October 23, 2015

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the November 4, 2015, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, November 4, 2015, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 2, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The following is an update of relevant information as of October 22, 2015.

Staff Activities

Staff has been updating the County Committee website with recent articles related to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

Staff participated in the October 19, 2015 Superintendent’s Fall Convocation and meeting of the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association, at which four members of the County Committee were elected or re-elected. A bulletin with the election results will be released next week.

Informational Correspondence

- A September 22, 2015, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice of Filing concerning City of Palmdale Annexation No. 2015.11. (Attachment 1)

- September 23, 2015, LAFCO Notice of Filing concerning City of Pomona Annexation No. 2015-09. (Attachment 2)
Legislative Updates

Several bills are currently being tracked; updates are attached. (Attachment 3)

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 4)

- “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals.” (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District) (Attachment 5)

Please call me at (562) 922-6131 if you have any questions or concerns.

KDC/AD/EH:ah

Attachments
NOTICE OF FILING

City of Palmdale
Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40
Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Health Care District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley/East Kern Water Agency
Palmdale Unified School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 20

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 2015-11 to the City of Palmdale (Desert View Highlands)

Pursuant to Government Code Section 56658, notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The application proposes to annex approximately 284± acres of inhabited territory to the City of Palmdale. The affected territory is generally located north and south of Elizabeth Lake Road between Amargosa Creek and 10th Street West, in Los Angeles County unincorporated territory surrounded by the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application, map, and legal description are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by October 22, 2015.

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

Date: September 22, 2015

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2015-11

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. City of Palmdale
2. Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
3. Los Angeles County Roads District No. 5
4. Los Angeles County Library District

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)
1. County of Los Angeles
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

APPLICANT: City of Palmdale

TITLE: ___________________________ CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: City of Palmdale

ADDRESS: 38250 Sierra Highway

CITY: Palmdale STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 93550

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Matthew Alcuran TELEPHONE: 661-267-5200

E-MAIL ADDRESS: malcuran@cityofpalmdale.org
By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filling 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: 9-10-2015

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

An application to annex a 284 acre pocket located within unincorporated Los Angeles County, known as Desert View Highlands, which includes two Palmdale School District sites, Juniper Intermediate School and Ocotillo Elementary School, into the City of Palmdale

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

284 acres

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

☑ Yes

☐ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The 284 acre pocket located within unincorporated Los Angeles County, known as Desert View Highlands, including two Palmdale School District sites, Juniper Intermediate School and Ocotillo Elementary School. The project site consists of existing single family residences, existing commercial uses, vacant single-family land and vacant land zoned for multi-family uses. Development in the area started in the early 1950's

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

The project site is located west of 10th Street West, east of Foxholm Drive, north of Cie Court and south of the Amargosa Creek. The Amargosa Creek runs adjacent to parcel numbers 3003-003-057 and 3003-003-039. The project area is relatively flat and largely developed within existing residential and commercial uses, and street improvements.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 3259

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area? 3609-3803

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 773

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

Immediately adjacent to residential properties to the south and west and residential properties are also located to the north, across the Amargosa Creek.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The approximately 35 acre vacant properties located immediately south of the Amargosa Creek are likely to develop with multifamily uses within the next ten years. Given the existing pre-zone designation of R-3 (Multiple Residential), which would allow development between 10.1-16 du/ac, it is likely that up to 350-544 units would be constructed.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

350-544 multi-family residential units

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 City's 5th cycle RHNA numbers are 1,395 VL, 827 Low, 898 Moderate, and 2,332 Above Mod, with a total of 5,452. The anticipated multifamily development is anticipated to provide 350-544 moderate to above moderate units to assist the City in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs.

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

Two existing schools are located within the annexation area, providing educational facilities to residents of the county island and City residents. Future development will provide housing opportunities for all races, cultures and income levels.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$85 million (2014 Tax Assessor Roll)

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

LA County General Plan - H8, H30, MU-R, P
LA County Zoning - R-A, R-3, MXD-RU
City of Palmdale General Plan - MFR, PF, SFR-3, NC
City of Palmdale Zoning - R-3 PZ, PF- PZ, R-1-7,000 PZ, C-1 PZ

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

Existing - Single family residential, commercial and public facility (school)
Future - Multi-family, commercial
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).

No changes are proposed.

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

Single family to the north, south and west, commercial and office to the west.

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

SFR-3 (Single Family, 3.1-6 du/ac), NC (Neighborhood Commercial), PF (Public Facility) and MFR (Multi Family Residential)

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

The proposal is consistent with the City’s General Plan.

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 vacant 35 acre property is pre-zoned R-3 (Multiple Residential) allowing for the development of 350-544 multifamily residential units.

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

Denial of the annexation would potentially result in development of the property under the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

The territory is not located within 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 is no agriculture or open space lands within the proposal area.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

The annexation is necessary to enable the Palmdale School District to be eligible for City sponsored programs and facilities, to allow the residents to utilize City of Palmdale facilities at resident rates at such facilities as libraries and public parks. Development of the uninhabited parcels would be more likely to occur if the parcels were under the jurisdiction of the City of Palmdale, which would allow a higher density under the City’s existing GP and Pre-Zone designation. The City would process any future entitlements, with public hearings being held within the City rather than downtown LA, allowing for better public access to local decision making. Further, the annexation will move toward eliminating all county islands within the City, pursuant to the City’s General Plan.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The proposed annexation would result in municipal services, currently provided by LA County, being provided by the City of Palmdale. All adjacent areas are currently serviced by the City. As most County services are located within Lancaster or downtown LA, the area would be better serviced by the City of Palmdale.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

The proposed annexation would result in the two Palmdale School District school sites being located within the City and not unincorporated LA County. Any future development applications would be processed through the City; meaning potential impact fees, property and sales would be shared by the City and County.
c. The local government structure of the County:

The proposed annexation is consistent with the policy of LA County in annexing entire County islands, rather than pieces of the island.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The majority of the governmental services received by existing residents are from County offices and facilities located within the City of Lancaster, a minimum of four miles to the north of the site. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department provide police and fire services respectively from facilities located within the City of Palmdale. The cost of services provided to properties within the annexation area is generally covered through direct assessments collected as part of the property tax for services such as fire, parks and library services.

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

Future government services to the uninhabited portion of the subject territory will be dependant upon future development. If future multifamily development is permitted within the City, the developer will be required to install and annex into applicable maintenance districts for sewer and streetlights, construct necessary on- and off-site improvements for water, sewer and stormwater. The City development fees, which will be applicable at the time permits are pulled, include Public Facilities, Drainage, Sewer, Fire Facility and Traffic Impact fees.

As both Parks and Library services within the City of Palmdale are located within close proximity to the annexation area and are free of charge, it is likely that the City is already paying for some services provided to unincorporated areas.

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?

The City of Palmdale is a full service municipal government that provides the following services: Animal Control Services (through contract with Los Angeles County Animal Control); Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (through the CFPD); Law Enforcement (through contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department); Public park maintenance, recreational programs and services; Land use planning and building regulation; Library services; Street maintenance; Street lighting (through Southern California Edison); Flood control and storm water disposal; Transit services (by the Antelope Valley Transit Authority).

According to the Municipal Services Review, the City provides a full range of services with the exception of water and wastewater treatment, with no duplication of municipal services. Cost reductions are fully practiced and economies of scale are achieved through contracting of law enforcement services with the County Sheriff, by provision of fire protection and emergency services through the Consolidated Fire Protection District, by utilizing available county services for animal control and through the operation of a joint transit authority.
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.

There is existing capacity with regards to sewer lines, water facilities and dry utilities (power, telephone, gas) so that development will not exceed the capacity of services available. With regards to the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant, the County Sanitation District has previously adopted a plan to expand capacity of the facility to service the population in 2020. Capital Improvement Fees paid by the developer at the time parcels develop will be utilized to finance this expansion. With regards to additional services such as police protection, the City reviews existing contracts on an annual basis and makes amendments as necessary to ensure adequate provision of services.

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.

Parcels within the annexation may be developed at some point in the future with multifamily uses. At that time, the developer will be required to form or annex into assessment districts such as Sewer ($4,000) and Streetlights ($3,000). At the time permits are issued for construction, developer impact fees including traffic (currently $2,860/unit), drainage (currently $2,160/acre), public facilities (currently $780 per unit) and fire facilities (currently $0.70 per square foot) will be charged based upon the use, acreage or building area. Additionally, a sewer capacity fee (currently $773/1,000 square feet of retail, $1,085/1,000 square feet of general office and $2,334/1,000 square feet of medical office) will be charged. Residents would no longer be required to pay Los Angeles County's utility surcharge on their utility bills.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

Yes ☑️ Name of Agency City of Palmdale No ☐

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

Juniper Intermediate School and Ocotillo Elementary School are located within the proposed annexation. Both schools are located within the Palmdale School District, which is in favor of 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).

N/A
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

Both of County of Los Angeles and the City of Palmdale have existing bonded debt.

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

The properties will remain within the County Parks district after annexation and will continue to be assessed on a yearly basis in order to pay off this obligation. Upon annexation, each parcel will be obligated to pay an assessment, voter approved in 2005, for the issuances of bonds to pay for City of Palmdale park improvement projects.

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

Landowners will remain liable for all existing indebtedness of the following districts: LA county Waterworks, AV Community College District, AV Union High School District, Palmdale School District, LA County Regional Park and Open Space District

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

N/A

NOTIFICATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Sayani</td>
<td>5022 W. Avenue N-4, #104, Palmdale CA 93551</td>
<td>661-722-3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imad Aboujawdah</td>
<td>Civil Design &amp; Drafting, 940 Enchanted Way, Simi Valley CA 93065</td>
<td>805-522-2622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Pertee, City Manager</td>
<td>38300 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA 93550</td>
<td>661-267-5101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palmdale Planning Manager</td>
<td>38250 Sierra Highway, Palmdale CA 93550</td>
<td>661-267-5200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT "A"

ANNEXATION NO. 2015-11

TO THE CITY OF PALMDALE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Those portions of Sections 21 and 28, Township 6 North, Range 12 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as a whole as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the southerly line of the northerly 30.00 feet of said Section 28 and the easterly line of Annexation No. 1978-6 to the City of Palmdale, recorded October 3, 1980 as Instrument No. 80-976548 of Official Records; thence along the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1978-6 the following 4 courses

Course 1.  North 0° 21' 45" East a distance of 374.60 feet; thence
Course 2.  North 24° 04' 38" East a distance of 180.26 feet; thence
Course 3.  North 48° 31' 00" East a distance of 1662.42 feet; thence
Course 4.  North 41° 27' 28" West a distance of East 147.01 feet to the most southerly corner of Annexation No. 1989-10 to the City of Palmdale, recorded January 15, 1991 as Instrument No. 91-61791 of Official Records; thence along the boundary line of said Annexation 1989-10 the following 4 courses

Course 5.  North 48° 31' 00" East a distance of 640.61 feet; thence
Course 6.  North 41° 29' 00" West a distance of 147.10 feet; thence
Course 7.  North 48° 31' 00" East a distance of 390.61 feet; thence
Course 8.  North 41° 29' 00" West a distance of 294.92 feet; thence continuing along the boundary line of said Annexation 1989-10 and its southwesterly prolongation said prolongation being along the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1978-6

Course 9.  South 48° 35' 17" West a distance of 1043.93 feet to an angle point in the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1978-6; thence along the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1978-6 the following 2 courses

Course 10.  North 41° 24' 43" West a distance of 305.05 feet; thence
Course 11.  South 48° 35' 17" West a distance of 655.55 feet; thence continuing along the boundary line of said Annexation 1978-6 and its northerly prolongation said prolongation being along the boundary line of Annexation No. 1988-3 to the City of Palmdale, recorded February 24, 1989 as Instrument No. 89-299462 of Official Records

Course 12.  North 0° 41' 57" West a distance of 178.10 feet to the most southerly corner of Annexation No. 1980-29 to the City of Palmdale, recorded November 17, 1980 as Instrument No. 80-1156333 of Official Records; thence along the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1978-6 the following 4 courses

Course 13.  North 48° 35' 17" East a distance of 1644.68 feet to the beginning of a curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 1060.05 feet; thence along said curve

Course 14.  Northeasterly through a central angle of 19° 27' 54" an arc length of 360.13 feet and having a chord distance of 358.40 feet; thence

Course 15.  North 68° 03' 12" East a distance of 1631.06 feet to the beginning of a curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 939.95 feet; thence along said curve

Course 16.  Northeasterly through a central angle of 19° 09' 38" an arc length of 314.34 feet and having a chord distance of 312.87 feet. The terminus of said curve being non-tangent to which a radial line bears South 41° 06' 26" East, said terminus being on the westerly line of Annexation No. 1975-4 to the City of Palmdale, recorded December 26, 1975 as Instrument No. 2075 in Book M5206, Page 322 of Official Records; thence along the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1975-4 the following 16 courses; thence

Course 17.  South 0° 29' 10" East a distance of 387.77 feet; thence

Course 18.  North 89° 47' 07" East a distance of 120.38 feet; thence
Course 19. South 0° 29' 10" East a distance of 67.87 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1380.00 feet to which point of beginning a radial line bears South 32° 32' 15" East; thence along said curve

Course 20. Southwesterly through a central angle of 10° 35' 27" an arc length of 255.09 feet and having a chord distance of 254.72 feet; thence

Course 21. South 67° 58' 31" West a distance of 1103.46 feet; thence

Course 22. South 41° 29' 00" East a distance of 1028.74 feet; thence

Course 23. North 48° 31' 00" East a distance of 940.68 feet; thence

Course 24. North 89° 26' 05" East a distance of 30.00 feet; thence

Course 25. North 0° 33' 55" West a distance of 79.43 feet; thence

Course 26. North 89° 26' 05" East a distance of 160.00 feet; thence

Course 27. South 0° 33' 55" East a distance of 1218.49 feet; thence

Course 28. North 89° 26' 05" East a distance of 2.00 feet; thence

Course 29. South 0° 33' 55" East a distance of 75.00 feet; thence

Course 30. South 89° 26' 45" West a distance of 182.00 feet; thence

Course 31. South 0° 33' 15" East a distance of 105.00 feet; thence

Course 32. North 89° 26' 45" East a distance of 380.00 feet to the westerly line of Annexation No. 1963-3 to the City of Palmdale, recorded December 4, 1963 as Instrument No. 3507 of Official Records; thence along the boundary line of said Annexation No. 1963-3 the following 22 courses; thence

Course 33. South 0° 33' 15" East a distance of 1515.00 feet; thence

Course 34. South 89° 38' 15" West a distance of 794.85 feet; thence

Course 35. South 0° 21' 45" East a distance of 360.00 feet; thence

Course 36. South 10° 49' 43" East a distance of 221.12 feet; thence

Course 37. South 3° 58' 54" East a distance of 207.00 feet; thence
Course 38. South 86° 01' 06" West a distance of 116.00 feet; thence
Course 39. North 87° 08' 20" West a distance of 50.36 feet; thence
Course 40. South 86° 01' 06" West a distance of 132.00 feet; thence
Course 41. South 3° 58' 54" East a distance of 99.12 feet; thence
Course 42. South 68° 12' 13" East a distance of 312.02 feet; thence
Course 43. South 0° 38' 07" East a distance of 165.11 feet; thence
Course 44. North 89° 58' 51" West a distance of 300.02 feet; thence
Course 45. North 0° 44' 48" West a distance of 79.00 feet; thence
Course 46. South 89° 15' 12" West a distance of 70.00 feet; thence
Course 47. North 68° 24' 48" West a distance of 268.00 feet; thence
Course 48. South 89° 12' 35" West a distance of 45.79 feet; thence
Course 49. North 0° 41' 17" West a distance of 178.57 feet; thence
Course 50. North 71° 11' 41" West a distance of 423.05 feet; thence
Course 51. South 59° 49' 40" West a distance of 200.00 feet; thence
Course 52. North 30° 10' 20" West a distance of 185.00 feet; thence
Course 53. North 0° 43' 50" West a distance of 776.00 feet; thence
Course 54. South 89° 38' 30" West a distance of 1578.68 feet to the place of Beginning.
BASIS OF SURVEY:

Recon and Distances shown herein are ground meas. X 100 (California Coordinate System based on WGS 84, NAD 1983)
(s.u. and a.u.) Nate (mod approx) Epoch 2007-06

The average combined factor of 0.0000010 was used to obtain ground surveyed coordinates.

COORDINATE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>POINT NO.</th>
<th>NORTHING (FEET)</th>
<th>EASTING (FEET)</th>
<th>ORTHO. ELEV. (FEET)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,028,828.08</td>
<td>6,515,917.546</td>
<td>2,700.448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,028,823.028</td>
<td>6,515,922.425</td>
<td>2,710.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,028,823.023</td>
<td>6,515,912.245</td>
<td>2,472.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,125,912.187</td>
<td>6,610,120.175</td>
<td>2,707.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,024,901.267</td>
<td>6,525,167.711</td>
<td>3,282.227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HORIZONTAL DATA: CSSKL Zone 5

ANNEXATION AREA CONTAINS: 275.9 ACRES

Date Prepared: 3/12/15

EXHIBIT B

"ANNEXATION NO. 2015 - 11"
TO THE CITY OF PALMDALE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX TABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LINE BEARING/DELT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 N 0°21'45&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 N24°04'38&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 N48°31'00&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 N48°27'28&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 N48°31'00&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 N48°29'00&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 N48°31'00&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 N41°29'00&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9 S48°35'17&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10 N41°24'43&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11 S48°35'17&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12 N 0°41'57&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L13 N48°35'17&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L14 DELTA = 19°27'54&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15 N60°03'10&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L16 DELTA = 19°09'38&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L17 S2°29'12&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L18 N89°47'07&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L19 S 2°29'12&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20 DELTA = 10°25'27&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L21 S67°58'31&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L22 S41°29'00&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L23 N48°31'00&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L24 N89°26'05&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L25 N 0°33'55&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26 N89°26'05&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L27 S 0°33'55&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L28 N89°26'05&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29 S 0°33'55&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L30 S89°25'45&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31 S 0°33'15&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32 S89°26'45&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L33 S 0°33'15&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L34 S89°36'15&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L35 S 0°21'45&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36 S10°49'43&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37 S 3°58'54&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L38 S86°01'06&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L39 N87°60'29&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L40 S86°01'06&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L41 S 3°58'54&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L42 S68°15'13&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43 S 0°36'07&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L44 S89°38'51&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L45 N 0°44'48&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L46 S89°38'51&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L47 S89°24'48&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L48 S89°12'35&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L49 N 0°41'17&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L50 N79°11'41&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L51 S59°49'40&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L52 N89°12'28&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L53 N 0°43'59&quot;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L54 S89°39'30&quot;V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE OF FILING

City of Pomona
Los Angeles County Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Pomona Unified School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 21
Three Valley Municipal Water District
Walnut Valley Water District
San Gabriel Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
Matthew Rzonca
Andrew C. Lujan
Chalmers South Mission Road, LLC
City of Industry (Urban Redevelopment Agency)

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 2015-09 to the City of Pomona

Pursuant to Government Code Section 56658, notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The application proposes to annex approximately 5.76± acres of uninhabited territory to the City of Pomona. The affected territory is located south of Valley Blvd approximately 2500' east of Grand Ave, in Los Angeles County unincorporated territory adjacent to the City of Industry, Pomona, and Walnut.

The proposal application, map, and legal description are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by October 26, 2015.

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

Date: September 23, 2015

Doug Dorado
Government Analyst

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2015-09

AFFECTED AGENCIES (Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Pomona
2. City of Pomona
3. 
4. 

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

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

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

APPLICANT: City of Pomona

TITLE: City Manager CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Linda Lowry

ADDRESS: 505 S. Garey Avenue

CITY: Pomona STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 91766

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Brad Johnson TELEPHONE: (909) 620-2311

E-MAIL ADDRESS: brad_johnson@ci.pomona.ca.us

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
80 S. LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 870 PASADENA, CA 91101
TELEPHONE: (626) 204-6500 FAX: (626) 204-6507
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: ______________________ DATE: 9-9-15

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The project site's legal address is 22122 Valley Boulevard. The Los Angeles County Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) that are applicable to the project site are 8709-026-004 and 8709-026-061. Valley Boulevard extends along the project site's westerly side. The nearest major cross streets are Grand Avenue and Valley Boulevard, located approximately 2,700 feet to the west of the project site.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

5.76 acres

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

☐ Yes

☒ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The project site is located along the south side of Valley Boulevard. The project site consists of 5.76 acres and is presently vacant. Valley Boulevard extends along the site's westerly side. A residential planned development is located approximately 750 feet to 1,000 feet to the northwest, in the City of Walnut. Industrial development is located to the north and south of the project site. A railroad right-of-way (ROW) and the concrete-lined San Jose Creek extends along the site's east side.

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

The project site slopes in an west-to-east orientation with the highest elevation located near Valley Boulevard. The local relief ranges from approximately 650 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) near Valley Boulevard to less than 630 feet AMSL along the eastern property line. The San Jose Channel, which is concrete lined, is located to the east of the project site's property line.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?  
0 (project site is vacant)

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

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.  
1 property owner

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

The nearest homes are located approximately 750 feet to 1,000 feet to the northwest. This residential planned unit development is located within the corporate boundaries of the City of Walnut. The site is separated from the residential development by differences in topography.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

Vacant land being used for farming is located to the northeast of the site between Valley Boulevard and San Jose Creek. The zoning of the parcels will promote new industrial development in the area.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

The area located along the Valley Boulevard corridor is zoned for industrial and manufacturing uses. The site is presently vacant and does not include any residential units (refer to attachment).

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 project will involve the construction of five concrete tilt-up structures with a total floor area of 145,900 square feet. No housing is proposed (refer to attachment).

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 proposed project is consistent with the manufacturing and industrial land use and zoning designations. The project site will not lead to any incompaerble land uses and development.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$2,331,305 (Los Angeles County Tax Assessor, Parcel View). Website accessed on October 1, 2014.

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

The project site's zoning designation within the County of Los Angeles is M-1.5-BE, or Restricted Heavy Manufacturing. The project will then conform the City of Pomona General Plan (Industrial).

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

The proposed project will involve the construction of five concrete tilt-up structures with a total floor area of 145,900 square feet (refer to attachment).
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 project site is currently undeveloped. The proposed project will involve the construction of five concrete tilt-up structures with a total floor area of 145,900 square feet (refer to attachment).

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

North: Industrial (Consolidated Precision Products, 4200 Valley Blvd.)
South: Industrial (California Coach Auto Body, Inc., 22064 Valley Blvd.)
East: San Jose Creek (concrete-lined flood control channel)
West: Valley Boulevard right-of-way.

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?

City of Pomona, Industrial (Workplace District)

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

The proposed industrial use is consist with the City of Pomona's applicable general plan designation.

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 proposed project will involve the construction of five concrete tilt-up structures with a total floor area of 145,900 square feet. Access to the proposed development will be provided by new curb-cuts on the east side of Valley Boulevard (refer to attachment).

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

A portion of the site is located within the corporate boundaries of the City of Pomona. The property owner and project proponent wishes to have the entire property within a single jurisdiction.
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?

Redevelopment is no longer applicable.

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 site is vacant though it is not being used for agricultural production (refer to attachment).

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

The site is currently undeveloped and in a poor state of maintenance. The property owner seeks to develop the property to correspond to the applicable General Plan designation. The property owner is a builder/owner of industrial properties (refer to attachment).

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 City of Pomona is located adjacent to the development site (a portion of the project site is located within the corporate boundaries of the City of Pomona).

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

City of Pomona (a portion of the project site is located within Pomona's corporate boundaries).
c. The local government structure of the County:

The proposed project site is the last remaining County island in the immediate area next to the City of Pomona. The unincorporated area is bounded by the City of Walnut (on the west), the City of Industry (on the south and west), and by the City of Pomona (on the north).

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The new development will involve the elimination of the existing blighted and vacant uses. The new development will consist of new construction that will conform to current building and health and safety codes. The increased assessed value (AV) of the property following development will offset any additional governmental costs.

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

The City of Pomona will take over responsibility for code enforcement, law enforcement, and emergency services.

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?

The City of Pomona will replace the services that are currently provided by the County. The project site is the last remaining County Island in the immediate area. The project site is surrounding on all sides by incorporated cities (Pomona, Walnut, and Industry).
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 proposed project is an industrial and the uses will be controlled by the City of Pomona Zoning Code. There is limited potential for the creation of any nuisance activity compared to other types of land uses (commercial, residential, etc.)

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

The proposed development will be required to pay for or otherwise provide for, those improvements that will required to serve the proposed project. The proposed development plans will undergo review to ensure that current building, health and safety codes are adhered to.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   Yes ☐ Name of Agency: NA ☐ No ✓

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

   The proposed project will provide up to 150 new jobs in the area that continues to experience high levels of unemployment.

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

   The City of Pomona is sponsoring the proposed annexation. The required evidence of support is attached.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

The proposed annexation will not affect any bond indebtedness.

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

The proposed project site will not be liable for any new existing debt.

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

No agreement has been made with the County.

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

See responses above.

NOTIFICATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Walnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

ANNEXATION No. XXXX-XX 2015-09

TO THE CITY OF POMONA,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BEING A PORTION OF RECORD OF SURVEY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 78, PAGES 1 THROUGH 5 AND RECORD OF SURVEY RECORDED IN BOOK 76, PAGES 51 THROUGH 56, BOTH MAPS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWEST TERMINUS OF THAT CERTAIN COURSE AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY RECORDED IN BOOK 78, PAGES 1 THROUGH 5 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, SAID CERTAIN COURSE BEING NORTH 55°07'22" WEST, 97.56 FEET; THENCE NORTH 32°11'00" WEST, 91.66 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE CITY OF WALNUT, ALSO BEING THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE BEGINNING OF A NON TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1766.59 FEET, A RADIAL LINE OF SAID CURVE BEARS SOUTH 32°28'13" EAST; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE AND THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF CITY OF WALNUT, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 19°48'21", AN ARC DISTANCE OF 610.67 FEET; THENCE TANGENT TO THE LAST MENTIONED CURVE, NORTH 37°43'26" EAST ALONG SAID CITY LINE, 458.72 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 966.71 FEET; THENCE CONTINUE ALONG SAID LINE OF CITY OF WALNUT, NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 22°17'51", AN ARC DISTANCE OF 376.21 FEET TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE TOWNSHIP LINE BETWEEN TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH AND TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH, RANGE 9 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO BASE AND MERIDIAN; THENCE ALONG SAID TOWNSHIP LINE, NORTH 89°46'53" EAST, 129.39 FEET TO THE NORTHERLY TERMINUS OF THAT CERTAIN COURSE AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY RECORDED IN BOOK 76, PAGES 51 THROUGH 56 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, SAID COURSE
BEING NORTH 04°10'40" WEST; THENCE LEAVING SAID TOWNSHIP LINE, ALONG SAID CERTAIN COURSE, SOUTH 04°01'35" EAST, 16.37 FEET; THENCE ALONG SAID RECORD OF SURVEY AND THE BOUNDARY OF THE CITY OF POMONA THE FOLLOWING COURSES;

SOUTH 27°57'35" EAST, 112.20 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 23°32'25" WEST, 187.44 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 17°22'35" EAST, 126.06 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 23°03'25" WEST, 298.93 FEET TO THE BOUNDARY OF THE CITY OF INDUSTRY AS SHOWN ON SAID RECORD OF SURVEY RECORDED IN BOOK 78, PAGES 1 THROUGH 5; THENCE ALONG SAID BOUNDARY OF THE CITY OF INDUSTRY AND SAID RECORD OF SURVEY THE FOLLOWING COURSES;

SOUTH 60°43'06" WEST, 491.73 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 17°09'35" WEST, 175.71 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 34°48'30" EAST, 43.23 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 71°27'30" WEST, 359.67 FEET;

THENCE NORTH 54°52'24" WEST, 97.56 FEET ALONG AFOREMENTIONED CERTAIN COURSE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING

CONTAINING 394,599.24 SQUARE FEET (9.059 ACRES) OF LAND, MORE OR LESS,

AND AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "B" ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART OF HEREOF.

______________________________
CLEMENT N. CALVILLO, PE 27743
CNC Engineering
Job No. MP 99-41 Legal No. 1016
Checked by: ___ March 29, 2015
This bill would require a court to implement specified remedies upon a finding that a district-based election was imposed or applied in a manner that impaired the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice. The bill would also direct a court to implement a redistricting plan if it would provide redress, as well as allow the court to increase the size of the governing body upon approval of voters, and/or approving a single member district-based election system that provides the protected class the opportunity to join in a coalition of two or more protected classes to elect candidates of their choice if there is demonstrated political cohesion among the protected classes.

This bill would likely result in increased activity related to the California Voting Rights Act, which has had significant impact on school districts statewide.

**RECOMMENDED POSITION**

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve**  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support**  County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose**  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove**  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would amend the CVRA’s definition of “political subdivision” to expressly include a charter city, charter county, or charter city and county.

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

This bill would likely not have a large impact on Los Angeles County school districts.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**: Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve**: County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support**: County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose**: County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove**: County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require the legislative body of a general law city with a population of 100,000 or more to adopt an ordinance, without voter approval, for the election of the members of the legislative body to be by district.

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

It is not yet clear how this bill would impact Los Angeles County school districts. It may trigger increased activity related to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve**  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support**  County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose**  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove**  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Assembly Bill 480 / Harper

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/23/15

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
05/28/15: Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

Existing law establishes procedures for the reorganization of school districts, including, but not limited to, unifying school districts by consolidating all or part of one or more school districts, as specified. This bill would require the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) to conduct a study of potential benefits and impacts of school district unification. The bill would specify topics to be included in the study.

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

If the study outlined in the bill is conducted by the LAO, it could provide valuable insights for any district, LACOE or the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) in analyzing unification petitions. Much of the bill language focuses on examining the benefits of unification, and that information could be helpful to any school districts considering this move. The County Committee, in its review of unification petitions, is assisted greatly by the availability of neutral analytical information and would likely make great use of the data developed by this study. Further, the County Superintendent of Schools, who serves as the statutory Secretary to the County Committee, may find the information developed by this study to be useful. Another of the points for study emphasized in the bill is the impact of the Local Control Funding Formula on unifications – that issue has been little studied statewide as it has only impacted three districts so far – however, one of those districts is in Los Angeles County (Wiseburn Unified School District).

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

☐ Watch  
Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.

☐ Approve  
County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.

☒ Support  
County Committee actively supports the bill.

☐ Oppose  
County Committee actively opposes the bill.

☐ Disapprove  
County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would establish separate procedural requirements for an action to form a new school district within the boundaries of a single school district within a single county. This bill would authorize an action to be initiated by a petition signed by at least 10% of the number of qualified electors who voted in the last gubernatorial election and who reside within the boundaries of the proposed school district, or by resolution of a local agency. The bill would require the county board of education to hold a public hearing. [emphasis added]

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

This bill as written could potentially substantially impact the school district organization process.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve**  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support**  County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose**  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove**  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
**DESCRIPTION OF BILL**

This bill would establish a state preclearance system for electoral procedures. Under this system, if a covered political subdivision, as defined, enacts or seeks to administer a voting-related law, policy, or regulation, as specified, that is different from that in force or effect on the date this act is enacted, the governing body of the covered political subdivision would be required to submit the law, regulation, or policy to the Secretary of State for approval. The bill would require the Secretary of State to approve the law, regulation, or policy only if specified conditions are met, and it may not take effect unless approved.

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

The bill would likely impact districts seeking to change their governance structure and/or voting procedures.

**RECOMMENDED POSITION**

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch** Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve** County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support** County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose** County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove** County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would authorize the legislative body of a city with 100,000 or fewer in population to adopt an ordinance that requires the members of the body to be elected by district or by district with an elective mayor without being required to submit the ordinance to the voters for approval.

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

It is not yet clear how this bill would impact Los Angeles County school districts. It may trigger increased activity related to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for amendments to the bill language, suggested alternative language is attached.
CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for correspondence to the bill’s author, the Governor or other governmental officials, a draft of suggested language is attached.

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee at (562) 922-6131.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

November 2015

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 October 22, 2015.

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

November 2015

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of October 22, 2015.]

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) AND LAWNDALE SD TO THE WISEBURN USD

On May 15, 2014, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer territory from the Centinela Valley Union HSD and the Lawndale SD to the Wiseburn USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christmas and Mr. Bill Magoon. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On June 20, 2014, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioners on June 23, 2014.

On October 15, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On October 15, 2014, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On November 6, 2014, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder that there were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Staff notified the chief petitioners, who elected to gather additional signatures. On December 4, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted additional signatures, which were submitted to the Registrar-Recorder on December 5, 2014 for signature verification. On December 22, 2014, the Registrar Recorder notified staff that the additional signatures were validated, and the petition did have sufficient signatures to move forward.

The petition was presented to the County Committee on January 7, 2015. Two public hearings were held March 2, 2015, one in each of the affected districts. A feasibility study was presented on July 8, 2015, at which time the County Committee preliminarily approved the transfer, pending further collection and review of additional information, as well as an environmental review.

Status: Additional financial review and environmental study to be conducted.
Status Date: September 22, 2015
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

On July 23, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioner Mr. Seth Jacobson, a community member who is a Malibu resident. Mr. Jacobson, along with two other chief petitioners, wants to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD.

Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on July 27, 2015, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on July 30, 2015, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable. The petition was mailed to the chief petitioner on July 31, 2015, for circulation within the petition area.

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: September 22, 2015

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

On April 8, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven 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 April 27, 2015, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on April 29, 2015, 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 Unified School District (the addition of two governing board members). It was submitted under EC §5020(c) and, based on the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD, requires valid signatures from at least 10% of the registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a vote within the district, before which the County Committee may choose to hold one or more public hearings on the proposal.

Status: Petitioner is gathering signatures.
Status Date: May 26, 2015
FORMATION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

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

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

On March 7, 2006, staff forwarded the draft petition to the Registrar-Recorder for verification that the description of the proposed boundaries of the Altadena USD was sufficiently clear (so that registered voters residing within the proposed petition area could be identified with specificity). The Registrar-Recorder confirmed that the description was sufficient on March 10, 2006.

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

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

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

In August of 2014, staff confirmed that petitioner is still interested in collecting additional signatures.

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

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

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

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

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

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/September 2015
- Glendale USD to La Canada USD/December 2014
- Pasadena USD to La Canada USD/April 2013
- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/August 2015

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- * Saugus SD/September 2015
- *Santa Clarita Community College District/September 2015
- Pomona USD / June 2015

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.