed. Young and campaigning in two languages, she was an unusual candidate for Holtville, but "people really responded to it," she said. Latinos don't tend to run for office there, she said, because many have low income and education levels and don't feel qualified.

In some cities with all-white councils, minority candidates have won in past elections – but not recently.
In Arcadia, for example, Asians served on the city council since 1994. Arcadia and neighboring cities in the San Gabriel Valley have an especially strong concentration of Asian, and particularly Chinese American, residents.

In the 2010 council election, three Asians and three whites competed for three council seats. The campaign seemed to inflame racial tensions.

Attorney Jason Lee announced he was running in part “because the Asian Americans are underrepresented in the City Council of Arcadia.”

In the end, all three Asians lost, leaving the council all white.

Asians have to work harder to get elected in Arcadia, but it’s not impossible, said John Wu, who served two terms and is running again. Wu said he would oppose a change to district elections.

“I think that’s a bad way to do it, because you basically try to segregate,” Wu said. “If you divide into districts, then you have fighting among the districts.”

Boosting minority representation isn’t a guaranteed outcome of district elections.

After civil rights lawyers sued Modesto in 2004, the city ended up paying a $3 million settlement and changing to district elections. But the racial makeup of the council is the same as it was before the switch.

David Geer, who is white, thought he had no chance to win in Modesto’s District 2, which he said was designed to elect a Latino. But Geer beat the Latino candidate and now believes the system worked to give a neglected neighborhood a voice.

“It’s nice to have someone who represents an area that has been historically unrepresented,” Geer said. “For decades, no one who served on the city council lived in District 2 because it’s on the wrong side of the tracks.”

**A previous version of this story listed 14 cities with all-white city councils and 20 with a single Latino member in Latino-majority communities.

45

This story was edited by Robert Salladay and copy edited by Nikki Frick.
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ESCONDIDO K-8 SCHOOL DISTRICT APPROVES VOTING MAP

Voters will select trustees by areas; new election method is set to begin in November

By Michelle Breier

Originally published March 11, 2012 at 12:01 a.m., updated March 9, 2012 at 12:34 p.m.

ESCONDIDO — The city’s K-8 school district approved a trustee-area boundary map Thursday night, a significant step in changing how voters elect school board representatives.

The National Demographics Corp. had drawn six trustee-boundary maps for the district. All four included a “majority minority” Latino district in the urban core of the city, a criteria for redistricting under federal voting rights law.

The boundaries of the approved map, Plan 4, were drawn with an emphasis on creating compact voting areas in each geographic direction around the central district in the city’s core, National Demographics Corp. senior analyst Justin Levitt said.

Trustee Marty Hranek dissented in the 4-1 vote, saying he could only support a map that closely follows the boundaries of the five middle schools.

School board President Zoe Carpenter said Plan 4 was more balanced because each trustee area included the boundaries of more than one middle school.

Several school board members have said repeatedly that they want future trustees to act in the best interest of all children and not be tied to one school or neighborhood simply because they are elected geographically.

The school board then unanimously approved a timeline for the start of voting by trustee area.

The first election for Trustee Area 1, the city-center district, and Trustee Area 3, where trustee Mary Gilbert lives, will be in November. Gilbert’s and Carpenter’s terms end this year, but Carpenter is prevented from running again because she lives in Trustee Area 2, where Joan Gardner also lives. Gardner is in the middle of her term.

Also Thursday, Assistant Superintendent Gina Manusov said the state Board of Education had approved a request for a waiver that allows the district to avoid an expensive election asking voters to approve the change in the trustee-election system.

The Escondido Union School District is changing from at-large elections to voting by trustee area to comply with the California Voting Rights Act. At-large elections may be challenged if a demographics analysis shows evidence of racially polarized voting.

A by-trustee area election system divides the school district into five areas. Registered voters in each area vote to elect one school board member, instead of voting for multiple candidates in a citywide election.

The city's high school district is engaged in the same process and its school board approved a trustee-area map Tuesday.

The map and other information on the election transition is on the elementary district's website, www.eusd4kids.org.

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

© Copyright 2012 The San Diego Union-Tribune, LLC. An MLIM LLC Company. All rights reserved.
High school district OKs trustee-area map

By Michelle Breier

Monday, March 12, 2012

ESCONDIDO — The Escondido Union High School District board unanimously approved a trustee-area boundary map Tuesday night, another step in the process that will change the way school board members are elected.

"There was a good debate," board President Tina Pope said Wednesday. "There were four very good maps. The consultant ... gave us options that made sense."

Pope said that all the draft maps balanced out the district population, but the consensus was that Plan 4 best blended the boundaries of the three comprehensive high schools.

Board members did not want the trustee boundaries to seemingly focus on one high school or neighborhood, she said. Although a trustee will be elected by voters from one area, he or she will represent all residents, board members have said.

The National Demographics Corp. created four trustee boundary maps for the high school district. All four included a "majority minority" Latino district in the urban core of the city, a criteria for redistricting under federal voting rights law.

National Demographics senior analyst Justin Levitt said the map selected by trustees Tuesday night splits the San Pasqual High attendance boundary area between two trustee districts rather than keeping most of it in one trustee district.

The high school district is changing from at-large elections to voting by trustee area to comply with the California Voting Rights Act. At-large elections may be challenged if a demographics analysis indicates racially polarized voting exists.

A by-trustee area election system divides the school district into five areas. Registered voters in each area vote to elect a singular school board member, instead of voting for multiple candidates in a citywide election. The city's K-8 district is engaged in the same process.

The high school district next will submit the map to the county Office of Education for approval, said Michael Simonson, assistant superintendent for business services. Meanwhile, the state Board of Education is scheduled in May to consider the district's request for a waiver to avoid an election asking for voters' approval of the trustee-by-area change.

The district is on target to start area elections in November, Simonson said. It must submit county education officials' approval of the election change and map to the registrar of voters by June 15, he said.

The map and other information on the election transition is on the district's website, www.euhsd.k12.ca.us.

michelle.breier@utsandiego.com • (760) 752-6752 • @UTSBreier

© Copyright 2012 The San Diego Union-Tribune, LLC. An MLIM LLC Company. All rights reserved.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION

CITY OF LONG BEACH BOUNDARY CHANGE
(Uninhabited Territory)

Proceedings for the following described change of organization was completed, and
the subject territory became a part of the City of Long Beach when the Certificate of
Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on
February 16, 2012, as Instrument No. 201202280788.

LAFCO Resolution No. 2011-64 RMD - MAKING DETERMINATIONS AND
APPROVING CITY OF LONG BEACH REORGANIZATION NO. 2011-13
(LOS ANGELES COUNTY/ORANGE COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT)

Number of Registered Voters: 0

Acres: 72.52 ± acres

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

Area 1: (44.51 ± acres): Annexation to the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles
County Sanitation District No. 3, and the Water Replenishment District of Southern
California.

Area 4: (5.79 ± acres): Annexation to the City of Long Beach, the Greater Los
Angeles County Vector Control District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No.
3 and the Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

Area 5: (20.94 ± acres): Annexation to the City of Long Beach, Greater Los Angeles
County Vector Control District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19, and
the Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

Area 7: (1.28 ± acres): Detachment from the City of Long Beach, the Greater Los
Angeles County Vector Control District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No.
19, and the Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

DATED: February 27, 2012
Notification Distribution List for City of Long Reorganization No 2011-13

COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER WEIGHTS & MEASURES
ANIMAL CARE & CONTROL
ASSESSOR
AUDITOR CONTROLLER - TAX DIVISION
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS - 4TH DISTRICT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE - COMMUNITY & MUNICIPAL SERVICES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE - LEASING & REVENUE
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE - PIPELINE FRANCHISING
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE - SPACE MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION-BLOCK GRANT DIVISION
CONSUMER AFFAIRS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
HEALTH SERVICES-SOLID WASTE
INTERNAL SERVICES- 911 PROJECT
INTERNAL SERVICES - PLANS & EST.
PARKS & RECREATION-MANAGEMENT SERVICES
PUBLIC LIBRARY-ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
PUBLIC WORKS-MAPPING SERVICES
REGIONAL PLANNING-MAPPING SERVICES
REGISTRAR-RECORDER
LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF-CONTRACT LAW
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-BUSINESS LICENSE DIVISION
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-UTILITY TAX DIVISION

OTHER AGENCIES
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
CITY OF LONG BEACH - CITY CLERK
CITY OF LONG BEACH - CITY MANAGER
CITY OF LONG BEACH - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS
CITY OF SEAL BEACH
COUNTY OF ORANGE
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
GEOGRAPHIC DATA TECHNOLOGY
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
RAND-MCNAULLY
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION - LOCAL TAX UNIT
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, EDISON
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, GAS COMPANY
STATE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BRO'S. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
VERIZON
EXHIBIT "A1"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 1
FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (RO 11-03) Detach from
City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13 (County Boundary Adjustment)
Annex to

City of Seal Beach
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

That certain parcel of land being a portion of the southeast quarter of Section 10 and a portion of Section 15, both sections in Township 5 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach, the County of Orange, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the intersection of the southwesterly right-of-way of Marina Drive, 80 feet wide, and the Orange/Los Angeles County boundary line, as shown on map of Record of Survey, filed in Book 90, pages 23 to 30, of Record of Surveys, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as same existed on April 4, 2011;

Thence leaving said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary line the following;

(L1) South 38° 59' 39" West  408.09 feet;

Thence, (L2) South 16° 44' 05" West  700.00 feet;

Thence, (L3) South 29° 10' 49" West  3450.00 feet;

Thence, (L4) North 64° 47' 04" West  614.00 to the intersection of said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary;

Thence, (L5) along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North  33° 00' 00" East
3482.93 feet;
Thence, (L6) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 32° 51' 52"
East 225.00 feet;

Thence, (L7) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 32° 58' 15"
East 392.46 feet;

Thence, (L8) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 57° 10' 40"
East 551.31 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Containing 44.51± acres
EXHIBIT "B4"  
From Orange County to Los Angeles County

Area 4
Orange/Los Angeles County Boundary

Area Adjustment 5.79 ± acres

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (R0 II-03) 
Annex to City of Seal Beach
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13 
(County Boundary Adjustment) 
Detach from City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3 
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

April 21, 2011
EXHIBIT "A4"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 4
FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (RO 11-03)
Detach from
City of Seal Beach
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetary District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(County Boundary Adjustment)
Annex to
City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

That certain parcel of land being a portion of Section 11, Township 5 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach, the County of Orange, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of Pacific Coast Highway, 100 feet wide, and the northwesterly boundary line of Orange County, as said intersection is shown on map of Record of Survey, filed in Book 90, pages 23 to 30, inclusive, of Record of Surveys, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as same existed on April 21, 2011;

Thence along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary, (L1) North 57° 15' 24" East  2788.42 feet to its intersection with the southeasterly boundary of that portion of land described as Parcel 1 in deed to the City of Los Angeles, recorded on February 15, 1961, in Book 5629, pages 527 to 530 inclusive of Official Records, in said Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said last mentioned intersection also being a point on that certain non-tangent 700-foot radius curve concave to the northwest, a radial of said curve to said point bears South 63° 44' 46" East;

Thence along said southeasterly boundary of Parcel 1 the following courses:

(C2) southwesterly along said curve an arc length of 378.77 feet, through a central angle of 31° 00' 10"

Thence, (L3) South 57° 15' 24" West  227.96 feet to that certain tangent 700-foot radius curve concave to the northwest;
Thence, (C4) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 154.37 feet through a central angle of 12° 38' 08";

Thence, (L5) South 69° 53' 32" West 50.00 feet to that certain tangent 500-foot radius curve concave to the southeast;

Thence, (C6) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 110.27 feet through a central angle of 12° 38' 08";

Thence, (L7) South 57° 15' 24" West 150.00 feet to that certain tangent 500-foot radius curve concave to the southeast

Thence, (C8) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 110.27 feet through a central angle of 12° 38' 08";

Thence, (L9) South 44° 37' 16" West 50.00 feet to that certain tangent 700-foot radius curve concave to the northwest;

Thence, (C10) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 154.37 feet through a central angle of 12° 38' 08" to a line parallel with and 100 feet southeasterly, measured at right angles, from said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary;

Thence along said parallel line, (L11) South 57° 15' 24" West 1483.78 feet to its intersection with said easterly right-of-way line of Pacific Coast Highway, said last mentioned intersection being a point on that certain non-tangent 2050 foot radius curve concave to the northwest, a radial of said last mentioned curve to said last mentioned points bears North 88° 18' 20" East;

Thence, (C12) northerly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 114.85 feet through a central angle of 03° 12' 36" to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 5.79 ± acres
EXHIBIT "B4"

Area 4

Orange/Los Angeles County Boundary

Area of Adjustment 5.79 ± acres

County Boundary Adjustment AREA 4
From Orange County to Los Angeles County

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (SD 13-03) Annex 10

City of Seal Beach
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSPA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

April 21, 2011

Assessor Parcel Numbers
095 010 24
043 160 30
043 160 48
043 160 47

COURSE DATA

(L1) N57°15'24" E 2788.42'
(C2) R = 700 L = 378.77 D = 31°00'10"
(L3) S57°15'24" W 227.98'
(C4) R = 700 L = 154.37 D = 12°38'08"
(L5) S69°33'32" W 50.00'
(C6) R = 500 L = 110.27 D = 12°38'08"
(L7) S57°15'24" W 150.00'
(C8) R = 500 L = 110.27 D = 12°38'08"
(L9) S44°37'16" W 50.00'
(C10) R = 700 L = 154.37 D = 12°38'08"
(L11) S57°15'24" W 1483.78'
(C12) R = 2050 L = 114.65 D = 03°12'36"
EXHIBIT "A5"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 5
FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (RO 11-03)
Detach from City of Seal Beach
Unincorporated Orange County
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(County Boundary Adjustment)
Annex to
City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

That certain parcel of land being a portion of the west half of Section 36, Township 4 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., and a portion of the northeast quarter of Section 2, Township 5 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach and unincorporated territory, the County of Orange, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of 7th Street, 80 foot wide, and the Orange County boundary line, as said intersection is shown on Tract Map No. 21550, filed in Book 636, pages 43 to 49, inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Los Angeles, said intersection also being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as same existed on March 31, 2011;

Thence along the Orange/Los Angeles County boundary, (L1) North 31° 31' 15" West 1009.45 feet and;

(L2) North 27° 50' 00" East 3125.31 feet to the generally southeasterly boundary of the 400-foot wide strip of land designated as San Gabriel River on said map;

Thence southwesterly along said generally southeasterly boundary the following courses;

(L3) South 22° 06' 09" West 1679.96 feet to the beginning of that certain (C4) tangent 2664.93-foot radius curve concave to the east;

Thence, southwesterly along said curve an arc length of 1020.47 feet through a central angle of 21° 56' 24";
EXHIBIT "BS"

Area 5

Orange/Los Angeles County Boundary

Area of Adjustment 20.94± acres

County Boundary Adjustment AREA 5
From Orange County to Los Angeles County

County Boundary Reorganization No. 2013-13 (County Boundary Adjustment) Annex to:
City of Seal Beach
Unincorporated Orange County
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 25)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

March 31, 2011
Copyright © 2011 County of Los Angeles

COURSE DATA

(L1) N 31' 31' 15" W 1009.45'
(L2) N 27' 50' 00" E 3125.31'
(L3) S 22' 05' 09" W 1679.96'
(C4) R = 2664.93 L = 1020.47 D = 21' 56' 24"
(L5) S 00' 09' 45" W 1236.57'
(L6) N 31' 31' 15" W 191.31'

1 in = 800 ft

ORANGE COUNTY
EXHIBIT "A7"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 7
FROM LOS ANGELES COUNTY TO ORANGE COUNTY

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(County Boundary Adjustment)
Detach from

City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

County Boundary Reorganization for the
City of Los Alamitos (RO 11-02)
Annex to

City of Los Alamitos
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County
Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District

That certain parcel of land being a portion of northeast quarter of Section 19, Township 4 South, Range 11 West, S.B.M., in the City of Long Beach, the County of Los Angeles, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the southerly right-of-way line of Ball Road and the southeasterly boundary line of Los Angeles County, as said intersection is shown on Parcel Map No. 20968, filed in Book 17, page 49, of Parcel Maps, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection also being a point in the common boundary of Los Angeles/Orange County, as same existed on March 31, 2011;

Thence, along said Los Angeles/Orange County boundary, (L1) South 58° 47' 54" West 692.46 feet to its intersection with the northwesterly line of the southeasterly 75 feet of that portion of land described as "PARCEL B" in deed to Los Angeles County Flood Control District, recorded in Book 48608 page 438, of Official Records, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Los Angeles;

Thence, leaving said Los Angeles/Orange County boundary and along said northwesterly line, (L2) North 36° 43' 10" East 186.93 feet to the most westerly corner of that certain parcel of land described in deed to the City of Alamitos, recorded in Book D5548, page 879, of said Official Records;

Thence, northeasterly along the northwesterly boundary of last said mentioned certain of parcel of land the following courses;
Thence, (L3) North 36° 43' 10" East 198.16 feet;

Thence, (L4) North 48° 41' 29" East 42.56 feet;

Thence, (L5) North 75° 28' 24" East 86.45 feet to said southerly right-of-way line of Ball Road;

Thence, along said southerly right-of-way line (L6) North 89° 56' 06" East 246.40 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 1.28 ± acres
EXHIBIT "B7"

From Los Angeles County to Orange County

County Boundary Adjustment AREA 7

Area 7

Los Angeles/Orange County Boundary

Area of Adjustment 1.28± acres

App. AC

City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Los Alamitos (RO 11-02)

City of Los Alamitos
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County
Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District

March 31, 2011
City and County Boundary Adjustment Team
March 5, 2012

To: All Affected Agencies.

Subject: City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(Los Angeles County/Orange County Boundary Adjustment)

On February 27, 2012, the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles issued a Notice of Completion for City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13, the wrong map attachment was included for Exhibit “A1”, County Boundary Adjustment Area 1. Attached is the correct map and legal description.

We sincerely apologize for any inconvenience. Please contact me at (626) 204-6500 if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

Enc:
EXHIBIT “A1”

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 1
FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (RO 11-03)
   Detach from

City of Seal Beach
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
   Annex to

City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

That certain parcel of land being a portion of the southeast quarter of Section 10 and a portion of Section 15, both sections in Township 5 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach, the County of Orange, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the intersection of the southwesterly right-of-way of Marina Drive, 80 feet wide, and the Orange/Los Angeles County boundary line, as shown on map of Record of Survey, filed in Book 90, pages 23 to 30, of Record of Surveys, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as same existed on April 4, 2011;

Thence leaving said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary line the following;

(L1) South 38° 59' 39" West  408.09 feet;

Thence, (L2) South 16° 44' 05" West  700.00 feet;

Thence, (L3) South 29° 10' 49" West  3450.00 feet;

Thence, (L4) North 64° 47' 04" West  614.00 to the intersection of said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary;

Thence, (L5) along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 33° 00' 00" East 3482.93 feet;
Thence, (L6) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 32° 51' 52" East 225.00 feet;

Thence, (L7) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 32° 58' 15" East 392.46 feet;

Thence, (L8) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 57° 10' 40" East 551.31 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Containing 44.51± acres
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Foothill Municipal Water District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 28 to County Sanitation District No. 16

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 1,680± acres to the district. The subject territory is located at the terminus of Trevan Road approximately 200 feet south of Villa Knolls Drive, all within the City of Pasadena.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, April 23, 2012.

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

Date: March 20, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-16-28

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 16 of Los Angeles County
2.

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

1. Annexation
2.

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager  CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 16 of Los Angeles County

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

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

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

**SIGNATURE:** [Signature]  
**DATE:** January 31, 2012

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:**

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 566, Grid G1

Located at the terminus of Trevan Road approximately 200 feet south of Villa Knolls Drive, all within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

**TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:**

1.680 acres or 0.003 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

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

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

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

   The topography is 30% or greater slope.

**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?
   
   6

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

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

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $1,012,700.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant residential. The current zoning is Single-Family Residential 20,000 sq. ft. min. lot size [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 residential.

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   The territory is being developed to include 1 proposed single-family home.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?
   Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District.
   There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can
   request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

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

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.
   All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their
   properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 16 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal
   service to said properties.

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

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   Yes ☑ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 16 of Los Angeles County No ☐

2. List any communities of social or economic interest within the proposed area or immediately adjacent. To what extent will any of these 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 share of this existing debt?

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

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

   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

   N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 291 to County Sanitation District No. 15

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 6.782± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Rimgrove Drive and the terminus of Galecrest Avenue, all within the unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, April 23, 2012.

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

Date: March 20, 2012

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

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-15-291

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)  RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)

1. County Sanitation District No. 15 of Los Angeles County  1. Annexation

2. _______________________________  2. _______________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager  CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 15 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: d.kitt@acsdo.org

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

DATE: February 28, 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 638, Grid H6
Located on Rimgrove Drive and the terminus of Galecrest Avenue, all within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

6.782 acres or 0.010 square miles

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of four single-family homes and a storage building including a snack stand at Rimgrove Park and is located within residential and light agricultural areas.

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

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

5

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

N/A (does not include development)

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

1

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:
   4 single-family homes

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $410,500.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential and a public park. The current zoning is Light Agricultural, 1 acre minimum lot size [A-1-6000].

3. What is the proposed planned land use of the subject area?
   The proposed land use is a storage facility including a snack stand at a public park.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.
   All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 15 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

1. Estimate the present cost and describe the adequacy of government services and controls in the area.
   The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.

2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
   The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?  
N/A

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.  
The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

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

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?  
Yes ☒ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 15 of Los Angeles County  No ☐

2. List any communities of social or economic interest within the proposed area or immediately adjacent. To what extent will any of these 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>
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 52 to County Sanitation District No. 18

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 6.699± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Pellissier Road approximately 200 feet west of Pearson Avenue, all within the unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, April 23, 2012.

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

Date: March 20, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-18-52

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 18 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. 18 of
Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.org

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]   DATE: March 1, 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 637, Grids C6; D6
Located on Pellissier Road approximately 200 feet west of Pearson Avenue, all within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

6.699 acres or 0.010 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of two warehouses and is located within an industrial area.

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

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   0

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

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

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   
   0

8. Give a summary of recent 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 $11,399,745.00.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   
   The present land use is industrial. The current zoning is Manufacturing-Industrial Planned Zone [MPD].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 18 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" refer to governmental services and whether or not those services would be provided by the local agencies subject to the proposal. It includes public facilities necessary to provide those services.

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

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

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

The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

N/A

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

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

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

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

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

Yes ☒ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 18 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

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

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

Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexation No. 52 shown thus

Boundary of Sanitation District No. 18 prior to Annexation No. 52 shown thus

Prior Annexations shown thus

Area of Annexation 6.699 Acres
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
City of La Verne
Three Valleys Municipal Water District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 414 to County Sanitation District No. 22

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 0.570± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on the northwest corner of Aldersgate Drive, all within the City of La Verne.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, April 23, 2012.

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

Date: March 22, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-22-414

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 22 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. 22 of Los Angeles County

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

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

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.org

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

**SIGNATURE:** Grace L. Owen  
**DATE:** January 27, 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 570, Grid P6
Located on the northwest corner of Aldersgate Drive and Wheeler Avenue, all within the City of La Verne.

**TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:**

0.570 acres or 0.001 square miles

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

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

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

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

   The topography is flat.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

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

   0

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

   3

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

   0

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

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

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $532,723.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential. The current zoning is Planned Residential - 3 detached dwelling units per acre
   (La Verne) [PR3D].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 22 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:

      N/A

   b. Mutual social and economic interests:

      N/A

   c. The local government structure of the County:

      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

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

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

   The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas? 
N/A

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

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

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and those 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. 22 of Los Angeles County  No ☐

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-APRIL 2012

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Assembly Bill 1252/Davis

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/18/11

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
02/01/12: Died pursuant to Art. IV, Sec. 10(c) of the Constitution. From committee: Filed with the Chief Clerk pursuant to Joint Rule 56.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
Existing law authorizes the county committee on school district organization, upon petition of the governing board of any community college district, to provide for the establishment, rearrangement, or abolition of trustee areas in any community college district.

This bill would establish a separate procedure for the election of the trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District (CCD). The bill specifies that a candidate for election must reside in, and be registered to vote in, the trustee area he or she seeks to represent.

The size of the board, nomination of candidates, and term length, would be determined, as specified. This bill would require the governing board to set the boundaries of each trustee area before March 1, 2012, to reflect the population enumerated in the federal 2010 decennial census. If the governing board fails to timely set the boundaries, then the county committee on school district organization shall do so before April 30, 2012.

Because this bill would impose new duties on the Los Angeles CCD, it would impose a state-mandated local program. In addition, this bill would make legislative findings and declarations as to the necessity of a special statute for the Los Angeles CCD. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill requires the Los Angeles CCD to establish trustee areas. If successful, this bill seeks compensation as a mandated local program for any costs associated with this directive.

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. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

April 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 March 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

- South Gate SD-Los Angeles USD/October 2011

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)

April 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 March 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 Steentofte, 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,
there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The BIR 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 concern 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.
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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 its 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 CBQA 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 CBQA 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.

*Status: Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD negotiating legislation and agreement with Centinela Valley UHSD; County Committee to contact the SBE.

Status Date: March 20, 2012

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

On August 18, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 27, 2010, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 30, 2010, 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(c) and, based on the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD, requires valid signatures from at least 500 registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study, public hearing, and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

On August 15, 2011, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. On August 16, 2011, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On August 29, 2011, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the petitions contained 697 valid signatures, out of 753 signatures submitted. The Registrar-Recorder also reported that the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD was 63,963. Under the guidelines of EC §5019(c), the petition contains enough valid signatures to move forward to review at a public hearing and a vote by the County Committee.

The petition was presented to the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting. The Secretary communicated that the Pomona USD was currently studying the issue of trustee areas in light of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and may develop a plan to implement them prior to any public hearing on this petition. The Secretary communicated this information to the chief petitioner as well. Staff informed the County Committee of the district’s progress at its January 4, 2012, regular meeting, where a district representative provided details about recent activities and coming plans to conduct demographic studies, hold public hearings, and present alternative trustee area plans in compliance with the CVRA. Staff informed the chief petitioner of developments and advised him of the status of the petition review by the County Committee, as well as upcoming agenda items for review by the Pomona USD governing board.

Pomona USD held three public hearings on this matter on February 7, 9, and 15, 2012, at local schools within the district. At the hearings, staff presented overview information about the County Committee and the CVRA as it impacts the current petition. District staff and their attorney presented additional information and answered questions from attendees in the audience. The chief petitioner was present and spoke at all of the hearings.

Attorney Mr. Kasey Flaws addressed the County Committee as a representative of the Pomona USD to provide an update on progress. He stated that the Pomona USD board would review various trustee area proposals at an upcoming meeting and would provide the County Committee with its decision. The district will also participate in any public hearing scheduled by the County Committee.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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Staff will poll the County Committee members for their availability for a public hearing currently anticipated to take place in May 2012. The County Committee will review the district’s progress on the issue and determine whether to review the petition prior to any definitive district action.

*Status: Pomona USD governing board to review and vote on alternative trustee area proposals; County Committee public hearing anticipated in May 2012.

Status Date: March 20, 2012

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 COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (CCD)

On February 26, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Mount San Antonio CCD. 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. County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient and staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on March 12, 2010, 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 Mount San Antonio CCD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019(c) and, based on the number of registered voters in the Mount San Antonio CCD, requires valid signatures from at least 1000 registered voters within the petition area.

On February 15, 2012, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. Staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification on February 24, 2012.

Staff immediately contacted Dr. Bill Scroggin, President/CEO of the Mount San Antonio CCD, to advise him on the submission of the petition. Dr. Scroggin advised staff that the district was already undergoing the process to move to a trustee area voting system under an expanded board. They have passed district resolutions and hired demographers who have studied the district and the issue of trustee area voting under the CVRA, and have developed multiple alternative plans. Dr. Scroggin advised that a review by the board of these plans, and a selection of one of them to implement for its next regular election, was imminent. He also stated that the board would seek a waiver for an approval election of any trustee area plan adopted, under the California Community College Chancellor’s office. Dr. Scroggin stated that he would keep staff apprised of developments with the district and its trustee area plan process.

On March 12, 2012, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the petitions contained 1212 valid signatures out of 1339 signatures submitted. The Registrar-Recorder also reported that the number of registered voters in the Mount San Antonio CCD was 349,833. Under the guidelines of EC §5019(c), the petition contains enough valid signatures to move forward to review at a public hearing and a vote by the County Committee.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Staff contacted the chief petitioner and followed up with a letter explaining the status of the petition on March 12, 2012. Staff also contacted the Mount San Antonio CCD and advised them of the sufficiency of the petition. The petition will be presented to the County Committee at its next meeting. At that meeting, staff will update the County Committee on the district’s progress toward implementing a trustee area voting structure.

*Status:* Petition valid; to be presented to the County Committee at its next meeting.

**Status Date:** March 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staff contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011, staff from the Registrar-Recorder’s office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

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 BC §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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK – LA MIRADA USD)

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: October 2, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* 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

- None

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.