November 15, 2011

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the December 7, 2011, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, December 7, 2011, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 4, 2012.

The following is an update of relevant information as of November 10, 2011:

Staff Activities

- On November 7, 2011, staff processed a transfer of certain territory from the Mount San Antonio Community College District (CCD) to the North Orange County CCD under Education Code (EC) §74104, delivering it to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BOS). This transfer did not require the review of the County Committee. It is anticipated that the matter will be heard by the BOS on November 15, 2011.

- On November 8, 2011, staff mailed the Los Angeles County Office of Education’s (LACOE) Informational Bulletin No. 118 regarding the results of the County Committee member elections held on October 20, 2011, and further action required by the district voting representatives for the At-Large District seat run-off election. Districts were requested to return their absentee ballots by mail or fax by December 2, 2011. Results of the run-off election will be announced at the next regular meeting of the County Committee and via bulletin to all districts.
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- An October 19, 2011, article from Pressdemocrat.com—“Santa Rosa Schools to examine fairness of districtwide elections.” (Attachment 2)

- An October 24, 2011, article from Signon San Diego—“Sweetwater moves closer to election change.” (Attachment 3)

- An October 24, 2011, article from Pressdemocrat.com—“Santa Rosa Schools names panel to examine voting system.” (Attachment 4)

- An October 30, 2011, article from Signon San Diego—“Escondido K-8 district moves to change elections.” (Attachment 5)

**Informational Correspondence**

- A November 1, 2011, Local Agency Formation Commission Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning the City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-22 (North Copperhill). (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
The Press-Enterprise

INLAND: State voting rights law reshapes local elections

BY JIM MILLER

SACRAMENTO BUREAU

jmiller@pe.com

Published: 17 October 2011 06:52 AM

SACRAMENTO — Fresh census data and a state law meant to increase minority representation in local government are fast revamping how people elect members of school boards, city councils and other bodies.

Dozens of cities and school districts around California are of moving from at-large elections, where candidates run across a whole city or school district, to by-district elections, in which candidates run in a particular council ward or trustee area. The goal is to avoid lawsuits related to the California Voting Rights Act.

"It appears we’re seeing the biggest and fastest change in how California government is organized at the local level since the Progressive movement in the early 1900’s," said Douglas Johnson of the Rose Institute at Claremont McKenna College, whose firm has advised agencies around the state.

The trend will have a heavy impact in Inland Southern California. The region experienced huge growth in the Latino population during the past decade, and many local governments — and seemingly every school district — now have at-large elections.

Critics blame at-large elections for disenfranchising Latino voters at the local level because Latino candidates often cannot win across a whole city or district.

"District elections promote good government. They bring local government closer to home," said Robert Rubin, director of litigation for the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area.

Rubin helped write the state voting rights law and has handled many of the cases stemming from it, including a landmark suit against Modesto that yielded a $3 million settlement in 2008. “They shouldn’t have to wait for me to threaten litigation to change,” he said of local agencies.

Many cities and school districts around the state are heeding that advice. There is no exact count, but Johnson said about 40 school districts alone so far have notified the state that they are switching to elections by trustee areas.
“It was put to them that, basically, it was very difficult to maintain the status quo and that other districts have come under legal challenge and sustained substantial legal costs," said Edwin Deas, vice president for business affairs at the College of the Desert, where trustees voted last month to go to trustee area elections.

Unhappy with switch

Some local officials are only grudgingly going along with the change.

“The name of our district is San Jacinto Unified. If we go to five different trustee areas, how is that unified?” said board of trustees president Deborah Rex, who said she felt "bullied" by the threat of litigation. "From everything we’ve been told, we would not win. I just feel like it’s messing us up."

Other agencies have no plans to scrap their at-large election system. Corona Councilman Steve Nolan said he thinks creating council wards would be needlessly divisive in the city of 152,000, where the Latino population grew from 35 percent in 2000 to almost 46 percent a decade later.

The cost of the legal and analytical legwork to change to by-district elections is low compared to potential lawsuit payouts. But doing away with at-large elections is an emotional one for some elected boards, and it can have major implications for officials' political careers.

Rex said she already has moved to a different part of the district to avoid running against board colleagues. In the Riverside Unified School District, where the Board of Education is weighing going to by-trustee area elections, some board members likely would end up grouped together.

Board president Tom Hunt said he wants to make the change but some of his colleagues do not. The county office of education ultimately could force the district to act, he said.

“When you’re at-large, you’re really an enigma. (With trustee areas), you will be accountable to those folks," Hunt said.

Riverside, Moreno Valley, San Bernardino and a few other Inland governments already elect leaders by districts. Officials will be redrawing those boundaries to reflect population changes in the coming months.

Compared to members of Congress and the Legislature, local leaders “are very attuned to doing the right thing” in changing the lines, said John E. Brown, an attorney in Best Best & Krieger’s Ontario office.

Passed in 2002

State lawmakers approved the California Voting Rights Act along party lines in 2002. The law prohibits at-large elections when they hinder the ability of a “protected class” of people, such as Latinos, to elect candidates from their community.
The Modesto case established the law’s constitutionality. Now gigabytes of 2010 census and political data are available to examine if at-large agencies need to switch to by-district elections.

“You see these things coming to a head,” said Democratic consultant Paul Mitchell of Redistricting Partners, who has worked with community college districts and other agencies around the state. “After redistricting is over, there are going to be a lot of people with line-drawing, demographic, and redistricting experience who are going to transition to working on these CVRA lawsuits.”

The state law targets places judged to have “racially polarized voting.” An example of that would be Latino-heavy precincts voting differently from white-heavy precincts in contests with racial or ethnic overtones.

In last year’s June Democratic primary, Assembly colleagues Hector De La Torre, who is Latino, and Dave Jones, who is white, ran for insurance commissioner.

In Corona census blocks that are at least 80 percent Latino, De La Torre got about 58 percent of the vote. In blocks that are at least 80 percent white, De La Torre got about 40 percent of the vote. Riverside Unified had about the same breakdown. The differences could be evidence of racially polarized voting.

“It is very, very clear that in areas with rather significant Hispanic populations, those political subdivisions...will be required to create districts within their geographic boundaries,” said former Riverside County District Attorney Rod Pacheco, who now advises legal clients on complying with the law.

A former Republican member of the state Assembly, Pacheco opposed the bill creating the state voting rights act. At the time, he recalled, lawmakers viewed the legislation as an intra-Democratic squabble among African Americans and Latinos in Los Angeles County.

Officials since have concluded that the law has “rather stunning” implications, Pacheco said. “To wait to get sued is to invite to pay ten times as much,” he said.
Santa Rosa Schools to examine fairness of districtwide elections

By KERRY BENEFIELD
THE PRESS DEMOCRAT
Published: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 at 7:07 p.m.

Sonoma County's largest school district is examining how it elects its school board members as other districts across California move to broaden their representation — and avoid litigation.

Santa Rosa City Schools plans to examine whether the current way trustees are elected disenfranchises minority voters and fails to comply with the California Voting Rights Act.

The district elects its trustees on an at-large basis, meaning they are chosen from across the district and do not represent a particular area.

Currently, all seven members of Santa Rosa's board live on the east side of Highway 101 and three of the seven live in the Fountain Grove hilltop developments.

Five of the seven trustees are white, one is Latino and one is black.

The racial makeup of students in the Santa Rosa district was 47.7 percent white, 37.2 percent Latino, 5.4 percent Asian and 3.2 percent African American in the 2009-10 school year, the most recent numbers available.

Of Santa Rosa's approximately 167,815 residents, 47,970 — 28.6 percent — are Latino.

"We understand that because of the California Voting Rights Act, we need to take a look at our district in reference to areas that we serve and (our) population," said Frank Pugh, the board's longest-serving member and current president.

"I would certainly like to have this thing resolved by early spring," he said.

While the district is not currently under a legal threat, civil rights attorneys statewide have been using the 2002 law to push districts into compliance with regulations that make it illegal to disenfranchise voting groups.

The law opens the door to lawsuits over whether so-called "at large" elections diminish the impact minority voters have on the outcomes.

The Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights has sued districts it claims are cutting minority voices out of the process. It has four active lawsuits in California related to election inequities and "another half a dozen that have been resolved," said Robert Rubin, director of organization's California Voting Rights Institute.

What fair representation looks like may not be obvious, he said.

"The Latino community may elect a black man or an Asian woman. Our argument is at least they have an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice," he said.

Liz Guillen, director of legislative and community for Public Advocates, a non-profit law firm and advocacy group based in Sacramento, echoed the argument.
“Essentially it was to ensure that people of color, minorities, especially Latino and African Americans and other underrepresented folks in school districts, were being represented on their local school boards and that is usually not so when school boards are at-large,” she said.

However, some critics say that area elections promote a provincial attitude in governance.

“The concern you have is more parochialism, 'I worry about my part of town,' instead of the wider city,” said Chris Skinnell, attorney with Nelson, Merksamer, Parrinello, Gross & Leoni of San Rafael.

Moving to area elections may be the only way to avoid litigation, experts on opposite sides in recent suits agreed.

“Certainly it's the safe approach and it's the only way to avoid getting sued,” Skinnell said.

“We are representing two or three dozen that are moving over” to area elections, Skinnell said. “It's partly people being more proactive and partly people being threatened.”

Santa Rosa has not fielded a complaint as to its election practices and is simply being prudent, Pugh said.

“We had no complaint, no letters, no nothing,” he said. “I think maybe it's something you look at so if people do have questions down the road, you have answers.”

Board members also noted that school board elections in recent years have not been competitive.

“Two out of the last four elections, everybody that got on the ballot” won, said Bill Carle, a trustee since 1998. “It's hard to say there is much of a barrier to getting on the school district board.”

Trustee Donna Jeye said the current conversation about changing the structure may generate more interest in running.

“It doesn't seem like these are hotly contested positions and I don't really know what that means,” she said.

Carle supports examining where the district stands — in particular its position as a city-chartered district and whether that affects how elections are governed.

“We need to be out in front of it and understand it and if there is an issue there, we need to resolve it,” he said.

Santa Rosa trustees expressed support for the establishment of a committee to look at the way the district operates.

“In Santa Rosa, we have changing demographics,” said board member Ron Kristof. “I'm very concerned about equity, there is not a question about that.”

Trustee Larry Haemel said the current lineup isn't balanced to reflect the district as a whole.

“Clearly, it's not,” he said.

But the board does not show bias toward or against particular campuses or students, he said.

“I don't really see any favoritism that exists because of the lack of district elections,” he said.
Laura Gonzalez, the board's sole Latino member, praised the board's current configuration.

"I think our board is pretty open," she said. "I think that the board represents kids, staff and administration as best as any board could. I don't know that it would be any better just because we had more diversity on there."

Still, area elections are probably in Santa Rosa City Schools' future, she said.

"I agree with it in principle because I think that Santa Rosa is an especially good example. So many of our elected officials come from one quadrant of the city," she said, noting that she too lives on east side.

"I think it would be better to have more voices from the Latino community, but that doesn't mean it's going to be better," she said. "Belonging to an ethnicity does not mean you are going to be more responsive to that community or vote in any different way on issues."

Trustee Tad Wakefield, who is black, said he has not heard "a ton of citizen fury over it."

Wakefield expressed concern that the lack of competition for seats in recent years is telling.

"I don't think (district elections) would hurt, but at the same time, it's an important position and you want people who are thoughtful and who are not going to just get in and not be the best and most qualified person who is there," he said.

"I don't think what we have currently is a negative to the kids," he said.
Sweetwater moves closer to election change
BY TAWNY MAYA MCCRAY REPORTER - SOUTH COUNTY EDUCATION
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2011 AT 12:50 P.M.

CHULA VISTA — The Sweetwater Union High School District has voted to waive the voter approval requirement for changing its election system.

In September, the board approved moving from an at-large election system, in which all voters in the district choose among all the candidates, to a by-trustee election system, in which the district is divided into sections and voters choose among candidates living in their area. Under the current at-large process, the district is susceptible to being sued under the California Voting Rights Act.

The waiver of election will save the district the expense of holding an additional election, and will allow the new by-trustee area elections to begin in November 2012. Without the waiver the change to by-trustee area elections could not begin until 2014, thus exposing the district to the additional risk of litigation.

The vote Oct. 17 was 3 to 2, with members Bertha Lopez and Pearl Quiñones dissenting. Several community members also opposed.

"I'm not in favor of the waiver, as I believe that all tax payers should have a voice in this decision," Kathleen Cheers said at the meeting.

Roberto Alcantar, a 2005 Sweetwater High graduate, agreed the public should have the right to be part of the process.

"This is not something simple we're looking at, this is complex," he said. "This is deciding how the people that are going to shape the future of our children are going to be elected."

During the meeting the board also approved five criteria for drawing the new trustee areas for elections. Again the vote was 3 to 2, with Lopez and Quiñones opposed.

The decision was based on federal laws, traditional criteria accepted by the state, and San Diego County Office of Education recommendations. The five include: the areas will be compact and contiguous; the boundary lines will follow visible geographic features; the areas will be considerable of community interest; the areas will ensure continuity in office such that no two current trustees are paired in the same area; and the areas may take into account future growth in underpopulated and overpopulated areas.

National Demographics Corp. will draw two to four different versions of new trustee areas for the district to consider.

Attendee Stewart Payne said he supports trustee areas but was concerned about how they'll be divvied up. Payne said he was especially concerned with the criteria that states no two current trustees are paired in the same area. Lopez, who is up for re-election in 2012 and Arlie Ricasa, up for re-election in 2014, live roughly three blocks from one another.

"Certain board members will be protected depending on how the lines are drawn," Payne said.

Santa Rosa Schools names panel to examine voting system

By KERRY NINGRUD
THE PRESS DEMOCRAT
Published: Monday, October 24, 2011 at 3:00 a.m.

Santa Rosa City Schools has named three trustees to a subcommittee charged with examining whether the district's current voting system is fair to minority voters.

Board member Bill Carle will chair the committee and trustees Laura Gonzalez and Tad Wakefield will also be on the three-person group.

Sonoma County's largest district has historically held at-large elections, meaning they are chosen from across the district and do not represent a particular area.

The current board includes one member who is Latino and a board member who is black. All seven board members live on the east side of Santa Rosa.

Statewide, districts that have elected trustees in a similar fashion have encountered legal challenges under the California Voting Rights Act.

School board president Frank Pugh said he expects the group to meet with an attorney and potentially a demographer before coming back to the full board with a report next spring.

Copyright © 2011 PressDemocrat.com — All rights reserved. Restricted use only.
Escondido K-8 district moves to change elections

BY MICHELLE BEEBER REPORTER - NORTH COUNTY

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED OCTOBER 30, 2011 AT NOON, UPDATED OCTOBER 31, 2011 AT 9:06 A.M.

ESCONDIDO — The Escondido Union School District board agreed to start a transition that would change trustee elections, a response to lawsuits filed against school districts around the state alleging violations of the California Voting Rights Act.

The board of the K-8 district unanimously approved a resolution Thursday night to start the process of electing trustees by area, instead of districtwide, after some small but pointed wording changes to the document by board President Linda Woods.

The city's high school district took a similar step earlier this month. Vista Unified agreed to voter districts and is farther along in the process. Vista trustees approved a boundary map Oct. 6.

Area trustee elections could begin in November 2012. Current board members would be allowed to serve out their terms.

The district's next steps will be to work with a demographer and attorney Peter Fagen, who is advising the district on the issue, to draw suggested trustee-area boundary maps and hold public forums for input.

The board hired National Demographics Corp. to study whether racially polarized voting existed in Escondido Union school board elections. School board seats do not represent specific geographic areas. Trustees are elected at-large, meaning all voters within the district's boundaries can vote for any candidate.

The California Voting Rights Act of 2002 says that an at-large election system may be challenged if analysis shows minority representation is restricted. Lawsuits have been filed by two attorneys who helped craft the law.

Trustees will seek a waiver to avoid an expensive election and to speed up the process. The decision to change the way trustees are elected would not go before voters.

Wording changes approved in the resolution included removing a statement that indicated it was the board's opinion that the public "will be better served" by trustee-area elections. Also, Woods wanted to make the resolution clear that the board's desire is to reduce any potential legal liability related to the Voting Rights Act and protect district finances.

Trustee Joan Gardner said she was conflicted on the issue, particularly taking away decision-making power from the voters.

"Saying you may now only vote for one (trustee), that's a momentous step," Gardner said. "To protect the interests of the district it must be done, but I don't feel good about it."

Trustee Marv Gilbert, concerned about the waiver, asked Fagen whether the district still could face a Voting Rights Act lawsuit if it did hold an election and voters rejected a change to area elections. Fagen said yes.

Woods said she hopes that any future school board candidates recognize that although they are elected by a smaller group of voters, they are responsible for representing all children in the district.

Trustee Marty Hranek, the newest member of the board, expressed no qualms about the decision.

"I believe in the Voting Rights Act and I believe it can only have a positive impact on the district," he said. "Resisting it only sets us back."
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NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

The Honorable Michael Antonovich
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
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
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Newhall County Water District
Sheriff Department – Enforcement Bureau

Subject: City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-22 (North Copperhill)

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 2,473 ± acres of inhabited, unincorporated county territory. The proposal area is generally located east of San Francisquito Canyon Road, south of the Angeles National Forest boundary, north of the City of Santa Clarita boundary limit, and west of Bouquet Canyon Road. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

City or District          Organizational Changes
City of Santa Clarita     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 November 30, 2011. If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (818) 254-2454.

Date: November 1, 2011

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

700 N. Central Avenue
Glendale, CA 91203
Phone: 818.254-2454
Fax: 818.254-2452
www.lafco.org
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:** 2011-22 (North Copperhill Annexation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED AGENCIES (Cities and/or Special Districts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. City of Santa Clarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES (Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: **✓ RESOLUTION**  [ ] LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

**APPLICANT:** City of Santa Clarita

**TITLE:** City Manager

**CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER:** Kenneth R. Pulskamp

**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: 10/31/2011

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 2,473 acres of land generally located east of San Francisquito Canyon Road, south of the Angeles National Forest boundary, north of the existing City of Santa Clarita corporate limit, and west of Bouquet Canyon Road. The annexation area also includes an area generally south of Bouquet Canyon Road, east of the existing City limits, north of Plum Canyon Road, and west of Santa Catarina Drive, inclusive of the residences on the east side of the street. Major streets in the annexation area include Bouquet Canyon Road and Copperhill Drive. Plum Canyon Road provides a boundary for that portion of the annexation area that is located in the vicinity of Plum Canyon.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

2,473 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 annexation area consists of established neighborhoods and undeveloped land. There are 3,181 homes, a neighborhood shopping center, three County parks, three elementary schools, two County probation camps, publicly-owned open space parcels, three electric transmission corridors, two aqueducts, and the Dry Canyon Reservoir site. There are no redevelopment areas within the project area. Two Los Angeles County probation camps are also included in the annexation area (Camp Scott and Camp Scudder).

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

The territory is a mix of established single-family neighborhoods, undeveloped hillsides, and canyons. Bouquet Creek is the primary water course in the area. Other drainages include Seco Canyon, Haskell Canyon, and Plum Canyon. The territory also contains publicly-owned open space parcels north of Copperhill Drive. The Angeles National Forest and the City of Santa Clarita limits form logical boundaries on the north and south. San Francisquito Canyon bounds the area on the west, although properties with the County's San Francisquito Special Standards Area were not included in the annexation territory. Santa Catarina Drive forms the eastern boundary of the annexation area, inclusive of those homes on the east side of the street.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 9,543 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. 6,222

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 3,285 (estimated)

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

Developed neighborhoods in the City of Santa Clarita are located directly south of the project area. City and County neighborhoods blend together, are indistinguishable from each other, and are commonly referred to jointly as the community of Saugus. Established neighborhoods in unincorporated Los Angeles County are located east of the project site in the Plum Canyon area. Rural horse properties are located west of the site in San Francisquito Canyon, and the undeveloped Angeles National Forest is located directly north of the annexation area.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

In addition to the 3,181 existing homes, another 132 homes have been tentatively approved in the project area by Los Angeles County under three tentative tract maps. Aside from those tentative maps, it is unlikely that other significant growth would occur in the project area because the vast majority of remaining undeveloped land is designated as open space and is publicly owned.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

According to County Assessor records, there are an estimated 3,181 single family homes in the annexation 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. No development is proposed as part of the annexation and the City will continue its effort to meet 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?

The project would not result in any negative impacts to lower-income communities. The proposal seeks to annex primarily developed areas and the annexation boundary was determined based on natural and jurisdictional factors without regard to race, culture, or income.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$449,633,438 (LA County Tax Assessor, 2011)

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

Under the County’s Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, the current land-use designation for the subject area is HM, N2, O-P, P, U1, U2, U3, and W. Under Los Angeles County zoning, the subject area is zoned A-A-1, A-A-1 DP, A-2-1, A-2-2, C-2- DP, R-1-5000, R-1-7000, R-1-10000 DP, RPD-1-3.0U, RPD-50003.5U, RPD-5000-4U, RPD-5000-4.5U, RPD-6000-4U, RPD-6000-5.9U, and RPD-10000-1.9U.

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

The area’s existing residential, open space, institutional, and commercial uses would continue without change.
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 Commercial Neighborhood (CN), Open Space (OS), Residential Estate (RE), Residential Suburban (RS), and Residential Very Low (RVL). The prezoning is consistent with the City of Santa Clarita General Plan. The prezone reflects the existing conditions of the project area. The annexation would not change the nature, character, or use of the annexation area.

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

North: Angeles National Forest and rural agricultural properties (County)
East: Rural agricultural and undeveloped land in Bouquet Canyon (County) and developed suburban neighborhoods in Plum Canyon (County)
South: Developed single-family homes and suburban neighborhoods in Saugus (City of Santa Clarita)
West: Rural properties in San Francisquito Canyon (County)

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 Commercial Neighborhood (CN), Non-Urban Residential 2 (NU2), Non-Urban Residential 3 (NU3), Non-Urban (NU3), Non-Urban Residential 5 (NU5), Open Space (OS), Open Space-Bureau of Land Management (OS-BLM), Public Institution (PI), Urban Residential 1 (UR1), and Urban Residential 2 (UR2) under the City's General Plan. These designations reflect the existing uses and conditions in the annexation area.

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 because it supports policies that direct growth into established areas while preventing sprawl into undeveloped areas without existing infrastructure. The proposal is also consistent with the County's proposed Santa Clarita Valley Area 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).

This proposal will not result in development of property now or in the future. The vast majority of the project area has already been developed and more than 500 acres is owned by the City of Santa Clarita for open space purposes. Additional homes may be allowed on those vacant parcels that are appropriate for development such as the three tentative tract maps that have been approved by the County. Such development, however, is currently allowed and would not be encouraged or impeded by the potential annexation.

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 in the subject area. The established neighborhoods would remain, public agencies would continue to own open space acreage, and public facilities (schools, utility corridors, parks, probation camps, etc.) would continue to operate.
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 active agricultural lands in the annexation area. The City of Santa Clarita owns approximately 510 acres of public open space in the project area, and another 300 acres (approximate) are designated as Open Space, either as park facilities or open space corridors. Since the proposal is consistent with the proposed County land use designations and includes areas that are primarily developed or designated as open space, the proposal would not have any affect on agriculture or open space lands in the annexation area.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

In July 2008, the City received a letter from the Pacific Crest Homeowners Association requesting annexation to the City. In response to that letter and other requests, the City established a project area and surveyed the residents. An overwhelming 87% of respondents supported annexation. The annexation would bring existing, established neighborhoods into the City and create a more logical boundary (many residents in the project area mistakenly assume that they already live in the City). The annexation will simplify government services for residents by providing those services locally in the Santa Clarita Valley. Additionally, the annexation would zone 510 City-owned parcels as Open Space. The annexation would ensure that these open space parcels are preserved indefinitely. 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 impact on adjacent areas. Agencies that provide services to adjacent areas, such as fire, police, and schools, 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:

Concerning social interests, the majority of residents who were surveyed support annexation. The annexation would bring existing, cohesive communities into one jurisdictional boundary. The annexation would also ensure that the City-owned open space parcels would remain undeveloped in perpetuity. 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 in 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 Saugus Union and William S. Hart Union High School Districts. This districts would be unaffected by the annexation. Upon annexation, the people in the established neighborhoods 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. The territory would not require new fire or police facilities. The annexation would not require new recreation facilities, nor would the annexation change or impact the existing school districts that provide education services to the established neighborhoods. Given that the purpose of the proposed annexation is to bring existing neighborhoods into the City and to preserve City-owned 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 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 the North Copperhill area 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 residences and to administer the open space acreage. The purpose of the annexation is to bring established areas into the City and 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 primarily contains established, fully developed neighborhoods as well as open space acreage that is already owned and maintained by the City, 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 as the annexation would not result in additional residents beyond those who already reside in the annexation area.

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 $29 per year per single-family residence
2) Stormwater Facility Maintenance: approximately $23 per year per single-family residence
3) Landscape Maintenance District 2008-1: approximately $60 per year per single-family residence
4) Streetlight Maintenance District: approximately $73 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 [X] Name of Agency City of Santa Clarita 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?

   There are no known communities of social or economic interest within the subject territory. The vast majority of the area consists of established, fully developed neighborhoods, utility corridors, public facilities, and natural open space. Adjacent developed neighborhoods are located in the City of Santa Clarita and other unincorporated neighborhoods are located east of the annexation area in the vicinity of Plum Canyon.

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).

   No Sphere of Influence amendment is proposed. In a letter dated July 19, 2011, the County of Los Angeles concurred that the boundary of the annexation area 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?

Not 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.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Jarvis</td>
<td>23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355</td>
<td>(661) 255-4330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hogan</td>
<td>23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355</td>
<td>(661) 255-4330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 North Copperhill 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 108 which is located within the annexation territory.

2. Is annexation to a County Fire Protection District part of this request?  
   [ ] Yes  [x] 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  [x] No
If yes, please give details.

Not applicable.

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 to be provided by the Flood Control District and the County Department of Public Works. City Stormwater staff would also be involved, inspecting and maintaining non-County storm drain facilities.

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

Services would continue without interruption.

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. These 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 $23 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. The nearest County library facilities are located in Castaic. Interim library services are also offered by the County in Stevenson Ranch.

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.

Upon annexation, the City of Santa Clarita will provide library services to the area. The nearest City libraries are located in Canyon Country and Valencia. City libraries are open seven days a week and will provide a greater level of service to residents than they currently receive.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? **Upon annexation.**

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 ad valorem property tax. The City may also provide other monies for specific library projects at the direction of the City Council, such as the current construction of a new library building in Newhall.

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.**

---

**Park and Recreational Services**

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

   Current park services are provided by Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation and by the City of Santa Clarita. Park services at both County and City parks are currently available to residents regardless if they live within the City limits or in unincorporated areas.

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 to be provided. Indicate any changes in service level.

   **Upon annexation, residents will be served by the City of Santa Clarita for parks and recreation services. Three County parks are located in the annexation area and would likely be transferred to the City. The City would also continue to maintain the public open space acreage that it owns in the annexation 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 are provided through general fund monies and program registration fees.

5. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request?  

   - Yes  
   - No
If yes, please give details.

Three County parks are located in the proposed annexation area: David March Park, Copperhill Park, and Pacific Crest Park. As part of the annexation process, these parks would be transferred to the City for maintenance and upkeep.

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.

   Currently, road maintenance services are provided by the County of Los Angeles. Upon annexation, road maintenance services (traffic engineering, street sweeping, etc.) would be provided by the City of Santa Clarita.

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.

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.

   A typical requirement from the County during the tax transfer discussion is the withdrawal of public streets from County Road District #5. Easements for public streets will transfer from the County to the City upon annexation. Private streets would not be affected by the 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 County Street Lighting Districts 1687 and LLA-1 provide street light maintenance. The annexation area is located within the County's Landscape Maintenance District zones 20, 44, 48, 62, 67, 71, and 72.

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 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 annual assessments are approximate and would be applied to the subject territory upon annexation: Open Space Preservation District- $29 per year per single-family home; Stormwater Facility Maintenance- $23 per single-family residence per year; Landscape Maintenance District - approximately $60 per year per single-family residence; and Street Light Maintenance District - $73 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.

Street lighting services are currently provided by the County of Los Angeles Street Lighting Districts LLA-1 and 1687. Upon annexation, the territory would be withdrawn/excluded from these districts.

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 annexation 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, walk 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. The current assessment is $73 annually for a single-family home.
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?

   Approval of the annexation would not result in an increase in water usage because no development is proposed nor would result from this annexation.

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 served by the Castaic Lake Water Agency (including the Santa Clarita Water Division), Newhall County Water District, and Valencia Water Company. No change will occur to water availability or agency service areas as a result of this annexation. The existing water purveyors will continue to service their respective areas upon 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 proposed annexation area is served by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts.

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

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, provide details.
   Not applicable.

5. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.)
   Annexation will not affect wastewater services in the subject territory. Should parcels be annexed into the LA County Sanitation Districts in the future, wastewater service would be funded through an annual tax assessment and annexation fee.

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, provide details.
   Not applicable.
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ANNEXATION NO. 2011- TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
"NORTH COPPER HILL"

Those portions of Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, Township 4 North, Range 15 West and those portions of Sections 1 and 2, Township 4 North, Range 16 West and those portions of Section 31, Township 5 North, Range 15 West and those portions of Sections 35 and 36, Township 5 North, Range 16 West, all of San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of said Section 6; thence (L1) along the east line of said Section 6 South 01°49'09" East 2321.64 feet to a point on the centerline of Bouquet Canyon Road as shown on map of Tract No. 35157 filed in Book 1095 pages 48 to 55 inclusive, of Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County; thence (L2) along said centerline South 50°53’56" West 320.18 feet to a point on the north line of the southeast quarter of said Section 6; thence (L3) along said north line North 89°47’35" East 254.85 feet to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of said Section 5; thence (L4) along the north line of said southwest quarter of Section 5 South 89°07’07" East 1272.62 feet to the east line of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said Section 5; thence (L5) along last said east line South 02°18’54" West 1315.34 feet to the south line of last said northwest quarter of the southwest quarter; thence (L6) along last said south line North 88°58’38" West 1176.06 feet to the northwesterly corner of Lot 170 of Tract No. 46258 as shown on map filed in Book 1141 pages 1 to 12 inclusive, of said Maps; thence
(L7) along the southwesterly and northwesterly lines of said Lot 170 as follows, South 01°01'22" East 14.73 feet; thence

(L8) South 46°47'19" East 334.06 feet; thence

(L9) South 56°22'51" East 117.00 feet; thence

(L10) South 60°59'37" East 697.63 feet; thence

(L11) South 27°39'09" West 367.49 feet; thence

(L12) South 78°56'48" West 159.84 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 170 on the northeasterly line of Santa Catarina Road as shown on said map of Tract No. 46268 and as shown on map of Tract No. 46269 filed in Book 1234 pages 50 to 61 inclusive, of said Maps; thence

(L13) along last said northeasterly line South 07°50'51" East 82.05 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 468.00 feet; thence

(L14) continuing along last said northeasterly line and southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 29°49'26" an arc distance of 243.61 feet; thence

(L15) continuing along last said northeasterly line and tangent to last said curve South 37°40'17" East 69.60 feet to the northwesterly corner of Lot 116 of said Tract No. 46269; thence

(L16) along the northwesterly line of said Lot 116 North 78°56'48" East 141.34 feet to the northeasterly corner of said Tract No. 46269; thence

(L17) along the easterly line of said Tract No. 46269 as follows, South 28°44'30" East 341.35 feet; thence

(L18) South 03°11'26" East 60.00 feet; thence

(L19) South 09°38'05" East 66.58 feet; thence

(L20) South 00°24'16" West 192.94 feet to the southeasterly corner of Lot 108 of said Tract No. 46269; thence

(L21) South 18°33'29" West 64.00 feet along last said easterly line to an angle point therein on the northeasterly line of Lot 107 of said Tract No. 46269 on a curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 318.00 feet through which last said course is radial; thence
(C22) southeasterly along last said curve and along said northeasterly line through a central angle of 1°50'01" an arc distance of 10.18 feet to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 107; thence 
(L23) continuing along said easterly line of Tract No. 46269 the following three courses, South 15°32'38" West 156.15 feet; thence 
(L24) South 22°21'52" West 58.16 feet; thence 
(L25) South 31°31'58" West 165.85 feet; thence 
(L26) continuing along said easterly line of Tract No. 46269 and along the easterly line of Tract No. 46270 as shown on map filed in Book 1234 pages 40 to 49 inclusive, of said Maps as follows, South 38°18'20" West 485.49 feet; thence 
(L27) South 25°11'07" West 140.33 feet; thence 
(L28) South 13°07'35" West 61.44 feet; thence 
(L29) South 07°52'46" West 50.91 feet; thence 
(L30) South 07°33'05" West 174.40 feet; thence 
(L31) South 04°48'44" West 43.09 feet; thence 
(L32) South 01°33'43" East 345.76 feet to the southeasterly corner of Lot 78 of said Tract No. 46270 being a point on the northerly line of Plum Canyon Road as shown on said map of Tract No. 46270 and as shown on map of Tract No. 31158 filed in Book 1246 pages 20 to 24 inclusive, of said Maps and as shown on map of Tract No. 44966 filed in Book 1140 pages 78 to 86 inclusive, of said Maps; thence 
(L33) South 08°26'58" East 50.00 feet to a point on the centerline of said Plum Canyon Road being a point on a curve concave northerly having a radius of 3100.00 feet, to which last said course is radial; thence 
(C34) westerly along last said centerline and said curve as follows, through a central angle of 12°50'36" an arc distance of 694.89 feet; thence 
(L35) tangent to last said curve North 85°36'22" West 445.21 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 1200.00 feet; thence
(C36) northwesterly along last said curve and said centerline of Plum Canyon Road through a central angle of 33°12′30″ an arc distance of 695.51 feet; thence

(L37) tangent to last said curve and along last said centerline of Plum Canyon Road North 52°23′52″ West 273.94 feet to the northerly terminus of that course shown as North 37°36′08″ East 3.94 feet (D2) on said map of Tract No. 44966; thence

(L38) along last said course South 37°36′08″ West 3.94 feet to an angle point in the boundary of said Tract No. 44966 and an angle point in the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on May 10, 2011; thence

(L39) along said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita North 49°12′30″ West 15.04 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 2000.00 feet; thence

(C40) continuing along said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita along the following courses and curves, northwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of 16°55′51″ an arc distance of 591.00 feet to the southwesterly corner of said Tract No. 44966; thence

(L41) North 16°32′26″ East 243.20 feet; thence

(L42) North 16°49′46″ East 60.00 feet; thence

(L43) North 73°10′14″ West 37.50 feet; thence

(L44) North 16°49′52″ East 127.21 feet; thence

(L45) North 88°26′06″ West 28.00 feet; thence

(L46) North 04°00′54″ West 104.47 feet; thence

(L47) North 05°29′16″ West 64.00 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 468.00 feet to which last said course is radial; thence

(C48) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 00°18′22″ an arc distance of 2.50 feet; thence

(L49) non-tangent to last said curve North 02°00′16″ West 183.57 feet; thence

(L50) South 89°07′48″ East 36.60 feet; thence

(L51) North 79°06′57″ East 81.07 feet; thence
(L52) North 72°47'10" East 82.48 feet; thence
(L53) North 26°58'32" West 105.08 feet to a point on a non-tangent curve
concaive northwesterly having a radius of 230.00 feet, a radial line
through last said point bears North 26°49'15" West; thence
(C54) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of
15°51'48" an arc distance of 63.68 feet; thence
(L55) radial to last said curve North 42°41'03" West 60.00 feet; thence
(L56) North 43°14'54" West 155.38 feet; thence
(L57) North 22°23'31" West 120.88 feet; thence
(L58) North 07°40'37" West 343.94 feet; thence
(L59) North 00°10'01" East 251.00 feet; thence
(L60) North 25°44'30" East 1148.04 feet; thence
(L61) North 02°16'50" East 1316.37 feet; thence
(L62) South 89°47'35" West 778.83 feet; thence
(L63) North 00°08'41" East 1350.83 feet; thence
(L64) North 89°34'15" West 600.00 feet; thence
(L65) North 89°32'51" West 1009.75 feet; thence
(L66) South 03°58'47" West 893.37 feet; thence
(L67) continuing along said City boundary South 66°29'31" West 89.98 feet
to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of
1500.00 feet; thence
(C68) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 54°47'04"
an arc distance of 1434.25 feet; thence
(L69) non-tangent to last said curve South 00°16'53" East 540.98 feet; thence
(L70) South 00°15'27" East 2644.81 feet; thence
(L71) South 89°41'16" West 500.31 feet; thence
(L72) North 00°16'04" West 555.00 feet; thence
(L73) South 89°41'16" West 826.54 feet; thence
(L74) South 00°16'21" East 555.00 feet; thence
(L75) South 89°41'16" West 1179.60 feet; thence
(L76) North 11°26'31" West 144.73 feet; thence
(L77) North 09°41'54" East 593.86 feet; thence
(L78) North 26°22'18" West 95.23 feet; thence
(L79) North 10°10'25" East 551.01 feet; thence
(L80) North 89°32'43" West 360.48 feet to a point at the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 1540.00 feet, a radial line through said point bears North 85°14'50" West; thence
(C81) northerly along said curve through a central angle of 5°27'16" an arc distance of 146.60 feet; thence
(L82) tangent to said curve North 00°42'06" West 506.63 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly having a radius of 5240.00 feet; thence
(C83) northerly along last said curve through a central angle of 01°55'26" an arc distance of 175.95 feet; thence
(L84) tangent to last said curve North 01°13'20" East 462.74 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 27.00 feet; thence
(C85) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 89°59'56" an arc distance of 42.41 feet; thence
(L86) tangent to last said curve South 88°46'44" East 36.32 feet; thence
(L87) North 00°17'49" West 40.01 feet; thence
(L88) North 88°45'09" West 1661.84 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southerly having a radius of 1200.00 feet; thence
(C89) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 20°30'25" an arc distance of 429.50 feet; thence
(L90) tangent to last said curve South 70°44'26" West 370.97 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1800.00 feet; thence
(C91) southwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of 28°03'31" an arc distance of 881.49 feet to the beginning of a tangent compound curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 1100.00 feet; thence
(C92) northwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of 24°21'53" an arc distance of 467.77 feet; thence
(L93) tangent to last said curve North 56°50'10" West 235.60 feet; thence
(L94) North 89°50'41" West 1360.92 feet; thence
(L95) North 00°26'10" West 2472.24 feet; thence
(L96) North 88°34'55" East 1264.78 feet; thence
(L97) North 06°12'05" West 1518.70 feet to the beginning of a tangent
curve concave easterly having a radius of 229.05 feet; thence
(C98) northerly along last said curve through a central angle of
02°55'53" an arc distance of 11.72 feet; thence
(L99) tangent to last said curve North 03°16'12" West 1519.17 feet to the
beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly having a radius of 229.05
feet; thence
(C100) northerly along last said curve through a central angle of
21°38'38" an arc distance of 86.53 feet; thence
(L101) tangent to last said curve North 18°22'26" East 277.38 feet;
thence
(L102) South 89°40'12" West 1104.39 feet; thence
(L103) South 89°40'05" West 448.62 feet
(L104) South 04°25'40" East 116.00 feet to the beginning of a tangent
curve concave easterly having a radius of 400.00 feet; thence
(C105) southerly along last said curve through a central angle of
15°50'15" an arc distance of 110.57 feet; thence
(L106) non-tangent to last said curve South 65°54'19" West 123.42 Feet;
thence
(L107) South 24°09'52" East 8.42 feet; thence
(L108) South 66°09'30" West 17.44 feet to the beginning of a tangent
curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 380.00 feet; thence
(C109) southwesterly along last said curve through a central angle of
14°30'52" an arc distance of 96.26 feet; thence
(L110) non-tangent to last said curve North 39°06'27" West 48.45 feet;
thence
(L111) North 47°53'50" West 34.57 feet; thence
(L112) North 68°55'14" West 53.21 feet; thence
(L113) South 47°07'15" West 31.65 feet; thence
(L114) North 44°06'22" West 102.12 feet; thence
(L115) North 34°34'02" West 110.22 feet; thence
(L116) South 09°40'42" West 76.51 feet; thence
(L117) South 37°03'27" West 22.78 feet; thence
(L118) North 51°26'59" West 137.92 feet; thence
(L119) North 84°02'39" West 59.61 feet; thence
(L120) South 76°54'14" West 245.10 feet; thence
(L121) South 00°06'34" East 519.60 feet; thence
(L122) South 89°27'20" West 275.50 Feet; thence
(L123) South 02°58'43" West 81.39 feet; thence
(L124) North 67°57'22" West 30.00 Feet; thence
(L125) South 54°45'37" West 29.25 feet; thence
(L126) North 67°02'10" West 33.94 feet; thence
(L127) South 87°07'15" West 29.94 feet; thence
(L128) South 57°56'51" West 31.34 feet; thence
(L129) South 31°09'31" West 75.06 feet; thence
(L130) North 76°35'56" West 118.81 feet; thence
(L131) North 83°21'51" West 142.75 feet; thence
(L132) South 81°08'03" West 240.44 feet; thence
(L133) South 21°48'57" West 36.69 feet; thence
(L134) South 23°34'21" East 171.50 feet; thence
(L135) South 44°04'57" West 414.07 feet; thence
(L136) South 89°39'57" West 126.55 feet to an angle point in said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita at the southwesterly corner of Tract No. 46564-03 as shown on map filed in Book 1227 pages 12 to 17 inclusive, of said Maps; thence
(L137) leaving said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita and along the westerly line of said Tract No. 46564-03 North 00°20'03" West 628.59 feet to an angle point therein at the west quarter corner of said Section 35; thence
(L138) continuing along last said westerly line North 00°19'54" West 162.85 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 4 of said Tract No. 46564-03; thence
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-DECEMBER 2011

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 1252/Davis
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
05/03/11: In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

December 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 November 10, 2011.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

South Gate SD-Los Angeles USD/October 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

None

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals  
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)  

December 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 November 10, 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 staff that the petition would be heard in November 2003.  

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On April 27, 2004, LACOE received a copy of the CDE’s final feasibility study. On April 29, 2004, LACOE received notice from the CDE that the petition hearing had been delayed indefinitely at the request of the Wiseburn SD. Subsequently, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE hear the petition, along with its request for two waivers. A hearing was scheduled for July 7, 2004. On July 7, 2004, staff was notified by the CDE that Centinela Valley UHSD requested a delay in review by the SBE. Wiseburn SD agreed to withdraw its petition for consideration before the SBE to accommodate additional review requested by Centinela Valley UHSD. Subsequent to granting this delay, legal counsel to Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD presented additional information (at the CDE’s request) regarding the legality of Wiseburn SD residents maintaining responsibility to pay Centinela Valley UHSD’s tax obligations following any unification of a Wiseburn SD.

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen Steentoft, Chief Counsel for the SBE, recommended that certain waivers submitted with the Wiseburn SD petition could be determined by the SBE at the time of the hearing. Subsequently, the CDE rescheduled the petition to be heard before the SBE on September 9, 2004.

On September 9, 2004, staff attended the SBE hearing. CDE staff recommended that the SBE adopt the proposal approving the petition to form a Wiseburn USD and to set the election area as the area of the Wiseburn SD only on the condition that the property owners within the Wiseburn SD retain current levels of responsibility for repayment of existing bonded indebtedness of the Centinela Valley UHSD upon successful formation of a Wiseburn USD. The SBE voted unanimously to approve the proposal and established that territory within the Wiseburn SD be the area of election. Statutory requirements provided that, following approval by the SBE, an election shall be called on the next available regular election date (March 8, 2005) in the territory determined by the SBE.

On October 19, 2004, at the direction of the SBE, the County Superintendent forwarded an order for special election to the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s (Registrar-Recorder) office, to be held in conjunction with the March 8, 2005, regular election. A ballot measure to approve or disapprove the formation of a Wiseburn USD and to elect a governing board was to be placed before the electorate. The election was scheduled to be held within the boundaries of the proposed Wiseburn USD. If the matter had received approval at that election, the new district would have been scheduled to become effective July 1, 2006.

On November 1, 2004, staff received a copy of a lawsuit filed by the Centinela Valley UHSD against the SBE, seeking to vacate approval of Wiseburn SD’s petition to unify based on lack of compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regulations. On November 18, 2004, staff received a copy of a second lawsuit filed in this matter, citing flaws in the legality of the SBE’s decisions and naming additional parties, including the County Committee, as defendants in the matter. The Centinela Valley UHSD, Wiseburn SD, and SBE began negotiations to delay the election in order to revisit the issues underlying the petition and subsequent lawsuits. The SBE requested that the County Superintendent delay the election to allow for this negotiation process to run its course. Staff consulted with the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (County Counsel) and was advised that neither the County Superintendent nor the SBE could order a delay of the election.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On Friday, December 10, 2004, in the case of Centinela Valley UHSD (Petitioners) vs. the SBE, the Los Angeles Superior Court (Court) issued a preliminary injunction barring the conduct of the March 8, 2005, scheduled election regarding the formation of the Wiseburn USD. The Petitioners also contacted the Court and requested that the Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Injunction) scheduled for December 13, 2004, vs. the County Committee and County Superintendent, be taken off the calendar. The Petitioners stated that they would consult with the Court’s clerk to re-schedule. This action was taken because the Petitioners received the Injunction that day. A hearing on the motion was scheduled for March 30, 2005. Staff received notice from County Counsel that both the County Committee and the County Superintendent were dropped as parties to the lawsuit in which they were named.

On January 6, 2005, County Counsel met with the County Committee in closed session to discuss the lawsuit. Later at the same meeting, Dr. Don Brann, then Superintendent of Wiseburn SD, appeared before the County Committee to inform them that the SBE would withdraw its approval of the petition, pending a negotiation with Petitioners and attorneys for Centinela Valley UHSD. On January 13, 2005, the CDE withdrew its recommendation to the SBE to approve the Wiseburn USD petition and order the election to be conducted within the territory of the Wiseburn SD. Staff at the CDE informed LACOE staff that they intended to redo the review process related to CEQA and to return the petition to the SBE for action at a later time (not to the County Committee). Subsequently, the SBE rescinded its previous approval of the Wiseburn SD’s unification petition.

On March 13, 2007, the California Department of General Services issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), under CEQA. The CDE held a CEQA scoping hearing on March 28, 2007, within the Wiseburn SD. Staff attended this meeting. A comment period was set by the SBE for March 13, 2007, to April 12, 2007. On April 24, 2007, staff was notified by the SBE that the CEQA comment period had been extended to May 15, 2007, due to a request made at the scoping hearing.

On July 7, 2008, staff received a copy of the draft EIR from Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, prepared on behalf of the CDE, which is the lead agency for CEQA reviews and thus responsible for completing any environmental review. A comment period for the draft EIR was opened from July 7, 2008, to August 21, 2008. A public hearing on the EIR was held on July 22, 2008, in the Wiseburn SD.

On April 15, 2009, staff provided follow-up information to the CDE regarding the financial status of the Centinela Valley UHSD. The CDE included this material in its updated feasibility study for the SBE.

On October 22, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE was scheduled for the SBE’s January 7-8, 2010, meeting. On December 8, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would not be heard until March 11, 2010. On January 6, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would not be heard until some time in July 2010. On March 25, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would be heard at the May 12-13, 2010, meeting of the SBE. On April 30, 2010, the CDE issued its revised feasibility study on the Wiseburn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently,
there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Status: Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD discussing proposed agreement and possible legislation with Centinela Valley UHSD.

Status Date: November 8, 2011

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

On August 18, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 27, 2010, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 30, 2010, for circulation.

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

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

The petition was presented to the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting. The Secretary communicated that the Pomona USD was currently studying the issue of trustee areas in light of the California Voting Rights Act and may develop a plan to implement them prior to any public hearing on this petition. The Secretary has communicated this information to the chief petitioner as well. Staff will inform the County Committee of the district's progress at the next meeting and make plans to study the petition proposal and schedule a public hearing within the Pomona USD boundaries.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY FROM THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (CCD) TO THE NORTH ORANGE COUNTY CCD

On September 6, 2011, LACOE staff received notice of a petition to transfer certain territory currently within the Mount San Antonio CCD to the North Orange County CCD. The petition was presented via resolutions by the board of trustees of both colleges. Under EC §74104, if a territory petitioned for transfer contains less than five percent of the adult age population of a district, it is considered a “minor” transfer of territory and does not require review by the County Committee. The Education Code requires a review by the County Superintendent and the petition is then forwarded directly to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) for both impacted counties (in this case, Los Angeles and Orange Counties). Staff discussed this petition with the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting to provide information on its progress. Staff submitted the petition to the Los Angeles County BOS on November 7, 2011. It is expected that the petition will be heard by the Los Angeles County BOS on November 15, 2011.

*Status: Petition was forwarded to the Los Angeles County and Orange County BOS. It is expected to be heard by the Los Angeles County BOS on November 15, 2011.

Status Date: November 10, 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 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.

* 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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 CCD/June 2011
• Cerritos CCD/July 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.