July 25, 2011

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary, County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the August 3, 2011, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, August 3, 2011, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 7, 2011.

The following is an update of relevant information as of July 21, 2011:

**Newspaper Articles**

- A July 11, 2011, article from the Community College Week—“Latino Residents Sue Over Compton College Voting Areas.” (Attachment 1)

- A July 13, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Wave—“Compton Community College District hit with lawsuit.” (Attachment 2)

- A July 14, 2011, article from Modecom (Los Angeles Conservancy Organization)—“Leuzinger High School.” (Attachment 3)

- A July 19, 2011, article from the El Camino College News—“El Camino College Boundary Review Committee Schedules its First Meeting.” (Attachment 4)

**Informational Correspondence**

- A June 29, 2011, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-03 (Elsmere Canyon). (Attachment 5)
A July 19, 2011, LAFCO Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning
Annexation No. 2011-17 (2006-50) to Los Angeles County Waterworks
District No. 40, Antelope Valley. (Attachment 6)

Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district
organization. (Attachment 7)

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 8)

• “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization
  Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School
  District).” (Attachment 9)

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

MFS/AD:mb
Attachments
Latino Residents Sue Over Compton College Voting Areas
Monday, July 11, 2011 - AP

COMPTON, Calif. (AP) — Two residents of the Compton Community College District sued the district over its voting areas, charging the boundaries are preventing Latinos from fairly participating in governing board elections.

Alex and Luis Landeros, brothers who are active in local Latino political affairs, filed suit in Los Angeles County Superior Court on grounds that the district is violating the California Voting Rights Act of 2001, the U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment, and the California Education Code.

Attorney Joaquin Avila said the lawsuit seeks to change the way the college district’s four voting areas are drawn because the current apportionment dilutes the Latino vote.

One voting area, which includes the city of Compton, elects two trustees on an at-large basis. Three other trustees are elected from single-member areas.

The suit seeks to have five, single-member areas, each representing a similar population based on the 2010 census, said Avila, a law professor at Seattle University who specializes in voting rights law.

Compton Community College lost state accreditation in 2005 and is now operated by El Camino Community College District, but retains its own Board of Trustees as it works to regain accreditation.

The Compton district comprises seven cities with sizable Hispanic populations located southwest of downtown Los Angeles. One of the district’s five trustees is Hispanic.

The lawsuit is similar to one Avila filed in December against the city of Compton on behalf of three Hispanic residents. The suit seeks to overturn Compton’s system of at-large City Council elections in favor of a district election system that would more easily enable a Hispanic resident to win office.

Although the city is nearly 70 percent Latino, no Hispanic resident has been elected to the City Council or other offices.

A judge denied a request to delay the council elections to be held this month. A full trial is scheduled on the case next year, Avila said.

Avila said he is preparing a lawsuit against the Compton Unified School District board on similar grounds.

Comments: ccweekblog

Community College Week
http://www.ccweek.com/

Compton Community College District hit with lawsuit


By LEILONI DE GRUY, Staff Writer
July 13, 2011

The El Camino Community College District is distancing itself from the Compton Community College District, on the heels of a lawsuit alleging that the Compton district has systematically violated state laws.

"It is important to note that through legislation outlining the agreement between the ECCCD and the CCCD, each district is a separate legal entity," said a statement from ECCCD. "As such, the El Camino Community College District is not a party to this action, and has no involvement whatsoever in this matter."

When Compton Community College lost its accreditation in 2005, the ECCCD entered into a memorandum of understanding that gave it complete authority to operate the campuses. However, the college has retained its own board of trustees.

According to the lawsuit Landeros v. Compton Community College District -- filed mid-June by attorney Joaquin Avila on behalf of two Latino voters, Alex and Luis Landeros -- the Compton Community College District has breached the California Voting Rights Act of 2001, the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, the districting principles of Article 21 of the California Constitution and the California Education Code.

The lawsuit seeks injunctive relief against the Compton Community College District.

"The plaintiffs believe that the district's historic and ongoing method of election has resulted in vote dilution for Latino residents, and has denied them effective political participation in governing board member elections," Avila said.

The suit further alleges that the district's election methods prevent Latino residents from electing candidates of their choice or influencing the outcome of the district's elections. Despite this assertion, two of the district's five trustees are Hispanic --
Andres Ramos, who represents area 3, and Lorraine Cervantes, who serves area 1.

Additionally, the suit contends that the trustee areas currently used by the district in its elections are not "population balanced" and conflict with the districting principles of the 14th Amendment, among other laws.

Of the four voting areas, one includes the city of Compton, which elects two trustees on an at-large basis. The three remaining trustees are selected from single-member areas. The Compton district is made up of seven cities with large Hispanic populations.

Both plaintiffs are seeking "to enjoins the district's continued abridgment of Latino voting rights ... and from further imposing or applying its election methods," Avila said, noting that if successful, the lawsuit will "require the district to design and implement true district-based elections where each trustee is elected from a separate trustee area by the electors of the same trustee area, where the candidates for such separate trustee areas must reside in the trustee area and where each trustee area is appropriately population balanced, or, alternatively, for such relief that is tailored to remedy the district's violation of the CVRA and California Constitution."

The suit aims to create five, single-member areas, with each representing a population reflective of the 2010 census.

A hearing was held July 7 at the Compton Courthouse to determine whether a preliminary injunction should be issued blocking the Compton Community College District's Nov. 8 election and prohibiting the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools from calling it.

"On its face, this appears to be a deliberate attempt to dismantle this board because there are three of the five who are up for re-election. This injunction comes right at the time we [were] scheduled to apply and file to run," Trustee Deborah Sims LeBlan said. "I don't want to pass judgment on the injunction without the full court reading on it, but anybody who wants to run can run. There has been no one prohibiting anyone from running. Elections are open. This is just a legal tactic that is being done, it is just another step in pulling this district back."

LeBlan added that having the board replaced by a citizens group would damage the college's recovery and delay steps toward re-accreditation if new members do not have experience with higher education and fiscal management. According to LeBlan, the district is currently working on a master education plan, improving the institution's facilities and FCMAT scores, decreasing expenditures and high-dollar contracts, increasing graduation rates and implementing programs that best serve students.
While the injunction was granted, the Compton Community College District — based on the fact that the trustees were not properly informed about the hearing and were thus unable to respond — convinced Judge Rose Hom to extend the injunction. As a result, all board seats that would have been up for election -- trustees Deborah Sims LeBlanc, Andres Ramos and Lorraine Cervantes — will now be extended through 2013.

But, it did not prevent the district from signing a settlement agreement, said Special Trustee Genethia Hudley-Hayes, who reported out of closed session Tuesday night. As part of the settlement, the district will pay $40,000 to the plaintiffs’ attorney.

"The district was able to move forward and take some action," LeBlanc said. "Our concern was that none of the elected officials were aware of what was going on. This hearing took place without board notification. All we got was a press release in our board packet. That was delivered to us Thursday [July 7] night and by the time I opened it up Friday morning, it was a done deal ... We are hopeful that this ripple will start to change our relationship and open up [the doors of] communication ... [so] that we can move forward with the recovery of Compton Community College."

In an attempt to dissolve any confusion and prevent a similar lawsuit, the ECCCD, whose trustees are elected at-large, has begun a public process to review and modify its elected trustee area boundaries. It will utilize 2010 census data to review current trustee areas to ensure they are representative of the district's constituents.

The ECCCD Board of Trustees began discussing the process last fall, and in January directed staff to establish a process and timeline for a trustee area boundary review. In May, the board appointed a seven-member Boundary Review Committee, with at least one member from each of the district's five trustee areas.

The committee begins meeting this summer with a mapping consultant to outline potential trustee boundaries, and will hold public hearings in early fall, with plans to present a recommendation to the ECCCD Board of Trustees early in 2012.

The board and its consultant will review reapportionment options based on the district's population and communities of interest, while the committee will seek the best way to set up the district's five trustee areas. ECCCD will hold its regular election in November.
July 14, 2011

Leuzinger High School (1930-1960s)

A new master plan for Leuzinger High School in the South Bay city of Lawndale calls into question the need for a full environmental impact report (EIR) to assess potential historic resources. To date, the Centinela Valley Union School District has opted not to complete an EIR. At stake is the city's oldest school campus, which has historic buildings dating from the 1930s to the 1960s as well as an association with the 1932 Olympics. The school's 1930s Industrial Arts Building has already been demolished, and seven single-story "finger" classroom buildings from the 1940s and '50s are slated for demolition soon.

◊ Learn more about this issue

Photo by Flora Chou/L.A. Conservancy
For Immediate Release

July 19, 2011

El Camino College Boundary Review Committee Schedules its First Meeting

The recently appointed El Camino Community College District Boundary Review Committee (BRC) will hold its inaugural meeting on July 21, 2011, at 3:30 p.m. in the El Camino College Board Room, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance.

The committee comprises at least one member from each of the El Camino Community College District’s (ECCCD) five trustee areas. Members include: John Edward Alter, a Torrance attorney; Heidi Ann Koch Ashcraft, CFO of Ashcraft Design, Torrance and former member of the Torrance Unified School District; Marché L. Boose, a business development and client relations manager from Inglewood; Nilo Michelin, history teacher and member of the Hawthorne School District Board of Trustees; Nathan M. Mintz, an engineer from Redondo Beach; Steve Napolitano, a former mayor of Manhattan Beach and representative for Supervisor Knabe in the South Bay; and El Segundo publicist Susan W. Truax, a board member of the El Segundo Education Foundation and former El Camino College Bond Oversight Committee member for Measure E.

The El Camino Community College District, along with many other public agencies and school districts in California, has begun a public process to review and modify its elected trustee area boundaries. This process includes utilizing 2010 census data to review current trustee areas to ensure they are representative of the District’s constituents.

In fall 2010, the ECCCD Board of Trustees initiated discussions on the process required to modify trustee area boundaries and change from "at large" to "trustee area" elections.

Currently, trustees in the El Camino Community College District must live in the trustee area they represent, however residents of the ECCCD vote for trustee candidates “at large;” that is, voters cast their vote for all candidates on the ballot. When voting by “trustee area,” residents would only vote for candidates who reside in their trustee area.

The BRC will schedule public hearings in the fall, with plans to present a recommendation to the ECCCD Board of Trustees in 2012.

###
NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

The Honorable Michael Antonovich  
Castaic Lake Water Agency  
City of Santa Clarita -- City Clerk  
City of Santa Clarita -- Planning Department  
Consolidated Fire Protection District  
Committee on School District Organization  
County Chief Executive Office  
County Assessor  
County Auditor -- Controller  
County Library  
County Department of Parks and Recreation  
County Department of Public Works  
County Department of Regional Planning  
County Sanitation Districts  
County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk  
Newhall Water District  
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District  
Sheriff Department -- Enforcement Bureau

Subject: City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-03 (Elsmere Canyon)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles. The application involves approximately 807 acres of unincorporated county territory, commonly known as the Elsmere Canyon area. The proposal area is generally located east of State Route 14, south of Whitney Canyon, west of the Angeles National Forest, and north of the City of Los Angeles boundary limits. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

City or District  
City of Santa Clarita  

Organizational Changes  
Annexation to the City of Santa Clarita

The proposed application, map and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit comments to the LAFCO office by July 29, 2011. If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (818) 254-2454.

Date: June 29, 2011

Sera Wirth  
Senior Government Analyst

Enc:

7100 N. Central Avenue  
Suite 445  
Glendale, CA 91203  
Phone: 818-254-2454  
Fax: 818-254-2457  
www.lafco.org
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/SPECIAL REORGANIZATION
(Pursuant to the Corlese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2011-03 (Elmire Canyon)

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Santa Clarita
2. County of Los Angeles
3. 
4. 

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

1. Annexation
2. Sphere of Influence Amendment
3. Annex to LMD 2003-1 and SMD No. 1
4. Annex to Open Space Preservation District

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: ✓ RESOLUTION □ LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

APPLICANT: City of Santa Clarita

TITLE: City Manager
CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Kenneth R. Pulsamp

ADDRESS: 23920 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300

CITY: Santa Clarita STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 91355

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Ben Jarvis TELEPHONE: (661) 255-4330

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

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

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]  DATE: 6/13/11

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The proposed annexation area consists of 806.52 acres of land generally located east of State Route 14, south of Whitney Canyon, west of the Angeles National Forest, and north of the Los Angeles City sphere of influence in the Elsmere Canyon area in the southern portion of the Santa Clarita Valley. State Route 14 is the only major roadway in or adjacent to the project area.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

806.52

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 proposed Elsmere Canyon annexation area consists mostly of rugged, undeveloped hillsides and canyons. One single-family home is located in the northwest portion of the annexation area. The area also includes a Los Angeles City aqueduct and power transmission corridors. State Route 14 is the only improved road in the area.

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

The territory is rugged with steep hillsides and canyons. Elsmere Canyon Creek runs northwesterly through the site. There are numerous oak woodlands and natural stands of chaparral. State Route 14 forms a natural boundary to the west. The territory is bounded by the Santa Clarita corporate limit to the north in the Whitney Canyon area, the Angeles National Forest to the east, and the City of Los Angeles Sphere of Influence to the south.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   3 residents (estimated)

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

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   8

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

The subject territory is surrounded by vacant, undeveloped land. The closest residential areas are located within the City of Santa Clarita, approximately .3 to .5 mile northwest of the annexation area. These areas consist of the Polynesian Mobile Home Park and the Lantana Hills neighborhood. Populated areas to the south and east are more than one mile from the subject territory, in the San Fernando Valley (Sylmar/Los Angeles City).
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The proposed annexation area is unlikely to see any growth in the future. The majority of the property is owned by public agencies for the purposes of open space preservation. The City of Santa Clarita also owns open space parcels immediately south of the subject territory, and the Angeles National Forest forms the boundary to the east. No development will occur in these areas. Vacant industrial-zoned land is located west of the annexation area within the City of Santa Clarita; however, there are no proposals for the industrial property and it is not expected that development would occur within the next ten years.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

There is one single-family dwelling unit in the project area.

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

The proposed annexation would not impede the City's ability to achieve its regional housing goals in that the area is intended for open space preservation and no new development is proposed.

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

The proposal seeks to preserve Elsmere Canyon as permanent open space for all City residents regardless of race, culture, or income. The project would not result in any negative impacts to lower-income communities.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

Total assessed land value: $3,476,487 (LA County Tax Assessor, 2011)

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

Under the County of Los Angeles jurisdiction, the current land-use designation for the subject area is HM and TC (Hillside Management and Transportation Corridor). The current zoning for the subject area is A-2-1 (Heavy Agricultural, One Acre Minimum Lot Size).

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

The vast majority of the subject area would be preserved as permanent open space. The single-family residence would remain.
4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city).

The subject site has been prezoned Open Space (OS) and Residential Estate (RE) in the City of Santa Clarita consistent with the open space areas and the existing single-family residence. The prezoning is also consistent with the proposed One Valley One Vision joint City/County general planning effort.

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

North: Whitney Canyon open space area/park land (City of Santa Clarita)
East: Undeveloped, natural, open space/Angeles National Forest (County)
South: Undeveloped, natural open space (County)
West: SR-14 freeway, vacant industrial land (City of Santa Clarita)

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

The subject area is designated OS (Open Space) and RE (Residential Estate) under the City's General Plan.

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

Preserving Elsmere Canyon as permanent open space is consistent with the City of Santa Clarita General Plan. The proposal is likewise consistent with LA County's adopted land use policies for the area. The proposal is also consistent with the City/County draft One Valley One Vision joint general plan update.

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

This proposal will not result in development of property now or in the future. The vast majority of the project area will be set aside as permanent open space. Residentially-designated parcels would remain unchanged; however, development constraints in the area are such that these properties are unlikely to be developed. No development is proposed in conjunction with this application.

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

Denial of this proposal would have no effect on development as there are no projects proposed in the subject area. Public agencies would continue to own land set aside for open space purposes and the single-family residence would not be impacted.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No. The subject territory is not located in, nor is it proposed to be located in, a redevelopment area.

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

There are no agricultural lands in the annexation area. Both the City and the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority own land that is designated as open space within the proposed annexation area. The annexation is necessary in order to assign City Open Space zoning to the Elsmere Canyon area and to permanently preserve the natural, undeveloped open space.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

In October 2010, the City purchased land in the Elsmere Canyon area in an effort to permanently preserve open space. City parcels are located next to other parcels owned by the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority. This annexation would place open space zoning on the non-residential, undeveloped parcels in Elsmere Canyon, thereby preserving the area as open space for future generations. The annexation is a logical and appropriate extension of the City's current boundary and service area.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

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

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

The proposed annexation would support the intent of the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority to preserve open space in the San Gabriel Mountains. No known mutual economic interests would be affected.
c. The local government structure of the County:

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

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

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

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

   The City currently possesses sufficient capacity to provide the full range of municipal services to serve this area once it is annexed. Given that the purpose of the proposed annexation is to preserve open space, it is not anticipated that any new public facilities would be needed. The annexation would result in a negotiated tax transfer agreement between the City of Santa Clarita and the County of Los Angeles, the purpose of which would be to partially fund public services should any be required.

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

   Annexation of Elsmere Canyon will have little or no impact on the City's ability to provide adequate services and controls. Existing municipal services are adequate to serve the single family residence and to administer the proposed open space acreage. The purpose of the annexation is to preserve natural open space. No development is proposed as part of this request nor would the annexation create the potential for future development or the need for additional government services.
4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

The City of Santa Clarita routinely evaluates the adequacy of government services as part of its annual budget process. An appropriate level of government services would be provided upon annexation to the City. Given that the proposed annexation area only contains one single family residence, any increase in the demand for services would not be expected to be significant. There will be no need for service providers to increase capacity.

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

1) Open Space Preservation District: approximately $28 per year per single-family residence
2) Stormwater Facility Maintenance: approximately $22 per year per single-family residence
3) Landscape Maintenance District 2008-1: approximately $58 per year per single-family residence
4) Streetlight Maintenance District: approximately $58 per year per single-family residence

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☐ No ☑
   Name of Agency

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

   There are no known communities of social or economic interest within the subject territory. The vast majority of the area consists of rugged, natural open space. The nearest developed neighborhoods in the City of Santa Clarita are located northwest of the subject territory across the Antelope Valley Freeway (SR-14) and will not be impacted by the proposed annexation.

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

   In a letter dated March 1, 2011, the County of Los Angeles concurred that the boundary of the annexation area/SOI amendment was "logical and appropriate." A copy of the County letter is attached.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

   No. The City of Santa Clarita has no voted bonded debt.

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

   Not applicable.

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

   No applicable.

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

   Not applicable.

NOTIFICATION

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

   Name | Address | Telephone
   ---- | ------- | -------
   Ben Jarvis | 23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355 | (661) 255-4330
   Jason Smisko | 23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355 | (661) 255-4330

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

   Name | Address | Telephone
   ---- | ------- | -------
   Ben Jarvis | 23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355 | (661) 255-4330
   Jason Smisko | 23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355 | (661) 255-4330
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APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION—ATTACHMENT "A"

Plan for Municipal Services

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

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

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

Fire and Emergency Services

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

   The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides both fire protection and emergency medical services to the project area. Medical services are divided between basic life support (emergency medical technicians) and advanced life support (paramedics). The nearest fire station is Station 73.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Services would continue without interruption.

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

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

All parcels located within Los Angeles County are assessed a fee for flood control related services. Those services are designed to maintain and protect the storm drain pipes and channels to ensure proper water flow. All parcels located within the City of Santa Clarita are assessed a storm water and urban runoff pollution control fee for NPDES related activities. These activities are designed to protect water quality. Following annexation property owners would be assessed this fee, currently $22 per year per single-family residence.

Library Services

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

The project area is currently served by the Los Angeles County Library System. There are three community libraries in the City. A new, larger, library is being built that will replace the existing Newhall Library.

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

The City of Santa Clarita will take over library services within its municipal boundary starting on July 1, 2011. The City will expand hours of operation to include Sundays, will enhance library programming, and will complete the construction of the new Newhall Library.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? [July 1, 2011]

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

Library services are financed with funds from a portion of the County's ad valorem property tax and a special library parcel tax. A Library Mitigation Fee is required for all new residential units. None of the existing library financing methods will be affected by the annexation. However, once the City takes over library operations, funds from the ad valorem tax for libraries would be redirected to the City of Santa Clarita for use for library services.

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

If yes, please give details.

Not applicable. The City of Santa Clarita will assume responsibility for library services regardless of this annexation. No library facilities are located within the subject territory.

Park and Recreational Services

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

The LA County Department of Parks and Recreation provides park services for the area. Additionally, the City of Santa Clarita and the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority maintain the public open space in the annexation area.

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

Upon annexation, residents of the single-family house will be served by the City of Santa Clarita for parks and recreation services. The City and the Streets Recreation and Conservation Authority will continue to maintain and make available the public open space and hiking trails in the annexation area as well as in the Whitney Canyon open space area located immediately north of the subject territory.

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

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

City parks and recreation services provided through general funds and bonds. Parkland acquisition and development of new facilities are funded by bond monies. Other fees, development impact fees, public safety activities, local improvement, and grants. The City has established a joint powers authority with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to manage open space. Park maintenance is provided through general fund monies, Parks Aids Park Divid, Lighting District assessment and Toxel Field. Additionally, the City has established an Open Space Preservation District. Parking districts the City is involved in are funded through additional units of open space preservation. The Open Space Preservation District is discussed in more detail in the Special Assessment District sections below.

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

Not applicable.

Police Services

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

Current general police protection for the annexation area is provided by the County of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department. The Santa Clarita Sheriff’s station is located at 23740 Magic Mountain Parkway, Santa Clarita, CA. The station is staffed by 190 sworn officers, 40 sworn reserve officers, 35 civilian personnel, 58 volunteers, with 69 vehicles (67 patrol cars). Traffic patrol is overseen by the California Highway Patrol in the unincorporated County areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

If yes, please give details.

Not applicable.
Road Maintenance Services

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

   Northbound State Route 14 (SR-14) is the only improved roadway in the annexation area. The road is maintained by Caltrans and this would not change under the annexation. There are no other improved roadways in the project area.

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

   Upon annexation, the City of Santa Clarita will provide road maintenance services to the subject territory for typical public streets. The City budgets between $4 and $7 million each year for street resurfacing and slurry seal. Caltrans would continue to maintain SR-14.

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

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

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

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

   No known roads will be transferred to City jurisdiction as part of this request. A typical requirement from the County during the tax transfer discussion is the withdrawal of public streets from County Road District #5. Easement for public streets will transfer from the County to the City upon annexation.

Solid Waste Services

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

   Solid waste services in the annexation area are currently provided under the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles. County residents may choose from various providers for solid waste service and pay on a fee-for-service basis that differs with each provider.

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

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

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

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

Special Assessment District Services

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

The subject territory is not currently any special assessment districts.

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

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

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

The following assessments are approximate and would be applied to the subject territory upon annexation: Open Space Preservation District - $26 per year per single-family home; Stormwater Facility Maintenance - $22 per single-family residence per year; Landscape Maintenance District - approximately $58 per year per single-family residence; and Street Light Maintenance District - $58 per year per single-family residence.

Street Lighting Services

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

The subject territory is not currently in a street lighting district.

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

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

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

Streetlight services are financed by an assessment paid by property owners as part of their annual property taxes. See additional information under Special Assessment District Services above.
Water Services

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

   If yes, provide details.
   Not applicable.

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

   No development is proposed nor would result from this annexation. Therefore, the approval of the annexation would not result in an increase in water usage.

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

   The subject territory is located within the Newhall County Water District service area. No change will occur to water availability or agency service areas as a result of this annexation.

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

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

Wastewater Services

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

   The area is not served by a public sewer system. The existing single-family home has a private, on-site wastewater disposal system.

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

   The annexation will have no affect on existing wastewater services in the subject area.
EXHIBIT “A”

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-03 TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA

“ELSMERE CANYON”

Those portions of Section 7 and Section 18 in Township 3 North, Range 15 West and those portions of Fractional Sections 12 and 13 in Township 3 North, Range 16 West, San Bernardino Meridian, all according to the official plats thereof, in the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California together with that portion of the Rancho San Francisco as shown on map recorded in Book 1 Pages 521 and 522 of Patents, in the office of the County Recorder of said County described as a whole as follows:

Beginning at the east quarter corner of said Section 7, said corner being a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on January 11, 2011; thence

(L1) leaving said boundary and along the easterly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 7 South 00°59′21″ West 2905.83 feet to the northeast corner of said Section 18; thence

(L2) along the northerly line of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 North 89°26′32″ West 1083.57 feet to the northeasterly corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 as described in Parcel 4 in deed to said City of Santa Clarita recorded October 29, 2010 as instrument no. 20101552902 of Official Records, in said office of the County Recorder; thence

(L3) along the easterly line of last said northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and along the easterly line of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 as described in Parcels 3 and 4 of last said deed South 02°04′59″ West 2607.54 feet to the
southeasterly corner of said southwest quarter of the northeast quarter; thence
(L4) along the south line of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 South 89°38′53″ West 1220.49 feet to the southeasterly corner of the northwest quarter of said Section 18; thence
(L5) along the south line of last said northwest quarter South 89°38′53″ West 2548.87 feet to the west quarter corner of said Section 18; thence
(L6) along the south line of the northeast quarter of said Fractional Section 13 North 86°39′15″ West 973.29 feet to a point on the centerline of the Antelope Valley Freeway (State Highway 14), also being a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on January 11, 2011; thence
(L7) along said centerline and along last said boundary North 18°56′51″ East 128.86 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 3500.00 feet; thence
(C8) northerly along said centerline and along last said boundary and said curve through a central angle of 34°50′29″ an arc distance of 2136.48 feet; thence
(L9) continuing along said centerline and last said boundary and tangent to said curve North 16°01′38″ West 1908.77 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly having a radius of 3000.00 feet; thence
(C10) continuing northerly along said centerline and last said boundary and last said curve through a central angle of 40°52′22″ an arc distance of 2140.09 feet; thence
(L11) continuing along said centerline and last said boundary and tangent to last said curve North 24°50′44″ East 645.22 feet to an angle point in said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita; thence
(L12) leaving said centerline and along last said boundary the following 7 courses, South 89°09′09″ east 872.20 feet; thence
(L13) South 83°22′14″ East 1285.70 feet; thence
(L14) South 00°28′31″ East 394.97 feet; thence
(L15) South 89°07'46" East 1291.28 feet; thence
(L16) South 89°07'39" East 1268.02 feet; thence
(L17) South 00°36'05" East 652.49 feet; thence
(L18) South 89°09'54" East 1250.57 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 806.52 acres, more or less.
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley

City of Lancaster

Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District

Antelope Valley Health Care District

Antelope Valley East Kern Water Agency

Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District

Lancaster Cemetery District

Lancaster School District

Los Angeles County Office of Education

Office of Supervisor Antonovich

Consolidated Fire Protection District

Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 2011-17 (2006-50) to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley

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 20.62 acres of uninhabited territory into the boundaries of Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley. The project site is located south of Avenue H between 42nd and 45th Street West, in the City of Lancaster.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by August 22, 2011.

If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (818) 254-2454.

Doug Dorado
Local Government/Information Systems Analyst

Date: July 19, 2011
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Annexation 2011-17 (2006-50)
TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS
DISTRICT NO. 40, ANTELOPE VALLEY

COMMENCING AT THE NORTH QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 7 NORTH, RANGE 13 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN THENCE, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 12, NORTH 89°56'30" WEST 336.62 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, THENCE;

1ST – ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 12, SOUTH 89°56'30" EAST 673.24 FEET; THENCE,

2ND – ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE EAST HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER SAID SECTION 12, SOUTH 00°45'27" EAST 1337.66 FEET; THENCE,

3RD – ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER SAID SECTION 12, NORTH 89°56'04" WEST 669.48 FEET, THENCE,

4TH – ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE EAST HALF OF THE WEST HALF NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 12, NORTH 00°55'06" WEST 1337.63 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 20.61 ACRE, MORE OR LESS.

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION:  Annexation 2011-17 (2006-50)

AFFECTED AGENCIES  RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Cities or Districts) (annexation, detachment, sphere of influence amendment)
1. WATERWORKS DIST. 40 - ANTELOPE VALLEY ANNEXATION
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY:  LA JOLLA VILLA, LLC.

RESOLUTION:  (LANDOWNER VOTER PETITION)

APPLICANT:  BEHROOZ HAVETUM / KAMYAR LASHGARI

TITLE:  MANAGER

ADDRESS:  903 MAPLE AVE. 2ND FLOOR

(City, District or Chief Petitioner)

CITY:  LOS ANGELES  STATE:  CA  ZIP CODE:  90015

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON:  KAMYAR LASHGARI  TELEPHONE:  (213) 268-3468

Aldrian  310 437-9190
By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/ Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

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

SIGNATURE: [signature]                     DATE: 11.30.06

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL, LOCATION:

The project site is located on the south of Avenue H between 42nd St. West and 45th St. West in the City of Lancaster, Ca.

MAJOR STREETS AND HIGHWAYS:

Avenue H

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY: 20.62 A.C.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION

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 project site consists of approx. 20 ac of desert saltbush scrub located near the SW corner of Ave. H & 42nd st. West. The proposed rectangular vacant land is within the block between the currently unpaved W. 45th St. to the west and W. 42nd St. at the east side of the property. North of the undeveloped property is Ave. H which is currently a paved road.

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

The proposed area is generally flat land which is part of a gentle north-sloping alluvial plain with alkalai clay soils, at a max. elevation of about 2,330 feet above sea level. Drainage across the site appears to be largely by sheet flow to the east.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   None

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area? 115 P.O.

3. Number of Registered Voters (give source and date of information): NIL
4. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?

Approx. 1/2 mile to a commercial area along Ave. H.

5. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas, within the next ten years?

From a farm trade and agrarian community, City of Lancaster has grown to a major suburban center. The general plan identifies residential areas surrounding the site. Currently there are numerous projects approved and being built within the vicinity of the site.

6. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

There are no residence within the site.

7. Give a summary of regional housing needs and to what extent the proposal will assist in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs as determined by SCAG. (City annexations only.)

Not applicable. The annexation request only includes the L.A. County Waterworks Dist. 40, Antelope Valley.

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the per capita assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?  $70,000. - per acre based on purchased price.
2. What is the present land use in the subject area? Be specific.

General Plan Designation: Multi-Residential (6.6-15.0 d.u./ac)
Zoning: Residential R-7000 § MDR. Min. Lot Size = 4000 sf

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

Residential. Single-Family-115

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):

Development of the site will be done at the base general plan and zoning designation of MDR and R-7000 sf lots.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>Light Industry</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>R-7000</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>M&amp;I § UR</td>
<td>MDR § R-7000</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>M&amp;I § UR</td>
<td>MDR § R-7000</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

Not applicable.
7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and other adopted land use policies?
   Yes. The proposal is consistent with general plans & zoning.

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 project site is currently zoned MDR & R-1000. The site will most likely be developed within the next couple of years.

9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?
   If the annexation request is denied, development of the site would be postponed until water service is available or an alternative is developed.

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?
    The project site is vacant and designated and zoned for residential development.
12. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   
   Yes.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

Pursuant to Government Code Section 56425, provide the following information if the proposal requires a sphere of influence amendment.

1. Describe any existing or future areas of social or economic interest within the proposal area?
   
   Not applicable.

2. Describe the present and probable need for public facilities and services in the proposed area:
   
   Not applicable.

3. Describe in detail the present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
   
   Not applicable.
4. Provide documentation regarding consultation that has occurred between the City and the County, with regards to an agreement on boundaries, development standards, and zoning requirements within the sphere.

THE PROPOSAL

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary?
   The annexation of the project site in Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 - Antelope Valley, is necessary to provide water service to the site.

2. What are the alternate courses of action, if any? (Include the names of other local agencies having the authority to provide the same or similar services as those proposed.)
   It may be feasible to create a mutual water company.

3. What will be the effect of the proposal, or exclusion and of alternative actions, on the adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county?
   The proposal will not impact adjacent areas nor have impacts on the social & economic interest nor affect the local government structure of the county. Residential development was envisioned for the property given the general plan designation and zoning.
4. If the service level(s) to be provided exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase the existing capacity (i.e., new facilities, additional personnel, etc.):

   The service provider will make reasonable accommodation for the project.

5. List any assessments, fees or other charges to be levied as a part of this proposal:

   Not known.

6. List the division, acquisition, improvement, disposition, sale or transfer of any property, real or personal, belonging to a city or district that is involved in this proposal:

   None.

7. List the disposition, transfer or division of any money or funds and any other obligations of a city or district involved as part of this proposal:

   None.
8. To what extent will residents or landowners within the subject area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district to or from which the change of organization/reorganization/special reorganization is proposed?

Not applicable given that there is no existing indebtedness.

9. List any terms or conditions requested as part of this proposal:

None.

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

None.

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

Not applicable given that the agency has no existing bonded debt.

3. In the case of detachments, does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt? If so, please explain why.

Not applicable.
MUNICIPAL SERVICES

1. Is there a need for centralized community services in the proposed area?
   No. City of Lancaster provide most services to the area proposed to be annexed.

2. Describe the present and probable need for public facilities and services in the proposed area:
   Services are adequate as infrastructure will be extended to serve the proposed area.

3. Provide a detailed description of the present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services in the proposed area:
   (L.A. County Waterworks Dist. 40 - Antelope Valley, has capacity to serve the site.)
4. What is the present cost and adequacy of existing governmental services and controls in the area? What are the probable future needs for those services and controls?

   Existing governmental services are adequate in this area.

5. What will be the effect of approval or denial of the proposal, and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services?

   Approval of the project would result in an increase of water users within District 40. Denial would create the need for a mutual water company.

6. What services and/or costs to residents or landowners in the area would be increased, reduced, or eliminated as a result of this proposal?

   Water infrastructure would be extended thereby increasing service.

7. Describe the adequacy and availability of water supplies to the proposed area. Include information on where those services are coming from and when they will be available:

   LA County Waterworks Dist. 40 - Antelope Valley, obtains water from a variety of sources including groundwater and imported sources from AVEK.
8. Plan for Providing Services:
Describe how his proposal will result in the provision of new services and changes in existing services, including location from which such services are or will be provided, service level or capacity (i.e., sewer line capacity, average response time for emergency vehicles, etc.) and how services area or will be financed. (Proposals initiated by cities must also fill out the information in Attachment "A" Plan for Municipal Services).

Final design of water transmission facility will be submitted to the Waterworks District upon annexation approval.

GENERAL

1. List names and addresses of any persons, organization or agencies known to you who may be opposed to this proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ANY OTHER COMMENTS YOU MAY WISH TO MAKE:
None.

3. 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behrooz Haverim</td>
<td>903 Maple St., 2nd Flr., L.A., CA 90015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamyar Lashgari</td>
<td>26740 Via Linda St., Malibu, CA 90265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Nikaien</td>
<td>4625 Cicion Ln., Palmdale, CA 93551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Complete Party Disclosure Form (*Not required for public agencies.)
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 821/Fuller

INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 05/30/11: Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Committee on Appropriations.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

Under existing law, the process of school district reorganization begins with the submission of a petition that is reviewed by the county superintendent of schools (county superintendent) and, if sufficient, forwarded to the county committee on school district organization (county committee) and the State Board of Education (SBE) for additional review and public hearings.

The county committee is authorized to formulate plans and recommendations for the reorganization of school districts. The reorganization, if approved by the county committee or the SBE, is required to be voted upon during the next available election.

The reorganization plans are also required to meet specified requirements, and those impacting school districts with more than 500,000 pupils based on average daily attendance are required to satisfy additional conditions.

This bill would require that interim or governing boards of existing school districts (and, where applicable, the administrators of such districts) involved in a reorganization notify the county superintendent, in writing and with relevant documents and information provided, before taking any action on any matter that could have a material fiscal impact or incur debt or liability, including, but not necessarily limited to, the approval of a charter school in the existing, proposed, newly formed, or newly organized school district. The county superintendent’s review would determine whether that action would have a material fiscal impact or incur debt or liability. This notice must be provided to the county superintendent no less than ten school days before any action is proposed to be executed. This bill would provide the county superintendent with the authority to stay or rescind any action that he or she deemed unnecessary for the immediate functioning of the existing or newly formed school district.

This bill was prompted, according to the author, by the actions taken in the Sacramento County reorganization of Grant Union High School District (HSD) and some of its feeder elementary districts into the Twin Rivers Unified SD. The outgoing board of the high school district issued non-voter approved debt, entered into binding construction contracts, and awarded severance bonuses to administrators (which ended up in litigation after the Sacramento County Superintendent of Schools refused to issue warrants for the bonuses).

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

This bill provides expanded authority to the county superintendent to review and approve actions that may have a fiscal impact on reorganized school districts. In its role as the body that reviews reorganization petitions, the County Committee is already charged with examining the fiscal status of districts after reorganization but does not have authority to act or review the actions of an existing or newly formed district.
after reorganization has been approved. This bill highlights the critical component of post-reorganization fiscal oversight and should have no adverse impact on the County Committee, the school district organization process, or Los Angeles County school districts. It does, however, convey additional responsibilities to county superintendents and expands their current fiscal oversight duties required under Assembly Bill 1200.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

☑ Watch  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action should be taken at this time.
☐ Approve  The County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support  The County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose  The County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove  The 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.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL
Existing law provides for California community college districts to receive general supervision from the California Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In addition, each community college district is under the control of its own elected board of trustees. Those independent boards of trustees develop the election structure that each community college district uses.

The latest version of this bill would authorize community college districts to adopt trustee area voting plans through which candidates for election to their board of trustees are elected by trustee area. It authorizes boards of trustees to adopt resolutions in support of trustee area voting and for the reapportionment of any existing trustee areas under the guidance of the 2010 U.S. Census data and to seek waivers for elections validating these new trustee area plans from the community college district chancellor’s office. The bill specifies that it would not apply to any community college district that enacts a specific statutory framework for its own trustee elections.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill authorizes community college districts in Los Angeles County to establish trustee area voting plans, or to review and revise their existing trustee area plan. The cost of any research or analysis of the 2010 U.S. Census data and other demographic information (along with any related legal costs) would be borne by community college districts.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

☐ Watch Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action should be taken at this time.
☐ Approve The County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support The County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose The County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove The 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.
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 should be taken at this time.
☒ Approve The County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support The County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose The County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove The 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

August 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of July 21, 2011.

PROPOSAL TO TRANSFER CERTAIN TERRITORY FROM THE COMPATON 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

None

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)

August 2011

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 July 21, 2011.

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 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 Steentoftte, 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 Wischburn USD petition and order the election to be conducted within the territory of the Wischburn SD. Staff at the CDE informed LACOE staff 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 Wischburn 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 Wischburn 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 Wischburn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wischburn SD

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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.

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 SD, Lawndale SD, Lennox SD, and Wiseburn SD, 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 SD, Lawndale SD, Lennox SD, and Wiseburn SD, 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.

*Status: Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD circulating proposed legislation; County Committee awaiting responses to query from all districts.

**Status Date:** July 21, 2011

**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.

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

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

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder's office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, 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.

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

Status Date: May 12, 2011

**PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS 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 and to establish trustee areas 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(e) and requires valid signatures from 500 registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 30, 2010

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019(c) and requires valid signatures from 500 registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

On July 14, 2010, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions in this matter. On July 15, 2010, the chief petitioner submitted additional signed petitions. The petitions were forwarded to the Registrar-Recorder on July 23, 2010, for signature verification.

On August 12, 2010, the Registrar-Recorder completed its review of the petitions submitted. The chief petitioner submitted 733 signatures. Of that group, 680 signatures were found to be sufficient (complete and signed by registered voters). However, under EC §5019(c)(1), a petition seeking to change the trustee areas of a school district must be signed within 180 days of submission to the County Committee. Staff examined the petitions submitted and found that only 84 signatures submitted were signed within the mandated timeline. Thus, the petition is not sufficient and will not move forward. On August 16, 2010, the chief petitioner was notified of the petition insufficiency.

Status: Petition insufficient; action ended.

Status Date: August 16, 2010

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(a) and (c) 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. On March 12, 2010, County Counsel notified staff that the petition was sufficient. On March 12, 2010, the petition was forwarded to the chief petitioner for circulation.
Please note that this is a new, additional petition, separate from other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, although it requests the same changes within the Mount San Antonio CCD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas with trustee area voting).

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 19, 2010

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

Status: Petition currently in circulation.

Status Date: February 21, 2008

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: May 11, 2007

* 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, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: January 17, 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: July 21, 2003

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: June 16, 2003

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2001

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/May 2011

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

•* ABC USD/June 2011
•* Compton Community College District/June 2011
•* Cerritos Community College District/July 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.