January 20, 2012

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary, County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the February 1, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, February 1, 2012, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 7, 2012.

The following is an update of relevant information as of January 19, 2012.

Staff Activities

- Staff conducted a lengthy phone call discussion with a community member from the Temple City area to discuss the transfer of territory process and legal requirements.

- Staff conducted several discussions with Mr. Larry Shirey, California Department of Education, regarding the Wiseburn School District unification process and the Environmental Impact Report.

Newspaper Articles

- A January 6, 2012, article from the Pasadena Sun—“Plan could change school district elections.” (Attachment 1)

- A January 10, 2012, article from the Escondido North County Times—“ESCONDIDO: City hires high-profile lawyer for voting rights case.” (Attachment 2)

- A January 14, 2012, article from the Vista North County Times—“VISTA: County to review Vista Unified election plan.” (Attachment 3)
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* A January 17, 2012, article from the Daily Edhat—“SBCC District Board Draws New District Lines.” (Attachment 4)

**Informational Correspondence**

* A December 21, 2011, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning the City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-26 (South Sand Canyon). (Attachment 5)

* A December 29, 2011, LAFCO Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning the City of Carson Annexation No. 2011-25 (Rancho Dominguez). (Attachment 6)

* A January 4, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning the City of Glendora Annexation No. 2011-08. (Attachment 7)

**Legislative Review**

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 8)

**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 9)

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

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

MFS/AD:alh
Attachments
Plan could change school district elections

Zones could mean open seats, incumbent against incumbent.

January 06, 2012 | by Playcock, jason.playcock@hbradco.com

Plans to elect school board members from separate geographic districts might force several incumbents to battle each other at the polls and could open at least two seats to newcomers.

Four preliminary district maps, each slicing the Pasadena Unified School District into seven distinct zones, are now up for public debate.
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Under one scenario, four of the seven current board members — Ed Honowitz, Elizabeth Porterroy, Tom Seltinakse and Kim Keane — would find themselves boxed into a single district that stretches from Altadena to the Foothill (210) Freeway.

In another, board allies Scott Phelps and Ramon Minamoto would have to battle for the same seat in the 2013 elections in a district bordering La Cañada Flintridge.

Either map would force voters to choose between Seltinakse and Keane when their terms end in 2015, assuming both choose to run again. The two most current maps under consideration can be viewed at www.pasadenasun.com.

With proposed district lines subject to change after a series of public hearings, incumbents are hesitant to announce re-election plans and are holding back strong opinions.

“Forcing out incumbents would seem regrettable,” said Porterroy. “But the decision is ultimately about what is best for the community.”

“You don’t know who’s going to run again and where the new lines will be drawn. We’ll have to see how it plays out,” said Honowitz.

Board member currently occupy seats voted on district-wide.

Pasadena officials began studying district maps after other California school districts were sued under the California Voting Rights Act for disenfranchising minority voters. Nearly 60% of PUSD students are Latino.

Districts would go into effect only if a majority of voters in Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre approve a charter change in the June 5 election.
Pasadena CA Foreclosures

The nine-member PUSD Districting Task Force needed to create districts of 26,911 residents each, and then draw lines favoring in education and income levels of residents, followed by ethnic makeup, fluency in English and established school attendance zones.

"We realize school achievement is not so much about race as it is about economics," said task force member Olana Peterson-More, an attorney and business consultant.

At least two proposed Northwest Pasadena districts would increase the voting power of minority and poor residents, said task force chair Ken Chawkins.

But wealthier voters also get grouped together.

Residents in areas where few public school students live, including the southwest and eastern portion of the city, will get two or three districts.

"I'm going to go with the will of the electorate, but one of the things that I think is important is you almost guarantee school board seats to parts of the community that generally don't support public education, that don't send their kids to public schools," said Board President Ronatto Cooper, a Northwest Pasadena resident who under current maps would not share a district with another incumbent.

Voting Rights Act compliance, said Chawkins, "doesn't concern which kids go to which schools, but equal representation of voters."

Miramontes said districting creates an opportunity for the school board to more accurately reflect the ethnic makeup of the city.

"I'm more concerned that communities of color don't get diluted," said Miramontes. "If largely district candidates don't have to have a very large district, then you're bringing democracy within reach."

Cooper said one benefit of districting could be a zone exclusively representing Atwood, where no current board member resides and where two elementary schools have been closed in recent years.

At least one task force member is concerned that the proposed maps water down the influence of one ethnic group.

"This is clearly not giving the Armenian community any chance at all," said Chris Chahinian, who objects to maps that would split Armenian residents between Hill and Atwood avenues along Washington Boulevard. Armenians, considered Caucasian under the U.S. Census, do not have Voting Rights Act protections.

Task force members will host two Saturday forums to collect public comments. The first is from 1 to 3 p.m. on Jan. 26 at the Altadena Public Library, 200 E. Manzana St., and the second is from 10 a.m. to noon on Feb. 4 at Westminster Presbyterian Church, 1757 N. Lake Ave., Pasadena.

The task force's next regularly scheduled meeting is scheduled for 6 p.m. on Jan. 17 at Mountain View Cemetery, at 2400 N. Fair Oaks Ave. in Altadena, and 6 p.m. on Feb. 7 at the Western Justice Center, 55 S. Grand Ave. in Pasadena.

The outcome, said task force member Roberta Martinez, "all depends on the conversation and the community being actively involved."

---
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ESCONDIDO: City hires high-profile lawyer for voting rights case

By DAVID GARRICK dgarrick@nctimes.com North County Times

| Posted: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 5:00 pm | (12) Comments

Escondido has hired a high-profile Orange County attorney to defend the city against a lawsuit alleging that its at-large elections discriminate against Latinos and must be replaced by a system electing City Council members by smaller geographic districts.

City Attorney Jeff Epp said he recently hired John Ramirez of Costa Mesa’s Rutan & Tucker law firm because Ramirez has litigated cases involving the California Voting Rights Act and has successfully defended cities across the state against a variety of lawsuits.

Ramirez’s hiring follows vows from Mayor Sam Abed and other council members that Escondido would fight the lawsuit despite the potential cost to taxpayers.

Modesto, a city in Central California, spent nearly $3 million fighting a similar lawsuit and was still forced to adopt districts.

Ramirez said Tuesday that it could take 12 to 18 months for a resolution to the lawsuit, which was filed Jan. 20 on behalf of five Escondido Latinos and the state’s Building and Construction Trades Council.

"I certainly don't think this case will be settled in a matter of weeks," said Ramirez, whose contract with the city pays him $350 an hour.

Ramirez, 41, is a prominent attorney who was named a "rising star" by Law & Politics magazine in 2006. In 2002, the Los Angeles Daily Journal declared Ramirez among the top 20 lawyers in the state under age 40.

Mayor Abed said Ramirez would help the city respond to the lawsuit by a deadline at the end of January.
"He understands voting rights law and he will put the city in the best position to defend ourselves," Abed said.

Ramírez declined Tuesday to discuss any of his previous cases involving voting rights. But a review of his bio on the Rutan & Tucker website shows that he relied on voting rights law to help plaintiffs in Monterey get an initiative pulled off the ballot because the petitions used for signature gathering weren't bilingual.

James Finberg, a San Francisco attorney who filed the lawsuit against the city, said Tuesday that he has never litigated against Ramírez.

Finberg said Ramírez's experience with voting rights appeared limited to initiatives but hasn't included other elements of the state's Voting Rights Act, such as racially polarized voting.

Finberg is part of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, a coalition of attorneys that has successfully forced several cities and school districts to adopt geographic districts in recent years.

The coalition is not formally involved in the Escondido case. Latinos lack power.

The lawsuit says at-large districts deny Latinos political power in Escondido by making it difficult for them to win. It demands that Escondido help Latinos get elected by creating one or two districts in the city's center, the area with the largest concentration of Latinos.

The suit also says the lack of Latinos on Escondido's City Council, where only two Latinos have served since 1888, is a key reason the council has pursued anti-Latino policies in recent years.

Those include a failed attempt in 2006 to prohibit landlords from renting to illegal immigrants, a day-labor ordinance proposed in 2008 but never adopted, and an abandoned effort to restrict parking in inner-city neighborhoods, where many Latino families share houses and apartments.

The city also hired Ramírez in 2006 to defend the rental ban, but his contract was nullified a few days later when Rutan & Tucker determined the firm would have a conflict of interest if he took the case. The city eventually abandoned the legislation after it was struck down by a judge.

Finberg said Tuesday that the voting rights lawsuit was strong enough that he would probably ask for a summary judgment, which would eliminate any trial and force a judge to rule based on opinions from experts.
He said his confidence was based on Latinos being a protected class and that voting in Escondido has been polarized by race.

But Mayor Abed said Tuesday that districts would hurt Latinos instead of helping them by isolating Latinos geographically and economically.

"Districts would pit neighborhood versus neighborhood and whites versus Hispanics," Abed said. "It makes no sense to divide a relatively small community like Escondido up."

However, Councilwoman Olga Diaz, a Latino, said Tuesday that districts would give Latinos a consistent voice on the council and make each council member an expert on a smaller geographic area.

She said districts would also reduce the cost of elections, opening the process to more residents.

Diaz has urged her colleagues to settle the lawsuit by adopting districts. She said that approach would save the city millions of dollars and allow the community to draw the districts instead of outsiders.

"Do we really want a judge to tell us how it's going to be?" she asked.

Escondido would be the first city in North County to adopt geographic voting districts. San Diego is the only city of the 18 in this county with such districts, and only about 30 of California's 482 cities elect council members by district, according to the League of California Cities.

In 2003, the Justice Department investigated whether Vista's at-large system violated the federal voting rights act, but found no evidence that it had.

Call staff writer David Garrick at 760-740-5468

Copyright 2012 North County Times. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

Posted in Escondido on Tuesday, January 10, 2012 5:00 pm Updated: 10:27 pm.
VISTA: County to review Vista Unified election plan

By STACY BRANDT sbrandt@nctimes.com

| Posted: Saturday, January 14, 2012 4:00 pm |

County officials will hold a public forum Thursday to consider Vista Unified's plan to split the school district into five separate voting areas beginning this fall.

The San Diego County Board of Education will hear community input before voting on the proposal or deciding to delay the decision for a future meeting.

Donna Caperton, assistant superintendent in charge of business services for the Vista Unified School District, said she expects the board to approve the changes.

This will be the last step in a process the district started in June 2010, she said.

The meeting is scheduled to start at 5 p.m. Thursday at City Hall, 200 Civic Center Drive, in the Morris B. Vance Community Room.

District officials will give a short presentation on their plan to change how trustees are elected.

For years, the five members of the board have been elected by voters throughout the district, regardless of where they lived.

Under the new plan, only people within each of the voting zones could run to represent that zone, and the residents there would only be able to vote for one candidate to represent them.

In October, the school board voted 4-1 to approve a map that will create five similarly sized zones within the district. No two trustees are in the same voting area.

At the time, Steve Lilly was the only trustee who said he thought the change might be beneficial to voters. The other three who voted for the move said they didn't like it but felt compelled because of legal challenges elsewhere.
The change would take effect starting with the election this November, when three trustee seats will be open.

The move was in response to legal challenges from the San Francisco-based Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights. The legal group has sued several school districts in Northern California, claiming that at-large elections can violate the California Voting Rights Act by preventing some ethnic groups from electing officials to represent them.

More than half of the students in the Vista district are Latino, but a Latino candidate hasn't served on the school board in decades.

Vista Unified hasn't been targeted by the group, nor has any other district in the county. However, the San Diego County Office of Education has recommended that school officials consider making the change to avoid a lawsuit in the future.

Vista Unified includes most of Vista, parts of eastern Oceanside and some surrounding unincorporated areas.
VISTA UNIFIED PROPOSED VOTING AREAS

Source: Vista Unified School District
SBCC District Board Draws New District Lines
updated: Jan 17, 2012, 4:23 PM

Source: SBCC

The Santa Barbara Community College District Board of Trustees has approved a new redistricting plan effective November 2012. The current at-large election model with seven trustees representing four designated geographical areas will become a by-trustee model with seven trustees and seven designated area districts. Each trustee must live in his/her designated district and can be elected only by voters residing in that district. Previously elections were held at-large and voters could vote for trustees in all four areas, regardless of where they live.

The change is being made to create districts of approximately equal voting population size and to avoid potential violation of the California Voting Rights Act.

Last fall, the Board discussed and reviewed in open meetings several options drawn up earlier by Redistricting Partners, a Sacramento consulting group. The election dates for 2012 and 2014 were established so that all trustees will be allowed to complete their entire four-year terms before running for re-election.

The Board's decision to convert to a by-trustee-area election system will be forwarded to the California Community College Board of Governors for review and approval. The final step is submission to the Elections Division of the County of Santa Barbara's Office of the County Clerk, Recorder and Assessor Registrar of Voters. The new by-trustee district model will be put into place and used for the first time in the November 2012 election.

For further background, information, and a map, please go to the SBCC Web site.

###

5 comments on this article. Read/Add
NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

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

Subject: City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-26
(South Sand Canyon)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles. The application involves approximately 692 ± acres of inhabited, unincorporated county territory. The proposal area is generally located south of Placerita Canyon Road, and west and south of Sand Canyon Road. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

City or District                      Organizational Changes
City of Santa Clarita                Annexation
City of Santa Clarita
Greater Los Angeles Vector Control Dist.   Sphere of Influence Amendment

Annexation

The proposed application, map and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit comments to the LAFCO office by January 31, 2012. If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (626) 204-6500.

Date: December 21, 2011

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2011-28 (South Sand Canyon)

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Santa Clarita
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

1. Annexation and SOI Amendment
2. 
3. 
4. 

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: ✓ RESOLUTION 
LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

APPLICANT: City of Santa Clarita

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

ADDRESS: 23920 Valencia Blvd.

CITY: Santa Clarita STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 91355

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Patrick Leclair TELEPHONE: (661) 255-4349

E-MAIL ADDRESS: pleclair@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: 12-13-11

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The annexation area is generally located south of Placerita Canyon Road, and west and south of Sand Canyon Road, just south of the existing Sand Canyon Community, predominantly within the Angeles National Forest.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

692.15 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 approximately 662.15 acres of land in the unincorporated Los Angeles County. The majority of the annexation area (530.3 acres) is located in the Angeles National Forest, held in private ownership. Two movie ranches are developed within the annexation area known as the Sable Ranch/Rancho Marla movie ranch and the Rancho Deluxe movie ranch. The Sable Ranch/Rancho Marla consists of approximately 400 acres of existing temporary filming sets, natural areas used for filming operations, and accessory single-family residences. Rancho Deluxe consists of approximately 140 acres of filming operations as well as accessory single-family residences. In addition, there are approximately 13 single-family residences that are developed within the annexation area. The remaining approximately 55.86 acres of the annexation area is located just south and east of the Sand Canyon Community and north of Sand Canyon Road, and remains in an undeveloped condition.

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

   The territory is predominantly in the Angeles National Forest, or immediately adjacent. Portions of the property have been developed with movie ranches, while other portions have been developed with single-family residential homes. All of the development is situated with the open space of the Angeles National Forest as a backdrop. Natural areas include hillsides and native oak trees in addition to undisturbed land in the Angeles National Forest. Elevations across the Annexation area vary and environmental conditions on much of the Annexation area consists of disturbed to developed land to natural undeveloped open space.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 40 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.
   34

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   23

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

   The subject territory is surrounded by vacant, undeveloped Angeles National Forest land to the south, east and west. There are single-family homes located immediately north to the subject territory.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The proposed annexation area, adjacent incorporated/unincorporated areas are unlikely to see any growth in the future. The City of Santa Clarita owns open space parcels immediately to the west of the annexation area and to the east of the area consists of public owned Angeles Forest land. To the north are existing large-lot single family homes.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

The annexation area includes approximately 13 single-family homes and two movie ranches.

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. The City has worked with the County of Los Angeles to come up with a methodology for the City to accept its fair share of the regional housing needs based on annexation of additional territory to the City.

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)?

Total assessed real value: $12,683,388.00; Total improvement value: $9,467,844.00 (LA County Tax Assessor, 2011)

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

Existing County of Los Angeles zoning for the project area includes: A-1-1 (Light Agriculture, 1-acre minimum lot size); A-1-2 (Light Agriculture, 2-acre minimum lot size); A-2-2 (Heavy Agriculture, 2-acre minimum lot size); A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture, 5-acre minimum lot size); RPD-1-1U (Residential Planned Development, 1 unit per acre); and CPD (Commercial Planned Development)

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

The area's existing residential and movie ranch 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 Open Space – Agriculture (OS-A) and Residential Estate (RE).

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

North: Sand Canyon Road, Single Family
South: Angeles National Forest
East: Angeles National Forest
West: City of Santa Clarita Open Space

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 City’s General Plan land use designations for the annexation include Open Space – National Forest (OS-NF) and Non-Urban 1 (NU1).

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 Los Angeles 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 consists of the two movie ranches. Additional homes may be allowed on those vacant parcels that are appropriate for development.

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 neighborhood and movie ranches would remain.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

The annexation area is not located within an existing redevelopment area and is not proposed to be located within a redevelopment area.

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

There are no designated open space or active agricultural lands in the annexation area. Therefore, the proposal would not impact open space or agricultural lands.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

This annexation includes the remaining privately owned properties within the southern Sand Canyon area that are immediately adjacent, and surrounded by, City-owned open space, U.S Government owned Angeles Forest land, the proposed Vista Canyon/Fair Oak Ranch Annexation and the existing southeastern City boundary. Thus, this annexation provides a logical and appropriate extension of the City's current boundary and service area. Public hearings and community meetings were conducted for the property owners within the annexation area. The property owners of the movie ranches which make up the majority of the annexation, do support annexation. Other owners within the annexation have not objected to the annexation of their respective properties into the City. The City supports this annexation proposal to promote sound planning and orderly growth, and to provide a logical extension of the City’s physical boundaries and urban service area.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The annexation proposal would have no direct impact on adjacent areas as services provided to those areas adjacent to the proposed annexation area would not change.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

There are no mutual social or economic interests that would be affected by the proposed annexation.
c. The local government structure of the County:

The proposed annexation will result in a negotiated tax transfer agreement between the City and County of Los Angeles, which would be used to partially fund public services to the annexation area.

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 presently adequate to serve this neighborhood. The County of Los Angeles currently provides both police and fire protection to the area; however, once annexed, City-level police protection and traffic control would be provided as part of the City's contract with the LA County Sheriff's Department. The area falls within the Sulphur Springs Elementary School District and the Wh. S. Hart High School District which would remain unchanged following annexation. Recreational programs and facilities currently offered to the area are provided by both the Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation Department and City of Santa Clarita.

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 annexed. There are no new public facilities needed to adequately serve this area. The annexation would result in a negotiated tax transfer agreement between the City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles, which would be used to partially fund public services within the annexation area.

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 this area will have a minimal impact on the City's ability to provide adequate services and controls and will be absorbed as part of the City of Santa Clarita's existing municipal service provision.
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 evaluates the adequacy of its government services during its annual budget cycle. An appropriate level of government services would be provided following annexation and monitored on an annual basis to ensure the provision of adequate services to 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: $29 per year per benefit unit
2) Stormwater Facility Maintenance: approximately $23 per year per equivalent run-off unit
3) Landscape Maintenance District 2008-1: Approximately $60 per year per equivalent benefit unit
4) Streetlight Maintenance District: Approximately $70 per year per equivalent benefit unit

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☐ No ☑

   Name of Agency: City of Santa Clarita

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 communities of social or economic interest that would be affected by the Sphere of Influence Amendment.

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

   In a letter dated December 3, 2010, the County of Los Angeles reviewed the annexation proposal which included several items that needed to be addressed. As a result, the City and County have had numerous discussions and have since addressed and resolved those items. 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 has no voted bond 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.

   Name    Address    Telephone
   
   
   

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

   Name    Address    Telephone
   Patrick Leclaire   23920 Valencia Blvd, Suite 300, Santa Clarita, CA 91355   (661) 255-4330
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.

   All municipal services, as described below, will continue without interruption. No development is proposed at this time and will not require the addition of any new infrastructure as a result of annexation to the City. Services will continue to be provided by the City as a part of the existing City budget, as well as based on the revenue received as a part of the tax transfer agreement between the City and the County of Los Angeles.

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, the latter of which is divided between basic life support emergency medical technicians (EMT) and advanced life support (paramedics).

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 these services at current levels.

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 provides funding for fire and emergency medical services through a combination of the ad valorem tax and the special fire parcel tax. The construction of new facilities is also financed by developer mitigation fees on new construction. However, no new construction is proposed within the annexation area at this time. No changes to property taxes or mitigation fee rates 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
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Flood Control Services

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

Flood control and stormwater 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 will 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 to pay for flood control related facilities and activities. These facilities and activities are designed to maintain and protect the storm drain pipes and channels to ensure water flow and flood protection. 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 applicable fees.

Library Services

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

Library services in the Santa Clarita Valley are currently provided by both the City of Santa Clarita and the County of Los Angeles. Libraries within the City are owned and operated by the City of Santa Clarita. Libraries within the County of Los Angeles are owned and operated by Los Angeles County. Presently there are four libraries within the Santa Clarita Valley (three in the City and one in the County). One new City library is under construction by the City in the Newhall community.

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

The City and County provide library services to residents of the Santa Clarita Valley. There will be no changes in service levels.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? [Not applicable.]

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

The City and County of Los Angeles pay for library services through a parcel tax or the general fund.

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

   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

   If yes, please give details.

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 Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Department. Park services at both the City and County are currently available to residents within the Santa Clarita Valley.

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 will be provided. Indicate any changes in service level.

   No change in service levels will occur with this annexation, as the City and County will continue to provide park and recreational services.

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? [Not applicable.]

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
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 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The Santa Clarita Sheriff Station is located at 25470 Magic Mountain Parkway, Santa Clarita, California. The station is staffed by 190 sworn officers and 40 sworn officers on reserve, 35 assigned civilian personnel, 58 volunteers, with 69 vehicles (67 patrol cars). Traffic patrol in unincorporated Los Angeles County is presently overseen by the California Highway Patrol. Upon annexation, traffic control within the annexation will be the responsibility of the Sheriff's Department.

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 include 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 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 by the City of Santa Clarita General Fund and Transit Fund monies under contract with the County Sheriff's Department and the 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, repair and maintenance) will be provided by the City.

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 of Santa Clarita will provide road maintenance services to public streets in the annexation area following annexation. The City budgets between $4 and $7 million annually for street resurfacing and slurry sealing throughout the City.

   Upon annexation:

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

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

   Funding for road maintenance comes from gas tax funds, Transportation Development Act dollars, the City's General Fund and from various 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 tax transfer is the withdrawal of public streets from County Road District No. 5. Easements for public streets will transfer from the County to the City upon annexation.

Solid Waste Services

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

   Solid waste services to the annexation area are currently under the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County. County residents may choose from various services for solid waste service. Fees are paid on a fee for service basis and differ from provider to provider as well as for service level.

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. The City contracts with Burioes for commercial disposal service. Residential services to be provided include but are not limited to weekly trash pickup, four free bulky item pickups per year, unlimited curbside weekly recycling, and unlimited weekly green waste recycling.

   The City's service will be available upon annexation:

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?
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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 District LLA-1 provides street light maintenance. The subject annexation area is located within the County's Landscape Maintenance District L.L.A.D. No. 51. The County L.L.A.D. No. 65, 65A, and 85B encompasses both areas within the County and the City and provides landscape maintenance for center medians and common areas.

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

Yes, the subject territory will be assessed a new stormwater and urban runoff pollution control fee, an open space and preservation district fee, a streetlight maintenance district fee, and an 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 fees would be applied to the subject territory upon annexation: Open Space Preservation District - $20 per year per benefit unit; Stormwater Facility Maintenance - approximately $22 per year per equivalent run-off unit; Landscape Maintenance District - approximately $80 per year per equivalent benefit unit; Street Light Maintenance District - approximately $70 per year per equivalent benefit unit.

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 District LLA-1.

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 Santa Clarita Streetlight Maintenance District No. 1 will provide services upon annexation. Actual maintenance and replacement of facilities is performed by Southern California Edison, the owner of the facilities. Energy and maintenance fees are paid to Edison by the District. The City contracts with Los Angeles County Public Works Department for maintenance of any City owned lighting facilities.

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

Streetlight services will be financed with the Santa Clarita Streetlight Maintenance District No. 1 assessment paid by property owners as part of their annual tax assessments. See additional information under Special Assessment District Services above.
Water Services

1. Is annexation of water service part of this request? [ ] Yes [✓] No
   If yes, provide details.
   Not applicable.

2. Will this request result in an increase in water usage upon approval of this request or in future development of the proposal area? What are the projected needs and availability of water supplies?
   There will be no change in water usage upon annexation as no development is proposed at this time.

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 Santa Clarita Water Division of the Castaic Lake Water agency presently provides water service to the annexation area and will provide water service upon annexation. Many residents in this portion of the City have private wells that provide water service that will not be affected by annexation to the City.

4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.).
   If not on a private well, property owners will continue to pay a fee for water service. No changes to water fees will occur as a result of annexation.

Wastewater Services

1. Give a brief description of how wastewater service is currently provided and by which agency.
   Existing development within the proposed annexation area is presently served by the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District.

2. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.
   No change to current services will occur upon annexation.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? [__] Services will continue to be available without interruption.

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request? [__] Yes [X] 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.)

   Wastewater services will be paid as part of yearly tax assessments.

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? [__] Yes [X] No

   If yes, provide details.

   Not applicable.
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-26 TO
THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
"SOUTH SAND CANYON 2"

Parcel 1:

Those portions of Sections 1, 2, 11 and 12 in Township 3 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as follows:

Beginning at the Center of said Section 12; thence
(L1) along the southerly line of the northwest quarter of said Section 12 South 89°55'44" West 1162.49 feet to the westerly line of parcel 1 as described in document recorded April 28, 1994 as instrument no. 94-018523 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said county; thence
(L2) along said westerly line North 00°14'28" West 2659.52 feet to the southwesterly corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said Section 1; thence
(L3) along the westerly line of parcel 11 as described in document recorded April 22, 2005 as instrument no. 05-094324 of said Official Records, North 00°19'41" East 1372.20 feet to the northwesterly corner of said southeast quarter of the southwest quarter; thence
(L4) along the southerly line of parcel 1 as described in document recorded April 22, 2005 as instrument no. 05-0943244 of said
Official Records, South 89°06′32″ West 1136.49 feet to the easterly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L5) along last said easterly line South 00°23′15″ West 1345.26 feet to the southeasterly corner of said Section 2; thence

(L6) along the southerly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 2 North 89°20′10″ West 674.28 feet to the easterly line of parcel 5 as described in said document recorded April 22, 2005; thence

(L7) along last said easterly line South 00°17′18″ West 1346.09 feet to the southerly line of said parcel 5; thence

(L8) along last said southerly line North 89°24′23″ West 1348.60 feet to the westerly line of said parcel 5; thence

(L9) along last said westerly line North 00°17′26″ East 1347.75 feet to the southerly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L10) along last said southerly line South 89°20′10″ East 337.14 feet to the westerly line of parcel 4 as described in said document recorded April 22, 2005; thence

(L11) along last said westerly line North 00°31′30″ East 1346.96 feet to the southerly line of parcel 1 as described in document recorded December 2, 2002 as instrument no. 02-2914078 of said Official Records; thence

(L12) along last said southerly line North 89°16′41″ West 1009.49 feet to the westerly line of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L13) along last said westerly line North 00°36′27″ East 1347.98 feet to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said Section 2; thence

(L14) along the northerly line of said southwest quarter of Section 2 North 89°13′10″ West 1328.21 feet to the westerly line
of the land described in document recorded June 07, 2006 as instrument no. 06-1253118 of said Official Records; thence (L15) along last said westerly line and its northerly prolongation North 00°21′14″ East 774.87 feet to a point on the centerline of Placerita Canyon Road being a point on a curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1500.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 05°10′01″ West; thence (C16) northeasterly along said curve and said centerline through a central angle of 27°11′33″ an arc distance of 711.90 feet to a point on the westerly line of the east half of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said Section 2 as described in document recorded July 12, 2007 as instrument no. 20071654941 of said Official Records; thence (L17) along last said westerly line North 00°28′55″ East 318.70 feet to a point on the southerly boundary of Parcel Map No. 7096 as shown on map filed in Book 108 pages 33 and 34 of Parcel Maps, in said office of the County Recorder; thence (L18) along last said southerly boundary South 89°30′04″ East 667.02 feet to the easterly boundary of said Parcel Map No. 7096; thence (L19) along last said easterly boundary North 00°36′27″ East 219.37 feet to a point on said centerline of Placerita Canyon Road; thence (L20) along last said centerline the following seven courses, North 50°56′00″ East 684.39 feet to the to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence (C21) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 17°49′10″ an arc distance of 311.01 feet; thence
(L22) tangent to last said curve North 68°45'10" East 165.73 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 800.00 feet; thence
(C23) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 16°03'00" an arc distance of 224.10 feet; thence
(L24) tangent to last said curve North 52°42'10" East 101.75 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 500.00 feet; thence
(C25) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 36°17'40" an arc distance of 316.73 feet to a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed February 14, 2011; thence
(L26) continuing along said centerline and said boundary and tangent to last said curve North 88°59'50" East 1072.47 feet to an angle point in said boundary on the centerline of Sand Canyon Road; thence
(L27) along said boundary and said centerline of Sand Canyon Road the following 11 courses and curves, South 11°09'05" East 473.95 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 300.00 feet; thence
(C28) southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 78°45'40" an arc distance of 412.39 feet; thence
(L29) tangent to last said curve South 89°54'45" East 166.04 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence
(C30) easterly along last said curve through a central angle of 25°44'50" an arc distance of 449.37 feet; thence
(L31) tangent to last said curve North 64°20'25" East 213.03 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 200.00 feet; thence
(C32) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 31°14'10" an arc distance of 109.03 feet; thence
(L33) tangent to last said curve North 33°06'15" East 95.70 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 200.00 feet; thence
(C34) northeasterly along last said centerline and last said curve through a central angle of 42°50'20" an arc distance of 149.54 feet; thence
(L35) tangent to last said curve North 75°56'35" East 670.82 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southerly having a radius of 300.00 feet; thence
(C36) easterly along last said curve through a central angle of 33°20'30" an arc distance of 174.58 feet; thence
(L37) tangent to last said curve South 70°42'55" East 108.17 feet to the easterly line of the west half of said Section 1; thence
(L38) leaving said City Boundary and along last said easterly line South 00°16'15" West 5075.48 feet to the south quarter corner of said Section 1; thence
(L39) along the easterly line of the northwest quarter of said Section 12 South 00°46'56" East 2628.75 feet to the point of Beginning.

Containing 634.47 acres, more or less.

PARCEL 2:

Lots 3 and 4 in Section 36, Township 4 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California according the official plat thereof on file in the Government Land Office described as a whole as follows:
Beginning at the southeast corner of said Section 36; thence

(L73) North 06°14'08" West 1240.26 feet; thence
(L74) South 89°47'09" West 2632.95 feet; thence
(1) along the southerly line of said Section 36 South 87°04'10" West 2267.96 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 3; thence
(2) along said westerly line North 03°26'48" West 1144.26 feet to the north line of said Lot 3; thence
(3) along the northerly lines of said Lots 3 and 4 North 89°48'42" East 2350.47 feet to the easterly line of said Section 36; thence
(4) along said easterly line South 00°55'26" West 1034.10 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 2 containing 57.68 acres, more or less.

Parcels 1 and 2 contain 692.15 acres, more or less, in their aggregate.
NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe
Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley Thomas
City of Carson - City Clerk
City of Carson - City Manager
City of Carson - Planning Department
City of Compton - City Manager
City of Compton - City Clerk
City of Compton - Planning Department
City of Long Beach City Clerk
City of Long Beach - City Manager
City of Long Beach - Planning Department
Central Basin Municipal Water District
Compton Creek Mosquito Abatement District
Consolidated Fire Protection District
County Office of the Assessor
County Chief Executive Office
County Sanitation Districts
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Los Angeles Unified School District
LA County Committee on School Dist. Organization
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
Sheriff Department -- Enforcement Bureau
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
West Basin Municipal Water District

SUBJECT: City of Carson Annexation No. 2011-25
(Rancho Dominguez)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County. The application involves approximately 1,710 ± acres of unincorporated territory, otherwise known as the Rancho Dominguez area. The subject territory is generally bounded by the City of Carson corporate limits to the north and the City of Long Beach corporate limits on the east. It is generally located south of the 91 Freeway, west of the 710 Freeway, north of Del Amo Boulevard and east of Wilmington Avenue. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or District</th>
<th>Change of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Compton</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence Amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed jurisdictional changes may affect your agency. The submitted application, map and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit all written concerns and comments to the LAFCO office by January 31, 2012. Should you have any questions regarding this proposal, please contact this office at (626) 204-6500.

Date: December 29, 2011

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

ENC:
City of Carson

Municipal Plan for Services
Annexation No. 2011-25
Rancho Dominguez
December, 2011

Prepared for:

Local Agency Formation Commission,
Los Angeles County
80 South Lake Avenue, Suite 870
Pasadena, CA 91101

Prepared by:

Sharou Song, Associate Planner
Lisa Berglund, Principal Admin. Analyst
City of Carson
LAFCO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

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: 2011-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED AGENCIES (Cities and/or Special Districts)</th>
<th>RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES (Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. City of Carson</td>
<td>1. Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

APPLICANT: City of Carson

TITLE: City Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: David Biggs

ADDRESS: 701 East Carson Street

CITY: Carson

STATE: CA  ZIP CODE: 90745

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Sharon Song, Associate Planner

TELEPHONE: 310-952-1761

E-MAIL ADDRESS: ssong@carson.ca.us

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: 12/20/11

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Unincorporated Rancho Dominguez: generally the area bounded by Wilmington Avenue on the west; Del Amo Boulevard on the south; The City of Long Beach corporate limits on the east; and the City of Compton corporate limits on the north.

The territory is south of the 91 Freeway, west of the 710 Freeway, north of Del Amo Boulevard and east of Wilmington Avenue. Alameda Street bisects the territory from north to south. The Metro Blue Line runs diagonally through the area.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

1,710 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.)

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

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 2,597

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.

   1,477 (October, 2011)

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

   Approximately 523

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

   The subject territory is bounded by the City of Carson, City of Compton and the City of Long Beach, all of which is populated.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The subject territory is surrounded by urbanized, developed areas and no major development or redevelopment is proposed. Significant growth is not anticipated within the area or adjacent areas.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

There are two large existing mobile home parks within the subject territory: Del Amo Mobile Home Estates (512 mobile home units) and Dominguez Hills Mobile Home Estates (511 mobile home units).

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

The subject annexation area is fully developed. Due to the industrial nature of the area, no new residential construction is anticipated. The two mobile home parks provide affordable housing within the area.

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 annexation will provide improved public services to the Rancho Dominguez area. The existing mobile home parks and residents will have equal access to city services as currently provided in the city of Carson.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$1,732,583,630 (DHA Consulting and the Hdh Companies, 11/14/2011)

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

The County of Los Angeles General Plan designates land use within the area as Major Industrial. The zoning includes the following: M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing), M-1.5 (Restricted Heavy manufacturing), C-M (Commercial Manufacturing), A-2 (Agriculture), and B-1 (Buffer).

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

There are no significant vacant parcels available for development within the subject area since the area is generally developed with industrial uses. There are some small retail areas within the industrial buildings to provide limited service to workers in the area. There are several isolated commercial buildings around the perimeter of the area.
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 proposed zone changes would be from A-2 (Heavy Agriculture) to CG-D (Commercial, General with Design Overlay); from C-M-5DP (Commercial Manufacturing—Development Program) to RM-D (Residential, Multiple Dwelling 12 dwelling units per acre maximum with Design Overlay); from M-1 B (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing) to M-1 D (Manufacturing, Heavy with Design Overlay) and ML-D (Manufacturing, Heavy with Design Overlay). The proposed new zones were selected to provide compatibility between land uses and to closely match the existing zoning and types of land uses permitted in each respective zone. The proposed General Plan land use categories are Commercial General for the area to be zoned CG-D; High Density Residential for areas to be zoned RM12-D; Light Industrial for areas to be zoned ML-D; and Heavy Industrial for areas to be zoned MH-D.

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

The area surrounding the property is generally industrial in nature including a polystyrene storage facility as the most intense use. Along the west boundary of the proposed expansion south of University Avenue is a large shipping distribution warehouse. To the south of University Avenue is the Dominguez Technology Center, a small business industrial park. North of the proposed expansion are predominantly industrial properties within the City of Compton. West of Natomas Street the properties are industrial developments. Further north is the Interstate 105 Freeway. Dempsey Community College is located on the south side of the Gardena Freeway east of Santa Fe Avenue. Properties within the City of Long Beach along the north side of Slauson Avenue between Victoria Street and the Aliso Freeway are predominantly single family residences while north of Slauson Avenue the properties are industrial developments. Further south the area is bounded by the Long Beach (CA-710) Freeway and the Los Angeles River.

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 proposed General Plan land use categories are Commercial General for the area to be zoned CG-D; High Density Residential for areas to be zoned RM12-D; Light Industrial for areas to be zoned ML-D; and Heavy Industrial for areas to be zoned MH-D.

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

The project site is pre-zoned and the City of Carson general plan has been amended. Therefore, the proposal is consistent with city general plans, specific plan, and other adopted land use policies.

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

The proposal does not anticipate major development now or in the near future since the project site is located in a heavily urbanized part of Los Angeles County.

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

No major development is proposed as a result of this project. Therefore, denial of this proposal would have no effect on proposed development, if any.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No.

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

The County has designated the historic Rancho San Pedro Dominguez Adobe property as Heavy Agriculture; however there are no current or planned agricultural operations.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

A portion of the Rancho Dominguez territory has been within the City of Carson's sphere of influence for many years. In March 2006, LAFCO adopted a joint sphere of influence for the entire area, identifying the Cities of Carson, Long Beach and Compton as potential service providers. The City of Carson provides a high level of municipal services, and would like to expand its boundaries so that the residents, businesses and property owners within the territory could benefit as well. The area has a relationship to the City, through the historic Rancho San Pedro Adobe, Cal State Dominguez Hills, County Fire Station No. 105, and a technology park.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The City of Long Beach has identified itself as a potential service provider for the area east of Alameda Street. The City of Compton could provide services to the area; although the City of Carson is not aware of any intent on that part of Compton to pursue annexation.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

If the Rancho Dominguez area is annexed to the City of Carson, there would no longer be an unincorporated island for which the County is responsible to serve. This would have a positive impact on adjacent areas, as Carson provides a high level of services for residents and businesses. Commercial traffic control would be enhanced, as would code enforcement. Carson would improve the street and roadway infrastructure, which are currently very deteriorated as the County has deferred maintenance and capital improvements. Annexation of the area to Carson would not negatively impact the City of Long Beach as it does not rely on this area for its financial contributions to the City budget.
c. The local government structure of the County:

The local government structure of the County would not be affected. The Rancho Dominguez area is a small unincorporated area that would have little to no effect on the County if annexed to the city of Carson.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The current estimated cost to provide services within the area is approximately $7.5 million for operations with approximately $34 million in capital costs. Please see the attached financial analysis for more detail.

The estimates above are preliminary estimates.

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

The present capacity of public facilities is adequate to meet the needs of the area. Public services are adequate, with the exception of capital improvements to the deteriorating streets and roadways. The County has deferred maintenance within the area. Please refer to the attached financial analysis for more detail.

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 area would not significantly change the cost for services; however, the costs for police protection, traffic control and capital improvements would be the responsibility of the City of Carson.

Annexation of the area to Carson would not negatively impact the City of Long Beach as it does not rely on this area for its financial contributions to the City budget.

County Fire Station No. 105 is located on Santa Fe Avenue, central to its current service area. This station contains the Hazardous Material Response Unit for the area. Should the City of Long Beach proposal prevail, the annexation to Long Beach would extend to Santa Fe Avenue, excluding the fire station location. This would significantly impact fire station operations, including their service plans and staffing. The City of Carson proposal would not alter the service area or plans of County Fire.
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.

A detailed Plan for Service is attached, including Attachment A. The City of Carson intends to provide municipal services and capital improvements with funding provided by general property taxes, sales taxes, franchise fees, the city's Utility Users Tax, and other miscellaneous revenues generated within the 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.

None.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes [✓] Name of Agency | City of Carson | No [ ]

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

   N/A

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

   N/A
BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   No.

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

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?
   There will be no change to any existing bonded debt.

4. In the case of detachment requests, does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt?
   There are no detachment requests.

NOTIFICATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Long Beach - Patrick West</td>
<td>13th Floor, City Hall 333 W. Ocean Boulevard Long Beach, CA 90802</td>
<td>562-570-6916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Compton - P. Lamont Ewell</td>
<td>205 S. Willowbrook Avenue Compton, CA 90220</td>
<td>310-605-5585</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>Sharon Song, Associate Planner</td>
<td>Planning Division 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745</td>
<td>310-952-1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berglund, Principal Analyst</td>
<td>701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745</td>
<td>310-952-1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Repp-Leadsman, Planning Officer</td>
<td>Planning Division 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745</td>
<td>310-952-1761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT A

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-25
TO THE CITY OF CARSON

ANNEXATION DESCRIPTION


BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINE OF WILMINGTON AVENUE, AND A LINE PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT 33 FEET SOUTH OF THE CENTERLINE OF DEL AMO BOULEVARD AS SHOWN ON PARCEL MAP BOOK 32, PAGES 16-17;

COURSE 1, THENCE NORTH 04°03'09" WEST 7564.51 FEET ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF WILMINGTON AVENUE AS SHOWN ON SAID PARCEL MAP BOOK 32, PAGES 16-17, PARCEL MAP BOOK 167, PAGES 3-4, PARCEL MAP BOOK 239, PAGE 26, PARCEL MAP BOOK 69, PAGE 96 AND PARCEL MAP BOOK 170, PAGE 39 TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF THE CITY OF CARSON, AND THE SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF THE CITY OF COMPTON AS SHOWN ON PARCEL MAP BOOK 167, PAGES 3-4;

THENCE ALONG THE SOUTHERLY, EASTERN, AND WESTERN BOUNDARY LINE OF THE CITY OF COMPTON AS SHOWN ON SAID PARCEL MAP BOOK 167, PAGES 3-4; THE FOLLOWING COURSES.

COURSE 2, THENCE NORTH 88°00'46" EAST 421.15 FEET;

COURSE 3, THENCE SOUTH 01°59'14" EAST 306.21 FEET;

COURSE 4, THENCE NORTH 88°00'46" EAST 621.52 FEET;

COURSE 5, THENCE SOUTH 01°59'14" EAST 475.70 FEET;

COURSE 6, THENCE SOUTH 50°30'00" EAST 362.55 FEET;

COURSE 7, THENCE NORTH 89°58'01" EAST 197.82 FEET;

COURSE 8, THENCE SOUTH 06°01'59" EAST 574.42 FEET;
COURSE 9. THENCE NORTH 87°58'19" EAST 1214.61 FEET;

COURSE 10. THENCE NORTH 08°10'21" EAST 1572.24 FEET;

COURSE 11. THENCE NORTH 07°57'02" EAST 232.62 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF APRA STREET AS SHOWN ON SAID PARCEL MAP BOOK 73, PAGES 28-29 AND THE ANGLE POINT IN THE SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF THE CITY OF COMPTON AS SHOWN ON P.M. BOOK 167, PAGE 3-4;

COURSE 12. THENCE NORTH 87°57'39" EAST 657.99 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID APRA STREET TO THE SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE WESTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF ACACIA AVENUE AS SHOWN ON PARCEL MAP BOOK 73, PAGES 28-29;

COURSE 13. THENCE NORTH 00°28'55" WEST 63.02 FEET ALONG THE SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE WESTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF ACACIA AVENUE AS SHOWN ON SAID PARCEL MAP BOOK 73, PAGES 28-29, TO THE EASTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTHERLY LINE OF VICTORIA DOMINGUEZ DE CARSON 19.43 ACRE TRACT AS SHOWN ON RECORDE OF SURVEY BOOK 20, PAGE 23;

COURSE 14. THENCE NORTH 87°57'39" EAST 1298.50 FEET ALONG THE EASTHERLY PROLONGATION AND THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID VICTORIA DOMINGUEZ DE CARSON 19.43 ACRE TRACT TO THE EASTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAILWAY AS SHOWN ON SAID RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 20, PAGE 23,

COURSE 15. THENCE NORTH 19°05'31" WEST 384.50 FEET ALONG TO THE EASTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAILWAY TO THE EASTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTHERLY LINE OF RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 20, PAGE 23, SAID NORTHERLY LINE OF RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 20, PAGE 23 HAVING A BEARING AND DISTANCE OF NORTH 88° 12' EAST 1013.04 FEET AND DELINEATED ON SAID RECORD OF SURVEY AS "FENCE LINE";

COURSE 16. THENCE NORTH 87°57'39" EAST 1274.22 FEET ALONG THE EASTHERLY PROLONGATION AND SAID NORTHERLY LINE OF RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 20, PAGE 23, TO A LINE THAT IS PARALLEL AND DISTANT 100 FEET EAST OF THE WESTHERLY LINE OF LOT VIII OF THE HELLMAN TRACT AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 79, PAGE 74;

COURSE 17. THENCE NORTH 07°29'21" WEST 1524.37 FEET ALONG THE PARALLEL LINE DISTANT 100 FEET EAST OF THE WESTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT VIII OF THE HELLMAN TRACT TO A LINE PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT 200 FEET SOUTH OF THE CENTERLINE OF ARTESIA BOULEVARD.
AS SHOWN ON STATE OF CALIFORNIA DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS R/W MAP NO. F1091-4-07-L.A-91-107, DATED DECEMBER 12, 1967, ON FILE WITH THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AS FM 21329-4;

COURSE 18. THENCE NORTH 89°49'49" EAST 2773.79 FEET ALONG THE PARALLEL LINE DISTANT 200 FEET SOUTH OF THE CENTERLINE OF SAID ARTESIA BOULEVARD TO THE EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SUSANA ROAD AS SHOWN ON SAID RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 126, PAGE 35;

THENCE ALONG THE EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID SUSANA ROAD THE FOLLOWING COURSES;

COURSE 19. THENCE SOUTH 00°15'22" EAST 108.45 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A 950.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY

THENCE ALONG SAID CURVE AND THE EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SUSANA ROAD THE FOLLOWING COURSES.

COURSE 20. THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 13°44'33" A DISTANCE OF 227.86 FEET;

COURSE 21. THENCE SOUTH 13°59'53" EAST 4332.96 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A 1050 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY;

COURSE 22. THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 3°19'34" A DISTANCE OF 60.95 FEET A RADIAL LINE TO SAID POINT BEARS SOUTH 79° 19' 39" WEST, TO THE SOUTH BOUNDARY LINE OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 126, PAGE 35;

COURSE 23. THENCE SOUTH 84°05'46" EAST 686.93 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTH BOUNDARY LINE OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH TO THE WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE LONG BEACH FREEWAY AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 87, PAGE 93-95 AND THE BEGINNING OF A 500 FOOT RADIUS NONTANGENT CURVE CONCAVE WESTERLY, A RADIAL LINE THERE TO BEARS NORTH 88° 27' 42" EAST;

THENCE ALONG THE WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE LONG BEACH FREEWAY AS SHOWN ON SAID RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 87, PAGE 93-95 THE FOLLOWING COURSES;

COURSE 24. THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 32°02'24" A DISTANCE OF 279.61 FEET

COURSE 25. THENCE SOUTH 30°30'10" WEST 820.69 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A 6100.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY;
COURSE 26. THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 27°07'29" A DISTANCE OF 2887.84 FEET;

COURSE 27. THENCE SOUTH 03°22'41" WEST 83.41 FEET TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE WEST BOUNDARY LINE OF A 4.40 ACRE PARCEL OF LAND PER OFFICIAL RECORDS 47743-381 AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY BOOK 87, PAGES 93-95;

THENCE ALONG THE WESTERLY AND NORTHERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID 4.40 ACRE PARCEL OF LAND THE FOLLOWING COURSES.

COURSE 28. THENCE SOUTH 06°50'47" WEST 487.13 FEET;

COURSE 29. THENCE SOUTH 17°26'56" WEST 103.08 FEET;

COURSE 30. THENCE SOUTH 38°24'17" WEST 61.03 FEET;

COURSE 31. THENCE SOUTH 61°22'04" WEST 78.10 FEET;

COURSE 32. THENCE SOUTH 89°57'49" WEST 145.00 FEET;

COURSE 33. THENCE SOUTH 00°02'11" EAST 264.81 FEET;

COURSE 34. THENCE SOUTH 03°24'44" WEST 135.50 FEET;

COURSE 35. THENCE SOUTH 04°24'13" EAST 351.45 FEET ALONG THE SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION OF SAID 4.40 ACRE PARCEL OF LAND TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY PROLONGATION OF A PARRALLELL LINE DISTANT 33 FEET SOUTH OF THE CENTERLINE OF DEL AMO BOULEVARD;

COURSE 36. THENCE SOUTH 89°57'49" WEST 8287.13 FEET ALONG SAID PARALLEL LINE DISTANT 33 FEET SOUTH OF THE CENTERLINE OF DEL AMO BOULEVARD TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 1,726.42 ACRES MORE OR LESS

SEE ANNEXATION MAP EXHIBIT B ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF BY THIS REFERENCE.

[Signature]

JAMES O. EVRIMAN

DATE

P.L.S. 6336 EXPIRES 12-31-2012
Financial Analysis

Rancho Dominguez
Annexation No. 2011-25
December 2011

Prepared for:
Local Agency Formation Commission,
Los Angeles County
80 South Lake Avenue, Suite 870
Pasadena, CA 91101

Prepared by:
City of Carson
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90749

Sharon Song, Associate Planner
Lisa Berglund, Principal Admin. Analyst
1. Overview

The city of Carson has undertaken a careful financial review of the Rancho Dominguez territory in order to develop a projection of the estimated costs associated with providing municipal services to the area. This effort included a cost estimate for operations, an evaluation and cost estimate for needed capital improvements, and an estimate of the revenues that would accrue to Carson to fund those services and capital needs. The underlying principle in compiling the projections is to ensure provision of government services comparable to the high quality service levels in Carson.

Financial information specific to the Rancho Dominguez area was obtained from the Los Angeles County Administrator’s office and its municipal finance consultant in October-November 2011. City staff developed budgets for providing service within the area that would be equal to the level of service now provided within Carson. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department costs was determined by using the actual expenditure costs for the unincorporated Rancho Dominguez area for FY 2006-2007 and applying an expenditure growth at a rate of 4.0% annually. Actual expenditure numbers for the past fiscal year will not be made available until January, 2012.

The city of Carson prepared its revenue and cost projections for the entire Rancho Dominguez area to evaluate the financial feasibility of an annexation.

2. Revenue Projections

The revenue projections shown in Table 2, Preliminary Revenue Projections are based on the data received from the County Administrator’s Office and its municipal finance consultant. The projections represent the city’s best available information at this time.

The property tax assumption is based upon a 6.7% share of the 1% ad valorem taxes Carson currently receives on properties within the city. Carson’s portion of the property tax dollar is relatively low in comparison to Long Beach and other municipalities.

Table 1 - Preliminary Revenue Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Revenues</th>
<th>Rancho Dominguez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$2,180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Franchise Fee</td>
<td>$125,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$224,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition A</td>
<td>$37,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C</td>
<td>$30,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business License, Pipeline and</td>
<td>$341,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes/Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Tax (2%)</td>
<td>$957,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,488,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Cost Projections

The cost projections shown in Table 3, Preliminary Cost Projections are based on the cost estimates prepared by city staff and the Los Angeles County Administrator's Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Capital Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>$6,254,142.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Control</td>
<td>$80,930.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti Abatement</td>
<td>$3,029.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Capital Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thin Overlay w/ Localized Repair &amp; Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,712,867.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Street Construction (Del Amo and Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,743,178.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Landscaped Medians (Del Amo)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,322,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sign Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>$43,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeping Cost</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Island Maintenance*</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Maintenance</td>
<td>$25,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Maintenance Services</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches, Trash Receptacles, Signs &amp; Poles</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench &amp; Trashcan Installation</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-a-Ride Program*</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Bus Route/In-house*</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Costs</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Needs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works*</td>
<td>$222,012.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety*</td>
<td>$148,155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Division*</td>
<td>$106,888.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | $7,469,972.00 | $26,802,788.00 |
| Total without (*) Items | $6,687,839.00 | $25,060,288.00 |
| Overall Total | $34,372,760.00 |
| Overall Total without (*) Items | $32,488,227.00 |

*Assumes service levels as elsewhere provided in the city of Carson
The following Table 3, Potential Revenue and Operating Costs Comparison, summarizes the results of the analysis:

**Table 3 - Potential Revenue and Operating Costs Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,488,012.00</td>
<td>$7,469,972.00</td>
<td>-$1,981,950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Operating Costs, not including (*)</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,488,012.00</td>
<td>$6,887,939.00</td>
<td>-$1,399,927.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Costs (Capital and Operating)</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,488,012.00</td>
<td>$34,372,760.00</td>
<td>-$28,884,748.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, the annexation of the Rancho Dominguez area will not provide sufficient revenue to provide for projected operating costs.

4. **Utility Users Tax**

The revenue projections shown in Table 1, Preliminary Revenue Projections include an estimate of the 2% Utility Users Tax (UUT) to be collected by the City of Carson, if annexed. The estimate is representative of the city’s average UUT collected in 2010 per square mile. Since the Rancho Dominguez area is mainly occupied by industrial uses a 10% increase was applied reflecting typical industrial utility usage. If the city moves forward with the annexation process, the city will contact Los Angeles County to determine the potential revenues associated with the city’s current UUT collected for this area. At that time, the County will provide contact referrals for the appropriate utility companies to allow city staff to determine the potential revenue to be collected within the Rancho Dominguez area, if annexed.

5. **Summary**

The major sources of revenue are from estimated annual property tax and estimated sales tax. With the inclusion of franchise fees, gas tax and other revenue sources, the total annual revenue is estimated at $5,488,012.00. Primary ongoing costs related to law enforcement and street maintenance are estimated to be $6.5 million with total operating costs estimated at $7,469,972.00 annually. The cost projections have been based upon the extension of current Carson services in a manner consistent with the city’s high quality municipal services. There is significant unfunded capital costs associated with street and traffic improvements.

The financial analysis completed by the city indicates that there would be a net deficit in operating revenues to serve the Rancho Dominguez area of $1,981,960.00.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Plan for Services for the "Rancho Dominguez" Annexation to the City of Carson has been prepared for submission to the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County (LAFCO) as part of the annexation application (Annexation No. 2011-25). The plan provides the City of Carson, LAFCO, affected property owners, residents, and other interested persons with information regarding existing and proposed local government services for the proposed annexation territory. Included in this report are:

- A description of the proposed annexation territory;
- A summary of annexation procedures and requirements;
- A comparison of the current service providers and facilities with those that would be provided should the area be annexed; and,
- Responses to questions included in the LAFCO application "Plan of Services" questionnaire.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ANNEXATION AREA

2.1 Rancho Dominguez Annexation Territory

The proposed Rancho Dominguez Annexation area comprises approximately 1,710 unincorporated acres generally located in southeast Los Angeles County. The territory is south of the 91 Freeway, west of the 710 Freeway, north of Del Amo Boulevard and east of Wilmington Avenue (Figure 1- Vicinity Map). In March 2006, LAFCO placed the property into a joint sphere of influence shared by the Cities of Carson, Long Beach and Compton. The subject property is fully built-out and predominantly industrial in nature. Two mobile home parks are located within the proposed annexation area. The subject territory has a population of approximately 2,600 residents. Because there are more than 12 registered voters residing in the area, the proposed annexation is considered "inhabited" as defined by Government Code §56046.

2.2 City of Carson

The City of Carson, incorporated in 1968, is mostly bounded by incorporated cities. The City of Los Angeles lies along the southern and western border, the City of Long Beach lies to the east and the City of Compton lies to the north. The unincorporated Rancho Dominguez area lies to the northeast. The City of Carson encompasses approximately 19.2 square miles and has an estimated population of 93,196 residents. The City contains a mixture of residential, commercial and industrial land uses. Industrial lands comprise 54 percent of the designated land use; residential uses make up 28 percent. Ten (10) percent of the City is vacant land. Heavy industrial areas exist along the Alameda Corridor and light industrial lands are primarily located near the City’s northern and western boundaries. Low density residential areas are located northeast and southwest of the 405 freeway. Regional commercial areas line the 405 freeway.
The City of Carson is home to the California State University, Dominguez Hills and the adjacent Home Depot Center, a regional sports complex which includes a soccer stadium, tennis stadium, track and field facility, and the first and only indoor velodrome in the United States.

The City of Carson provides a full range of municipal services including administration, land use planning, park and recreation services and street maintenance. The City contracts with Los Angeles County to provide fire, paramedic and police services within the City boundaries. Los Angeles County also provides library, wastewater treatment, animal control and street lighting services to Carson.

The City of Carson is part of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), a regional planning agency for six counties (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Imperial and Ventura). Between 1990 and 2000, Los Angeles County population increased by 11.5 percent or 1,021,091 persons. Los Angeles County had the highest numerical growth of all six counties. However, significant growth has also occurred in Orange, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1980-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7,477,503</td>
<td>8,863,164</td>
<td>9,884,285</td>
<td>1,021,091 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>92,110</td>
<td>109,303</td>
<td>145,285</td>
<td>35,982 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1,982,709</td>
<td>2,410,556</td>
<td>2,826,351</td>
<td>417,795 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>663,168</td>
<td>1,170,413</td>
<td>1,522,855</td>
<td>352,442 (30.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>895,016</td>
<td>1,418,380</td>
<td>1,689,281</td>
<td>270,901 (19.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>529,174</td>
<td>669,016</td>
<td>756,501</td>
<td>87,485 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1980, 1990 and 2000 Census

According to the Carson General Plan, the City experienced moderate growth between 1970 and 2000. Between 1990 and 2000, however, Carson grew by 11 percent, making it the faster growing city of the four cities in the Carson vicinity (Carson, Compton, Long Beach and Torrance). Current data shows the population growth in Carson will continue to increase, but at a slower rate. The current population of 93,196 is expected to grow to 101,896 (an increase of 8,700 persons) over the next 20 years.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1990-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>81,221</td>
<td>83,995</td>
<td>93,196</td>
<td>9,201 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>81,286</td>
<td>90,454</td>
<td>97,966</td>
<td>7,512 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>361,284</td>
<td>429,453</td>
<td>457,608</td>
<td>28,175 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>129,881</td>
<td>133,107</td>
<td>147,414</td>
<td>14,307 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Carson General Plan, Housing Element
3.0 ANNEXATION PROCESS

LAFCO is authorized by California state law as the agency responsible for approving annexations to cities and special districts. Created in 1963, LAFCOs are responsible for coordinating logical and timely changes in local government boundaries and ensuring that services are provided efficiently and economically. Prior to submittal of an annexation application for consideration, LAFCO requires:

- Initiation of the annexation by landowner petition or city council resolution
- Pre-zoning of the property by the affected agency
- Environmental review
- A map and legal description of the annexation territory

Further, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code Section 56000), the governing statute for LAFCO, requires that the City submit a plan for providing services to the annexation territory. This report satisfies that requirement.

An annexation of territory to a city can be initiated through either: (1) a resolution of the affected city council, or (2) a petition signed by five percent of the registered voters or at least 5 percent of the landowner(s) owning at least five percent of the total assessed value of the proposed annexation territory. Once initiated, the applicant files an annexation application, along with processing fees, with LAFCO.

3.1 LAFCO Review, Public Hearing and Protest Procedures

LAFCO staff are responsible for reviewing the application to ensure its completeness, preparing a staff report analyzing the proposal based on the evaluative criteria outlined in Government Code §5666B, and scheduling a public hearing before LAFCO. The law requires that a public notice be published at least 21 days in advance of the hearing. At the LAFCO public hearing, staff presents the proposal to the LAFCO Commission. Affected and interested parties are invited to testify during the hearing. Following the public hearing, LAFCO can approve the proposal, deny the proposal or approve the proposal with modifications.

The Los Angeles LAFCO Commission includes nine members: two members are from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors; two members represent cities within Los Angeles County; two members represent special districts within Los Angeles County; one member represents the City of Los Angeles; one member represents San Fernando Valley; and the ninth member is designated as a public member, representing the general public.

If the annexation is approved by LAFCO, two scenarios are possible and are summarized below:

- If 100% of the landowners consent to the annexation, no further notices, hearing or election will be required, and the annexation will be recorded with the County Recorder and become effective on the date of recording.
If less than 100% of the landowners are in agreement, LAFCO staff is required to conduct what is called a “protest hearing”. The date of the protest hearing is set by LAFCO during the public hearing. During a designated period of time following the public hearing and leading up to the protest hearing, registered voters and landowners may file written protests with LAFCO if they disagree with LAFCO’s approval of the annexation.

If less than 25 percent of the registered voters within the annexation territory file valid protest, the annexation will be recorded with the County Recorder and become effective on the date of recordation. If between 25 and 50 percent of the registered voters file valid protest, the annexation is put to a vote of the registered voters within the annexation territory at the next regularly scheduled general election. If over 50 percent of the registered voters residing within the annexation territory file valid protest, all annexation proceedings are immediately terminated.

If the annexation is terminated by protest, Government Code §57090 precludes any party from submitting an application to LAFCO for annexation of the same, or “substantially the same” property, for a period of one year.

3.2 Annexation Fees
The City of Carson is the applicant for the proposed annexation. Los Angeles LAFCO uses an “acreage-based” fee schedule for city annexations. For the subject 1,710-acre Rancho Dominguez annexation, LAFCO charges an $8,000 processing fee. Should a protest by landowners or registered voters trigger the need for an election, the City would bear any election costs. The State Board of Equalization (SBE) charges a one-time fee of $3,500. The SBE fees are paid after LAFCO approval of the annexation. These fees are required to be paid by the annexation proponent (the City of Carson) and are subject to change. The City also pays County Recorder fees.

4.0 LONG RANGE PLANNING/SPHERE OF INFLUENCE
The proposed annexation territory is located within the sphere of influence of three cities – the City of Carson, the City of Compton and the City of Long Beach. A Sphere of Influence identifies the logical, long-term municipal service provider for this area. Los Angeles LAFCO has identified all three cities as potential long-term service providers for the annexation area. LAFCO requires that territory be “pre-zoned” prior to annexation. This permits property owners and other interested parties to be informed of future City zoning and permitted land uses prior to finalization of any proposed annexation.

4.1 County Planning and Zoning
Land uses in the annexation area are currently subject to the policies outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan. The County General Plan designates the annexation territory for Industrial uses, and the approximately 1,710-acre territory is zoned almost entirely for manufacturing uses with the following designations: M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing), M-1.5 (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing), C-M (Commercial
Manufacturing), A-2 (Agriculture), and B-1 (Buffer) (Figure 4). The C-M-DP designation allows for mobile home park use.

4.2 City Planning and Zoning

The City of Carson last updated the City’s General Plan in 2004. The City currently comprises approximately 10,176 acres. Almost 50 percent of City’s territory is designated for light and heavy industrial uses. Approximately 30 percent is reserved for residential uses, 8 percent for general and regional commercial uses and the remainder designated for public facilities.

The annexation territory’s existing and proposed General Plan and Zoning designations are illustrated in Table 3, below, and on Figure 2 (Existing County General Plan Land Use Designations), Figure 3 (Existing County Zoning Designations), Figure 4 (Proposed City General Plan Land Use Designations) and Figure 5 (Proposed City Pre-Zoning Designations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING COUNTY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS</th>
<th>PROPOSED CITY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS</th>
<th>EXISTING COUNTY ZONING DESIGNATIONS</th>
<th>PROPOSED CITY ZONING DESIGNATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Heavy Manufacturing</td>
<td>Manufacturing-Heavy (MH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Manufacturing-Light (ML)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>Commercial Manufacturing</td>
<td>Commercial-General (CG-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>Heavy Agriculture</td>
<td>Residential-Multi-Family (10-12 units per acre) (RM-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Existing and Proposed General Plan and Zoning Designations
Figure 2 – Existing County General Plan Land Use Designations
Figure 3 – Existing County Zoning Designations
Figure 4 – Proposed City General Plan Land Use Designations

Rancho Dominguez Expansion Area
Proposed General Plan

91 Freeway

General Plan

[Map of Rancho Dominguez Expansion Area with land use designations]
5.0 MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Below is a detailed summary of the various service providers for the annexation area. Table 4, "Rancho Dominguez Annexation to City of Carson – Municipal Services Summary Table" summarizes the existing service providers to the area and identifies any changes in providers and service levels if the area is annexed to the City of Carson. Detailed discussion of the services follows; the information was obtained from multiple sources, including City documents and the 2005 Gateway Municipal Service Review.

**TABLE 4**

"Rancho Dominguez" Annexation to City of Carson

Municipal Services Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPAL SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT PROVIDER</th>
<th>FUTURE PROVIDER IF AREA ANNEXED TO CITY OF CARSON</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN SERVICE LEVELS, IF ANNEXED</th>
<th>LOCATION OF NEAREST SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>CHANGE IN COST TO RESIDENTS, IF ANNEXED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (Traffic Enforcement: California Highway Patrol)</td>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St, Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff Department to provide traffic enforcement due to discontinued service by California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (by contract)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1860 E. Del Amo, Carson, CA (headquarters) 127 W. 233rd St, Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Paramedic</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Fire Department</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Fire Department (by contract)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>18915 S. Santa Fe Ave, Compton, CA 755 Victoria St, Carson, CA 2049 E. 223rd St, Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>California Water Service Company</td>
<td>California Water Service Company</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>11469 Rosecrans, Norwalk, CA 2632 W. 237th, Torrance, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sewers</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>960 S. Fremont, Alhambra, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewers</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sanitation District</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sanitation District</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1955 Mill Road, Whittier, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sanitation District</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sanitation District</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Joint Water Pollution Control Plant 24501 Figueroa St, Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Service</td>
<td>Current Provider</td>
<td>Future Provider in Area Annexed to City of Carson</td>
<td>Difference in Service Levels, if Annexed</td>
<td>Location of Nearest Service Provider</td>
<td>Change in Cost to Residents, if Annexed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Library System</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Library System</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Carson Regional Library 151 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Recreation</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>Increased service level - residents eligible for City park/recreation programs</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works/Local Street Maintenance</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>Increased service level - City will provide and address deteriorated street conditions</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>Increased service level - City will provide</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff Department</td>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>Increased service level - City will provide</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Collection</td>
<td>Los Angeles County (by contract with Waste Management for residential, commercial/industrial may select provider)</td>
<td>City of Carson (by contract with Waste Management or EDCO)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>Potential for increased costs for commercial and industrial accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Flood Control</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dominguez Yard 2159 E. Sepulveda Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Flood Control</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dominguez Yard 2159 E. Sepulveda Carson, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>City of Carson and MTA</td>
<td>Increased: Carson Dial-a-Ride service for Seniors and Disabled</td>
<td>701 E. Carson St. Carson, CA</td>
<td>Lower cost for Carson Circuit Bus $1.00 Dial-a-Ride ≈ reduced rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Services</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>215 W. Victoria St. Gardena, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>900 S. Fremont Alhambra, CA</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Police

Police services are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. There is one existing Carson Sheriff Station, located at 21356 South Avalon, in Carson. The Department provides Carson residents with the following services: patrol, dispatch, search and rescue, crime lab, SWAT, bomb squad, mutual aid and canine services. In 2002, 187 sworn personnel and 25 civilian personnel operated from...
this station. There are approximately 2.1 sworn personnel per 1,000 residents and 0.40 civilian personnel per 1,000 residents. (A standard of 1.7 officers per 1,000 is considered excellent.) Within a 24-hour period, there are approximately 31 patrol cars serving the Carson area, divided among three work shifts. Average response times in 2004 for “priority one” calls averaged 4:24 minutes (based on average from July, August, September 2004 logs).

The City of Carson has responded to increasing crime rates by adding two community-oriented policing teams, a two-person crime suppression patrol unit, a park enforcement team, and other community oriented programs and services:

- **Community Oriented Police Teams** -- The Community Oriented Police Teams (COPS) interact regularly with City leaders and the community to identify community priorities regarding public safety and quality of life issues. Collaborative efforts with the community and other public service agencies are utilized to develop and implement solutions to these issues.

- **Park Enforcement Team** -- The Park Enforcement Team provides law enforcement services to all park facilities located within the City and the adjacent neighborhoods. Park Watch Programs have been developed to provide proactive law enforcement and community mobilization in the protection and safety of the City’s parks.

- **Community Relations** -- The Community Relations office coordinates a variety of community outreach activities to improve the relationship of the Sheriff’s Department with the Carson community. These activities include, among others, home/school/business presentations, station open houses, neighborhood watch programs, the Explorer Scout program, and the station volunteer program.

- **Vital Intervention Directional Alternatives (VIDA) Program** -- The VIDA Program is a 16-week curriculum for at-risk youths. The program functions within a highly structured and disciplined environment focusing on respect, essential life skills and assuming responsibility for one’s actions.

- **Child Outreach Program** -- The Carson Station Child Outreach Program provides field trips and an annual Christmas party for at-risk youth with the community.

The City will continue to contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department to provide the same level of police protection services for the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation territory as is available throughout Carson. The City’s existing contract will be expanded to include additional Sheriff’s Department staff to provide police protection and traffic enforcement services to serve the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation territory. Commercial and general traffic enforcement will be enhanced. No additional police facilities are required.
5.2 Fire Protection

The City of Carson contracts with the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (CFPD) to provide fire protection and emergency medical services throughout the City. CFPD also provides fire services to the proposed annexation territory. There are five primary fire stations that provide both fire and emergency medical services to the City of Carson, with four of the stations located within Carson’s boundaries. In addition to the fire stations, there is a Fire Prevention Office located at the Carson City Hall.

9-1-1 calls are dispatched by the CFPD Command and Control facility in Los Angeles. The California Highway Patrol provides initial dispatch of cell phone 911 calls. The CHP dispatches law enforcement-related calls to Sheriff Stations and dispatches fire and emergency medical calls to the CFPD Command and Control facility. In addition to emergency fire suppression services, the City also provides paramedic, ambulance transport, hazardous materials services, air rescue, and dispatch through CFPD.

Table 5
Fire Stations and Equipment Serving the City of Carson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>STAFF PER SHIFT</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station No. 10 1860 E. Del Amo, Carson</td>
<td>1 Captain 2 Engineers 2 Firefighters 1 Utility Driver 1 Battalion Chief</td>
<td>Engine Foam Unit Utility Vehicle Staff Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station No. 36 127 W. 223rd Street, Carson</td>
<td>2 Captains 2 Engineers 3 Firefighters 3 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
<td>2 Engines Paramedic Squad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station No. 105 18915 S. Santa Fe Ave., Compton</td>
<td>2 Captains 2 Engineers 5 Firefighters</td>
<td>Engine HazMat Squad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station No. 116 755 Victoria Street, Carson</td>
<td>2 Captains 2 Firefighters 2 Firefighters 3 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
<td>Engine Paramedic Squad Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station No. 127 2049 E. 223rd Street, Carson</td>
<td>1 Captain 2 Engineers 3 Firefighters</td>
<td>Engine Quint Light Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gateway Final Municipal Services Review (November 2009)

In addition to Stations 36 and 116, identified above, additional paramedic squads are located in the surrounding area (Lomita, Lawndale, Hawthorne, Lakewood, Paramount and Rolling Hills) to augment coverage in Carson. Three Los Angeles County Fire Department helicopters are strategically located to provide air ambulance and paramedic service to the area that includes Carson. Station 105 in Rancho Dominguez provides hazardous materials emergency response within the area. In 2004, the average response time (including dispatch) for those fire stations serving Carson averaged 4:18 minutes.
The Los Angeles County Fire Department's current Five-year Fire Station Plan includes a new station in the western part of the City near the 405/110 Freeway interchange. It is identified as a Priority Four project, with one being the highest priority and five the lowest. No site has been selected.

The City will continue to contract with the Los Angeles County Fire Department and maintain the existing level of fire protection services for the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation territory. No additional fire facilities or staffing are required to serve the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation territory.

5.3 Water Service

Water service in the City of Carson is provided by the California Water Service Company (formerly Dominguez Water Company) and the Golden State Water Company (formerly Southern California Water Company). Golden State Water Company serves approximately 13 percent of the City of Carson. The California Water Service Company serves the remaining 87 percent of Carson along with the proposed annexation territory within its Dominguez District service area. California Water Service Company, the largest investor-owned American water utility west of the Mississippi River, was formed in 1926. The San Jose-based company serves 500,000 customers through 28 customer operations centers throughout California. Its rates and operations are regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. Its local service area, located in the South Bay, covers a 35 square mile area, including most of Carson.

California Water Service Company has two principal water sources: local groundwater and imported water. Imported water is purchased from the West Basin Municipal Water District, a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The Company has eight direct and one indirect MWD service connections. The Company participates in the MWD-sponsored "In-Lieu" Water Programs, whereby water suppliers purchase imported water from MWD at a reduced rate instead of pumping groundwater. The non-pumped groundwater then stays in the basin for use in the future when imported water may not be as plentiful.

The total number of California Water Service Company customers in its Dominguez District is projected to grow approximately 10.7 percent from 2005 to 2030. Future shifts in water demand most likely would result from either the expansion/dowisizng of major industrial customers, new industrial customer growth and the introduction of recycled water. To meet water demands for the next decade, the company will rely on a mix of ground, imported and recycled water sources. As shown in its 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, California Water Service Company projections indicate that, under normal precipitation conditions, it will have sufficient water supplies to meet annual customer water demand through 2030.

The Golden State Water Company serves a small portion of north Carson. It is an investor-owned private utility company that supplies water service to approximately 2,030 customers within the City of Carson. Carson is within the District's Lawndale/Gardena Zone, which has an average daily demand of 13,900 gpm, a maximum daily demand of 20,850 gpm, and a peak hour demand of 35,445 gpm. The Company
purchases approximately 80 percent of its water supply from MWD, with approximately 20 percent of its water supply obtained through company-owned deep wells.

The California Water Service Company is the current local water purveyor for the majority of Carson and the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation area. There will be no change in the water provider or service levels upon annexation. California Water Service Company has sufficient water supply and capacity to meet expected demands.

5.4 Wastewater Service

The City of Carson owns the local sanitary sewers within the City. The sewers are constructed of vitrified clay pipe which have a normal service life in excess of 75 years. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) operates and maintains the local sewer lines within the City of Carson and within the Rancho Dominguez annexation area. The LACDPW collects user fees for operation and maintenance of existing local sewer lines.

LACDPW maintains three small sewer lift stations that are located within the Carson boundaries:

- **Scottsdale Pump Station**
  23426 Avalon Boulevard, Carson
  Capacity: 100 gallons per minute

- **Belshaw Pump Station**
  22650 Belshaw Avenue, Carson
  Capacity: 1,125 gallons per minute

- **Recreation Road Pump Station**
  21820 Recreation Road, Carson
  Capacity: 100 gallons per minute

The Los Angeles County Sanitation District maintains the trunk sewer lines within the City of Carson and the proposed annexation area. There are approximately 12 trunk sewer lines within the City ranging in size from 50 inches to 8 feet in diameter. Trunk sewer lines are located in Del Amo Boulevard, Main Street, Wilmington Avenue, Alameda Street, and Broadway.

The Joint Water Pollution Control Plant, located at 24501 South Figueroa Street in Carson, is part of the Joint Outfall System that provides sewage treatment and disposal for residential, commercial and industrial users within the 17 sanitation districts in Los Angeles County that are participants in the Joint Outfall Agreement. Owned and operated by the County Sanitation Districts, the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) is one of the largest wastewater treatment plants in the world. It serves a population of about 3.5 million people and many industries in southern and eastern Los Angeles County.
It provides advance primary and partial secondary treatment for 320 million gallons of wastewater per day.

The JWPCP was recently upgraded to full secondary treatment. Prior to discharge, the treated wastewater is disinfected with hypochlorite and sent to the Pacific Ocean through a network of outfalls. These outfalls extend two miles off the coast of the Palos Verdes Peninsula to a depth of 200 feet. The CSD is building another tunnel for the ocean outfall to allow the existing tunnel and outfall to be inspected and maintained. The November 2005 “Gateway Municipal Service Review,” prepared for the 26 cities and 26 special districts that make up Southeast Los Angeles County, identified no wastewater collection deficiencies or needs for the City of Carson.

The Los Angeles County Public Works Department and the Los Angeles County Sanitation District maintain the local and regional sewer system in the City of Carson and within the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation area. There will be no change in service providers or service levels upon annexation.

5.5 Solid Waste Services

The City of Carson has franchise agreements with two private companies, Waste Management and EDCO, to provide solid waste services within the City. Waste Management collects approximately 70,000 tons from residential customers and 153,000 tons from commercial and industrial customers per year. The solid waste collected is transported to a transfer station at 321 W. Francisco Street in Carson, where it is sorted. The 10-acre facility has a permitted capacity of 5,300 tons per day. After the materials are sorted, tires, green waste, steel and wood are sent to special facilities for disposal or recycling.

The remaining waste materials are loaded onto trailers and taken to the El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County, a distance of 75 miles from Carson. The El Sobrante Landfill currently has a capacity of 10,000 tons per day and has a current life expectancy of 80 years. Waste Management also uses Lancaster Landfill and Simi Valley Landfill as alternatives.

Currently, commercial and industrial properties within the annexation area may select their own waste service provider. Upon annexation, they would be required to use Waste Management or EDCO per the terms of Carson’s franchise agreements.

5.6 Regional/Local Flood Control

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) is the responsible agency for regional flood control protection within Los Angeles County. LACDPW presently owns and maintains three flood control facilities within or in close proximity to the City of Carson. These facilities include the Dominguez Channel, Compton Creek and Wilmington Channel. Flows in the City are conveyed by several networks of large drainage facilities to the Dominguez Channel, the primary regional flood control system that traverses and serves the City. The City of Carson contracts with the LACDPW to
provide routine maintenance and clean-up of debris in City-owned catch basins. The majority of local storm drains and related facilities are owned, operated and maintained by the LACDPW.

The LACDPW currently provides regional flood control and related maintenance services to the proposed annexation area. No change in flood control service providers or service levels will occur upon annexation of the Rancho Dominguez territory to the City of Carson.

5.7 Schools
The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and Compton Unified School District (CUSD) provide school services to the City of Carson and the proposed annexation territory. LAUSD has 14 elementary schools, five middle schools, and six high schools that serve the Carson area. CUSD has one elementary school, one middle school and one high school serving the City. The annexation will not affect school district boundaries, and no change in public school service providers will occur should the Rancho Dominguez territory annex to the City of Carson.

5.8 Parks and Recreation
Upon annexation of the Rancho Dominguez territory, park and recreation services for this area will transfer from the County of Los Angeles to the City of Carson. The City has 16 public parks, one County park (Victoria), and one public golf course (Victoria Golf Course). The Carson Community Center also provides recreation programs and meeting rooms for all residents. The total amount of recreational open space in Carson is 354 acres. Table 6 lists the City’s park and recreational facilities.

### Table 6
City of Carson Parks and Recreational Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK FACILITY</th>
<th>AMENITIES</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Park 19101 S. Wilmington Ave.</td>
<td>Basketball courts, children’s play area, Frisbee golf course, meeting/craft rooms, picnic areas, tennis courts.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Street Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calas Park 1000 W. 220th Street</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children’s play area, meeting/craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, tennis courts, wading pools</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage Crest Park 23800 S. Figueroa Street</td>
<td>Ball field, basketball court, children’s play area, meeting/craft room, picnic areas, snack bar</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Community Center 3 Civic Plaza Drive</td>
<td>26 meeting/craft rooms; 5400 sq. ft expansion planned that will include a new senior hall and two new early childhood classrooms.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Park and Pool 21411 S. Orrick Avenue</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children’s play area, football field, horse-shoes, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, soccer field, volleyball courts, swimming pool.</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Amo Park 703 E. Del Amo Boulevard</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children’s play area, football field, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar.</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin Park and Pool 21205 Water Street</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children’s play area, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, tennis courts, volleyball courts, wading pools.</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Park and Pool 21330 Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children’s play area, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, tennis courts, swimming pool.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Mini Park 21930 S. Water Street</td>
<td>Children’s play area, picnic areas.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK FACILITY</td>
<td>AMENITIES</td>
<td>ACREAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemingway Park 700 E. Gardena Boulevard</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children's play area, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, tennis courts.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Park 700 E. Gardena Boulevard</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children's play area, football field, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, soccer field; tennis courts.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Street Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Park and Pool 23410 Catskill Avenue</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, boxing equipment, children's play area, gymnasium, horse-shoes, meeting craft rooms, picnic areas, snack bar, tennis courts, volleyball courts; wading pool, swimming pool, boxing center...</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson Park 17400 Lysander Drive</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children's play area, horse-shoes, meeting craft rooms; picnic areas, snack bar; tennis courts, volleyball courts, wading pool.</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street Mini Park 440 E. Walnut Avenue</td>
<td>Basketball courts, children's play area, picnic areas;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Sports Complex and Skate Park 22400 Moneta Avenue</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, children's play area, horse-shoes, meeting craft rooms; tennis courts, wading pools, 25,000 square foot building with basketball courts, gymnasium, volley ball courts, fitness center, racquetball courts. Skate Park is planned.</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park (County) 419 E. 192nd Street</td>
<td>Ball fields, basketball courts, play area, picnic area, recreation building, tennis courts, swimming pool, and gymnasium.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Golf Course (County) 340 East 192nd Street</td>
<td>Public regulation golf course.</td>
<td>161.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Golf Course 19800 S. Main Street</td>
<td>18-hole, par 3 golf course with two tier driving range.</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.9 Streets/Public Works

Upon annexation, responsibility for the operation and maintenance of local streets will transfer from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to the City of Carson. The City's Public Works Division is responsible for the operation and maintenance of streets, sidewalks, storm drains, traffic signals, alleys, dirt roads, street signs, street trees, streetscapes, and park trees. Because of the proximity of City facilities to the proposed annexation area, response time to address public works/road-related issues will likely improve.

The County has deferred maintenance and capital improvements for the streets within the Rancho Dominguez area, and there is now serious deterioration on some of the major streets, including Del Amo Avenue. The City of Carson has a high standard for the condition of its roadways and streets and plans to address these needs in a timely manner as funding permits.

5.10 Code Enforcement

Primary responsibility for code enforcement services within the proposed annexation territory is through the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The City of Carson Code Enforcement Division provides ongoing enforcement of the Carson Municipal Code and other codes. The City would provide code enforcement services within the annexation area.
5.11 Street Lighting

Street lighting services are provided both within the proposed annexation area and the City of Carson through Los Angeles County. A series of Los Angeles County Lighting Maintenance Districts provide funding for the operation and maintenance of lighting facilities. The districts are funded through property owner assessments. There would be no change to this service upon annexation.

5.12 Library Services

The County of Los Angeles Library system provides services to residents living in County unincorporated areas and to residents in 51 of the 88 incorporated cities in Los Angeles County, including the City of Carson. Two County libraries are located in the City of Carson: the Victoria Park Library, located at 17906 S. Avalon Boulevard, and the Carson Regional Library, located at 151 E. Carson Street.

Together, both libraries offer a collection of over 250,000 books, periodicals, audio recordings, magazines, pamphlets, and government publications. Services available to patrons include public internet access, workstations, photocopiers, typewriters, rental videos, public meeting rooms, pre-school story hours, adult literacy programs, and specialized children’s programs. The Carson Regional Library is also a selective government depository for federal and state documents.

Funding sources for the City of Carson library service area consist of property taxes, revenues for fines, fees and other miscellaneous revenue sources. Los Angeles County libraries also receive funds from the Public Library Foundation allocated by the State annually on a per capita basis.

Los Angeles County currently provides library services to the proposed annexation area and to the City of Carson. No change in library service providers or service levels will occur within the annexation area should the territory annex to the City of Carson.

5.13 Animal Services

The Los Angeles County Department of Animal Care and Control serves all unincorporated Los Angeles County areas and 50 contract cities, including the City of Carson. County animal control services respond to calls Monday through Saturday. Officers patrol streets for lost, injured and abandoned animals, sell dog licenses, conduct investigations whenever cruelty to animals is suspected, provide emergency rescues during natural disasters and enforce all state and local animal control laws. The Department is dedicated to promoting humane care of animals through education and a proactive animal services program. The Department has six shelters located throughout Los Angeles County, including one in the City of Carson located at 216 W. Victoria Street.

No additional facilities or staffing are required to serve the animal services needs of the proposed Rancho Dominguez annexation territory.
5.14 Transportation Services

Transportation services within the annexation territory are currently provided by the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The City of Carson has the Carson Circuit, a fixed-route bus system providing service within the City with connections to the Metro Blue Line Station and regional bus services, including MTA, Long Beach Transit, Torrance Transit, MTA, and Gardena Municipal bus lines. Buses run from 5:20 a.m. to 6:40 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 10:40 a.m. to 5:20 p.m. on Saturday. Fares are $1.00; seniors and disabled ride free. Carson also provides Dial-A-Ride service, which serves as an economical taxi service for seniors at least 60 years of age and/or individuals with permanent disabilities. The Dial-A-Ride Program operates 24 hours, seven days a week. Service is provided anywhere within city boundaries and to specific medical and social service appointments at satellite locations outside the city. Satellite areas include Torrance, San Pedro, Gardena, Harbor City, Long Beach, Wilmington and Lomita.

The Carson Circuit bus routes, schedules and fees will not change due to the annexation. Senior and disabled residents within the annexation area will be eligible to use the Carson Dial-a-Ride service at the same reduced rates as current City residents.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County has placed the 1,710-acre Rancho Dominguez annexation territory within the joint sphere of influence of the Cities of Carson, Long Beach and Compton. If annexed to the City of Carson, as proposed, changes in service providers and levels of service for the subject annexation territory will be minimal. Police, fire, paramedic, local and regional sewers, wastewater treatment, library, animal control and street lighting services will continue to be provided by Los Angeles County. Water service will not change.

Services that will change upon annexation include overall government administration, parks and recreation services, land use planning, code enforcement, public works/local streets maintenance, and transportation — all of which will be provided by the City of Carson. Because of the proximity of City facilities to the proposed annexation area, residents of the subject annexation area will likely receive faster response time to address public works/road-related issues and have increased access to City park and recreation facilities and programs. Transportation services would be improved as the annexation area would be served by the Carson Dial-a-Ride. Lastly, the City of Carson will address the condition of the streets and roadways which have deferred maintenance and significant capital needs. The streets and roadways will be brought up to the City’s standards as funding permits.
ATTACHMENT A

LAFCO APPLICATION – PLAN OF SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

The following section specifically responds to the Plan for Municipal Services questionnaire included in the Los Angeles LAFCO application for change of organization:

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

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

Fire protection services are provided through the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County currently provides fire protection services to both the proposed annexation territory and to the City of Carson. A summary of fire protection services provided to the subject area is included in this report beginning on Page 14.

B. Is annexation to a County Fire Protection District part of this request?

No

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

Los Angeles County will continue to provide fire protection services to the subject territory under contract to the City of Carson. No change in service levels will occur upon annexation.

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

Existing service to continue; City contract will be effective upon annexation.

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

Fire protection services to the subject annexation territory will be financed through general property taxes, sales tax revenue, and other revenues which accrue to the City. No special taxes or assessments will be required.

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

No
FLOOD CONTROL SERVICES

A. Which agency currently provides this service? Give a brief description of how this service is currently provided and by which agency.

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) is the responsible agency for flood control services for both the subject territory and the City of Carson. A description of the flood control services provided is included in this report beginning on Page 17.

B. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.

Los Angeles County will continue to provide flood control services to the subject territory. No change in service levels will occur upon annexation.

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

Existing service to continue

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

Flood control services to the subject annexation territory will continue to be financed through general property taxes that are retained by the County. No special taxes or assessments will be required.

LIBRARY SERVICES

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

Library services are provided through the County of Los Angeles. The County currently provides library services to both the annexation territory and to the City of Carson. A summary of library services provided to the subject area is included in this report on Page 20.

B. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.

Los Angeles County will continue to provide library services to the subject territory. No change in service levels will occur upon annexation.
C. *What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?*

Existing service to continue.

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

Library services to the subject annexation territory will continue to be financed through general property taxes that are retained by the County, library fines and user fees. No special taxes or assessments will be required.

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

No

**PARK AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES**

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

Park and recreation services are provided to the annexation territory by the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.

B. *What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.***

Upon annexation of the subject territory, responsibility for park and recreation services for this area will transfer from the County of Los Angeles to the City of Carson. A description of the City’s park and recreation facilities is included in this report beginning on Page 18. Upon annexation, residents will have access to City park and recreation programs.

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

Upon annexation
D. Provide information on how those services will be financed (e.g. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.)

Park and recreation services to the subject area will be financed through general property taxes, sales tax revenue, and other revenues which accrue to the City. No special taxes or assessments will be required.

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

No

POLICE SERVICES

A. Which police protection agency currently provides this service? Give a brief description of how this service is provided and to what extent.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department currently provides police protection services to both the proposed annexation territory and to the City of Carson (by contract). The California Highway Patrol provides traffic enforcement within the annexation area. A summary of police protection services provided to the subject area is included in this report beginning on Page 12.

B. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department will provide police protection and traffic enforcement services to the subject territory by contract with the City of Carson. This will include the addition of deputies, patrol units, COPS deputies, and enhanced general and commercial traffic enforcement. Service levels are expected to increase upon annexation.

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

Upon annexation.

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

Police services to the subject annexation territory will be financed through general property taxes, sales tax revenue and other revenues which accrue to the City. No special taxes or assessments will be required.
E. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request?
No

ROAD MAINTENANCE SERVICES

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

Currently, road maintenance services in the subject area are provided through Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

B. Will services be extended to the affected territory? If so, provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided.

Upon annexation, responsibility for the operation and maintenance of local streets will transfer from the Los County Department of Public Works to the City of Carson. The City’s Public Works Department is responsible for the operation and maintenance of streets, sidewalks, storm drains, traffic signals, alleys, dirt roads, street signs, street trees, streetscapes and park trees. A description of road maintenance services in the area is included in this report beginning on Page 19.

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

Upon annexation

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

Road maintenance services to the subject territory will be financed through general property taxes, sales tax revenue, and other revenues which accrue to the City. No special fees or assessments will be required.

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

Upon the effective date of annexation, the City of Carson will take responsibility for the following property currently owned by the County of Los Angeles: all public roads and any appurtenant slopes, medians and adjacent property. The County of Los Angeles has deferred maintenance and capital improvements for the roadways and streets within the annexation area. The City of Carson intends to negotiate with the County of Los Angeles to seek some level of cost sharing on the capital infrastructure needs within the area. Projects have been specifically identified within the County’s
multi-year Capital Improvement Plan, and the County has been benefiting from the property tax revenue and Utility Users Tax generated within the area.

SOLID WASTE SERVICES

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

Waste Management, Inc. and EDCO provide solid waste services both to the subject territory and to the City of Carson. Commercial and industrial properties within the annexation area may select their solid waste service provider.

B. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.

The City of Carson has franchise agreements with Waste Management, Inc. and EDCO. Per the terms of the agreements, commercial and industrial properties within the annexation area will be limited to using the services of either EDCO or Waste Management. A summary of solid waste services provided in the area is included in this report on Page 17.

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

Upon annexation

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

Solid waste services will be paid directly by the individual property owners. No special taxes or assessments will be required.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT SERVICES

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

The annexation territory is within a Los Angeles County Lighting Maintenance District.
B. Will subject territory be included in any assessment district and be subject to any new assessments upon approval of this request?

The territory will remain within the Lighting Maintenance District; no new assessments would be imposed as a result of annexation.

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

The City of Carson is proposing that the existing five (5) percent Utility Users Tax that is currently collected by the County of Los Angeles within the annexation territory remain in place, with the revenue to accrue to the City of Carson to be used to provide municipal services and capital improvements within the Rancho Dominguez area. This is the continuation of an existing tax and does not represent an increase, a new tax or an expansion of the tax into areas that are now within the City’s boundaries.

STREET LIGHTING SERVICES

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

Street lighting services are provided both within the proposed annexation area and the City of Carson through Los Angeles County. A series of Los Angeles County Lighting Maintenance Districts provide funding for the operation and maintenance of lighting facilities. A description of street lighting services in the area is included in this report beginning on Page 20.

B. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.

Los Angeles County will continue to provide street lighting services to the subject area. No change in service levels will occur upon annexation.

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

Los Angeles County Lighting Maintenance Districts are funded through annual property owner assessments.
WATER SERVICES

A. Is annexation for water service part of this request?

No

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

The subject annexation area is fully developed. No new construction within the area is anticipated. The California Water Service Company, a private water purveyor, provides water to the subject territory and to 87 percent of the City of Carson. In its 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, California Water Service Company states that, under normal precipitation conditions, it will have sufficient water supplies to meet annual customer water demand through 2030.

C. What agencies will be providing water services to the affected territory? Provide a description of the capacity level and range of services to be provided and the approximate date those services will be made available.

California Water Service Company will continue to provide retail water service to the subject territory. A description of water services in the area is included in this report beginning on Page 15.

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

Water services to the subject territory will continue to be financed through water utility rates. No special taxes or assessments will be required.

WASTEWATER SERVICES

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

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works operates and maintains the local sewer lines within the City of Carson and within the Rancho Dominguez annexation area. The Los Angeles County Sanitation District maintains the trunk sewer lines within the City of Carson and the proposed annexation area. A description of wastewater services in the area is included in this report beginning on Page 16.
B. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there will be a change in service level.

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the Los Angeles County Sanitation District will continue to maintain local sewer lines and trunk sewer lines within the annexation area, respectively. No change in service levels will occur if the subject area is annexed.

C. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request?

No

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

Wastewater services for the subject annexation territory will continue to be financed through general property taxes and user fees. No special fees or assessments will be required.
NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich
City of Glendora - City Clerk
City of Glendora - City Manager
City of Glendora - Planning Department
City of Glendora - Police Department
Consolidated Fire Protection District
County Office of the Assessor
County Chief Executive Office
County Sanitation Districts
LA County Committee on School Dist. Organization
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
Sheriff Department – Enforcement Bureau

SUBJECT: City of Glendora Annexation No. 2011-08

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County. The application involves approximately 68 ± acres of inhabited, unincorporated territory. The subject territory is generally located south of Sierra Madre Blvd., east of the City of Azusa corporate limits, west of Barranca Ave., and north of the BNSF Railroad. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or District</th>
<th>Change of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendora</td>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed jurisdictional changes may affect your agency. The submitted application, map, and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit all written concerns and comments to the LAFCO office by February 6, 2012. Should you have any questions regarding this proposal, please contact this office at (626) 204-6500.

Date: January 4, 2012

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

Enc:
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS 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: 2011-08

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Glendora

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

1. Annexation to the City

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: City Council, City of Glendora, by resolution

APPLICANT:
City of Glendora
116 E. Foothill Blvd
Glendora, CA 91741

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON:
Jeff Kugel
Director of Planning & Redevelopment
626-914-8215
jkugel@ci.glendora.ca.us

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 the amount to cover the anticipated litigation costs.

SIGNATURE: ___________________________ DATE: __/14/___

NAME/TITLE:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The proposed annexation is south of Sierra Madre Blvd and east of the City of Azusa boundary, west of Barranca Avenue and north of the BNSF Railroad. The proposed annexation would result in the incorporation of the existing County Islands within this area, of which there are +/-68 acres of developed and undeveloped property.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
Approximately 68.02 Acres

Is the proposal area inhabited (having 12 or more registered voters residing within the territory)?
YES
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 area includes a number of parcels that were formerly used as a commercial nursery for the growing of ornamental plants and an existing single-family neighborhood consisting of 67 residences. The area is surrounded by existing or planned residential development in the cities of Glendora and Azusa. A historic cemetery (the Fairmount Cemetery) is completely surrounded by the project site. In 2010, a 95-acre specific plan was approved by the City of Glendora which included +/- 28 acres of the existing 68 acres of unincorporated islands. Development of the specific plan area faces constraints associated with the land that must be resolved including incomplete or inadequate flood control and/or storm drain improvements, off-site flood hazards that affect the site, soil contamination from the previous decades of the use of the site as a nursery, unsuitable soils conditions in some areas of the site which have liquefaction potential and expansive properties, inclusion of a portion of the site in a "very high fire hazard severity zone", and the proximity of the project area's southern acreage to an existing railroad line which has the potential to expose future residences to excessive noise and vibration impacts from the planned future operation of a light rail line (the Gold Line). A water main line operated by the Covina Irrigating Company also bisects the southerly portion of the site. Despite the constraints described above, appropriate mitigation has been ascribed to the development of the project site which reduces potentially significant impacts below a level of significance. The same flooding, fire, and storm drain capacity issues that affect the specific plan area also affect the existing residential area proposed to be incorporated.

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

The project site is located at the base of the San Gabriel Mountains, at approximately Latitude 34° 8'31.15" North and Longitude 117°53'6.46" West. Located in the Northwest portion of the city of Glendora along the city of Azusa boundary, the project is bounded by Sierra Madre Avenue to the North, Barranca Avenue to the East and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way to the South. The general slope of the topography is in a southwesterly direction ending at the conversion of Citrus Avenue and the existing railroad and ultimately at an existing storm drain inlet and pipe system known as Drain 1264 located below the project site. Makeshift culverts and drainage channels have been installed over undeveloped property in the area over time to convey drainage through the site. There is currently a drainage basin that straddles the city boundaries located midway along the city of Azusa and city of Glendora border known as the Citrus basin.
POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   The population of the territory is estimated at 201 residents assuming 3 persons per household. There are 67 residential units in the territory according to Los Angeles County Assessor records. However, based on 2010 Census household information for the census tract (4008), population may be closer to 2.3 persons per household which would provide a population estimate of 134 residents.

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   The area to be annexed will facilitate the development of a specific plan over +/- 95 acres located in the City of Glendora and existing unincorporated territory. The specific plan development will allow 124 single family dwellings; assuming 4 persons per dwelling, the population could be up to, or above 500 people beyond existing population of the area.

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory?
   TBD

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory?
   66

5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   The subject territory is directly adjacent to existing populated areas. It is surrounded by low density residential development on +/- 20,000 square foot lots.

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

   Growth in the area will come from the conversion of a former +/- 600 acre wholesale container plant operation known as the Monrovia Nursery located in the cities of Azusa and Glendora. Azusa has already commenced development of its side of the Nursery which included annexation of unincorporated areas of the Monrovia Nursery into the City of Azusa. The City of Azusa approved a specific plan for the project contemplating build out of the specific plan at around 1,300 units of single-family residences, townhomes, and condominiums. Within the Glendora portion of the Monrovia Nursery, the City has also approved a specific plan for the development of +/- 95 acres which envisions a build
out of 124-homes. Beyond the boundaries of the specific plan areas, no significant
growth is anticipated since both cities are nearing their build out capacities.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

According to data from the Los Angeles County Assessor, there are 63 single-family
residences in the territory proposed to be annexed and 4 additional dwelling units likely
to be in the of “granny flats”.

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?

State Housing Element law requires that a local jurisdiction accommodate a share of the
region’s projected housing needs for the planning period. This share, called the
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), is important because State law mandates
that jurisdictions provide sufficient land to accommodate a variety of housing
opportunities for all economic segments of the community. Compliance with this
requirement is measured by the jurisdiction’s ability in providing adequate land to
accommodate the RHNA. The Southern California Association of Governments
(SCAG), as the regional planning agency, is responsible for allocating the RHNA to
individual jurisdictions within the region.

The RHNA is distributed by income category. For the 2008 Housing Element update, the
City of Glendora is allocated a RHNA of 744 units as follows:

- Extremely Low Income (up to 30 percent of AMI): 96 units (13 percent)
- Very Low Income (31 to 50 percent of AMI): 96 units (13 percent)
- Low Income (51 to 80 percent of AMI): 119 units (16 percent)
- Moderate Income (81 to 120 percent of AMI): 127 units (17 percent)
- Above Moderate Income (more than 120 percent of AMI): 307 units (41 percent)

This income distribution includes an “impaction correction” factor to allocate a higher
proportion of lower income households to Glendora than the regional average in order to
balance the income distribution across the region. The City must ensure the availability of
residential sites at adequate densities and appropriate development standards to
accommodate these units.

Since the RHNA uses January 1, 2006 as the baseline for growth projections for the
Housing Element planning period of 2008-2014, jurisdictions may count toward the RHNA
any new units built or issued certificates of occupancy since January 1, 2006. Since January
2006, 760 housing units have been developed, approved, planned, or are under
construction in Glendora. These units had the following income distribution: 61 very low
income units, 25 low income units, 0 moderate income units, and 666 above moderate
income units.
### Table 1: Credits Towards RHNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability Level</th>
<th>Extremely Low/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted and Issued Certificates of Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-Family Residences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Kitchen Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units with Planning/Zoning Approval (Not Yet Constructed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-Family Residences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Being Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Units Permitted and Issued Certificates of Occupancy:** According to City records, 368 units have been permitted or issued Certificates of Occupancy since January 1, 2006. Most of these units are market-rate and affordable only to above moderate income Glendora households. Among these 368 units are the 87 affordable units at the Elwood Family Apartments.

The City currently approves two to three applications for second units each year. Eight of the 368 units permitted or issued Certificates of Occupancy since January 1, 2006, are second kitchen units. While second units are not income-restricted, they provide an affordable housing option in Glendora. Neither the State law nor the City's Second Unit Ordinance requires second units to be rented. Therefore, no rental information is collected as part of the City's second unit permitting process. The City has no authority to collect information that is not pertinent to the approval of the second unit application. In addition, "second unit" is a technical planning term, which is never used in rental listings. According to www.rentlicer.com, for rental listings between January and April 2009, 13 studio and single (efficiency) units were listed for rent. The average rent for these small units is $877. There were also 15 one-bedroom units listed for rent, with an average rent of $987. Based on the maximum affordable housing costs for various income groups second kitchen units, which are small units, are affordable to low income small households.
This 67-unit project provides affordable housing to extremely low income (9 units), very low income (52 units), and low income (25 units), and moderate income (one manager's unit) households through a variety of funding sources, including redevelopment housing set-aside and State HOME funds, as well as Low Income Housing Tax Credits.

Units with Planning/Zoning Approval (Not Yet Constructed): According to City records, 267 residential units have received planning/zoning approvals in Glendora. Most of these units are affordable only to above moderate income residents.

Units Planned: 124 single-family homes are anticipated in the Monrovia Nursery Specific Plan area. All of these units are expected to be market rate and affordable only to above moderate income households. An unknown number of second units are also likely to be built but no estimate is provided as part of this information.

Remaining RHNA: The City has already achieved a significant portion of its RHNA with housing units permitted or issued Certificates of Occupancy, under construction, and with planning/zoning approvals. Specifically, 760 units have been permitted or issued Certificates of Occupancy, approved, or are under construction since January 1, 2006. With these credits the City has fulfilled its entire allocation of above moderate income units and has a remaining RHNA of 342 housing units, including 131 units for extremely low/very low income households, 86 units for low income households, and 126 units for moderate income households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>RHNA</th>
<th>Units Permitted/Planned Since 1/1/06</th>
<th>Remaining RHNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low/Very Low</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 the public facilities and provision of public services?
The specific plan project includes public facilities to accommodate flood control, a public bike/pedestrian walking path, public streets, and public open space. The project addresses its own environmental impacts through on-site mitigation programs. Public open space guarantees the public will have access to planned transportation improvements near the project such as access to the Gold Line extension for Phase 2A to Azusa. Flood control measures are planned on-site to protect downstream properties, which are lower income areas, from the threat of flood hazards which exist in the San Gabriel Foothills to the north of these areas. In the project’s construction phases, archeological monitoring is required to minimize or avoid impacts to Native American artifacts that may be unearthed during grading and demolition.

To address traffic impacts the project will create, the project was required to minimize access to existing neighborhoods and utilize nearby arterial streets which serve the community at large.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

As of the date of this application, the County Assessor has determined an assessed value for the annexation area of $22.4 million dollars. The recent sale of +/- 95 acres identified as the Monrovia Nursery has not been included in the valuation. County Assessor records record the land sale at $20 million dollars. The assessed value is presently stated at just under $700,000. The data was collected on November 15, 2011 from a third party data provider of information compiled by the Los Angeles County Assessor (Win2Data).

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

The county has zoned the area RA-20,000 with a general plan land use of Low Density (1-6 units per acre).

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

In December 2010, the City of Glendora adopted a specific plan over the area to be annexed, in concert with approximately 70 acres also owned by the land owner already located in the City of Glendora, which would provide for 124 single-family residential
units overall along with appurtenant infrastructure needed to serve the development of the site. Existing single-family residences would be zoned single-family with a minimum lot size requirement of 20,000 square feet. The City's designation is Single-Family Estates (20,000 square foot minimum lot size), also identified as E-7(20,000) in the City's Zoning Code.

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

No changes are proposed. In December 2010, the City of Glendora amended its pre-zone designation over +/- 28 acres areas to be annexed from Single-Family Estates (20,000 square foot minimum lot size) to Specific Plan in anticipation of annexing the unincorporated territory of the specific plan area. No changes in land use or zoning are proposed involving existing residences either.

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

Land uses in the area are nearly exclusively residential. Areas immediately surrounding the territory to be annexed are developed as single-family residences on lots which are typically 20,000 square feet in area. Beyond the immediately surrounding area, land uses include existing and planned higher density areas located in the City of Azusa to the west in the planned development known as Rosedale located in the City of Azusa. To the immediate south in the City of Glendora, the territory to be annexed is bounded by the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way. Beyond the railroad right-of-way land uses include neighborhood churches, condominiums, single-family residences, and a community college (Citrus College). To the north, the territory to be annexed is bounded by single-family residences located in the City of Glendora and Los Angeles County. Further to the north are the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. To the east, the territory to be annexed is bounded by single-family residences located in the City of Glendora and Los Angeles County. Further east are additional single-family residences, an elementary school and middle-school.

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

The City's general plan designation for the area is Low Density Residential (1-3 units per acre).

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

A portion of the territory to be annexed will implement the Monrovia Nursery Specific Plan adopted by the City of Glendora in 2010. The specific plan includes +/- 28 acres of the territory to be annexed in its land use, circulation and infrastructure plans. Without the territory, the specific plan could not be implemented. The existing residences in the remaining territory are developed at a density of just over 1 unit per acre which is
consistent with the City's General Plan Low Density Residential designation over the area of 1-3 units per acre.

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).

In December 2010, the City of Glendora adopted a specific plan over a portion of the area to be annexed, in concert with approximately 70 acres also owned by the land owner already located in the City of Glendora, which would provide for 124 single-family residential units overall along with appurtenant infrastructure needed to serve the development of the site.

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

The denial of the proposal would render the City of Glendora's specific plan unachievable and leave significant infrastructure needs unmet and likely unfeasible, given the cost of the improvements without being able to spread the cost of the improvements over the entire specific plan area. Without annexation, existing established neighborhoods in the City of Glendora and Los Angeles County could be subject to unwanted traffic increases, unresolved flooding, and sewer capacity issues if development of the area proceeds partly under the City and County's jurisdiction. The City's specific plan relies on the territory to be annexed in helping to bring needed infrastructure to the area which is presently underserved by sewer and flood control improvements. The neighborhoods would be ultimately developed under different development standards without regard to issues raised by county and city residents during the planning phases for the specific plan. Significant concerns raised by both City and County residents included access, flood control, grading, privacy, and neighborhood compatibility.

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

No

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

A portion of the territory to be annexed was formerly part of a commercial plant container nursery which has since ceased operations. The land is presently fallow and not involved in any agricultural production. The property is not part of any open space lands.
GENERAL INFORMATION

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

In April, 2011 the City submitted an application to annex only a portion of the county islands located south of Sierra Madre Avenue and west of Barranca Avenue needed to bring the aforementioned unincorporated specific plan area consisting of +/- 28 acres into the City of Glendora. After consultation with LAFCO staff, the City was directed to expand its annexation application to include the unincorporated island area located south of Sierra Madre Avenue and that LAFCO would process the revised annexation request in accordance with Government Code Section 56375.3 addressing annexations with less than 150 acres. The revised application resulted in an additional +/- 40 acres being added to the City’s annexation request.

The only reason the City has initiated this annexation request is to move the implementation of its adopted 2010 specific plan forward. The development of the specific plan area will stimulate hundreds of construction jobs and bring millions of dollars of investment into the local economy as well increase county property tax rolls. In addition to the general economic reasons stated, the proposal supports government efficiency and good planning as the area to be annexed is presently a substantial portion of the unincorporated area known as the “East Azusa Islands”. Except for fire services, County services are generally not located in a manner which can provide optimum levels of service and efficiency to the area to be annexed. Annexation of the area into the City of Glendora will generally relieve the county from having to provide services that are property-centric such as law enforcement, zoning, and building services. Instead, the annexation would result in the delivery of services to the area to be annexed to be provided by the City of Glendora, which has facilities and personnel within a few short miles of the area to be annexed, increasing government responsiveness and efficiency in the delivery of services to the area.

In addition, the specific plan provides effective neighborhood-level planning through implementation of a development plan that is responsive to neighborhood concerns over the development of a 98 acre infill site which once accommodated the Monrovia Nursery. It is also critical for the purposes of infrastructure planning and financing, that the Monrovia Nursery be developed as one piece. Areas of the Nursery located in the City cannot be developed without the territory presently under the County’s jurisdiction and vice-versa due to the need to provide infrastructure over land in both city and county jurisdiction. The land will likely remain fallow for a significant period of time depriving the City and County of badly needed construction jobs and development unless the property can be annexed into the City where the development of the land has been thoroughly studied and evaluated along with substantial input from both City and County residents.

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 delivery of services to adjacent areas will not be significantly affected. For example service providers for water, sewer, and fire will continue to be the same since the City and County already provide these services and will continue to do so if the proposal is approved. Only the City of Glendora or Los Angeles County has the authority to provide the services to the general area. The proposal will merely transfer responsibility for many of the basic services residential development requires from the County to the City such as building, zoning, and law enforcement. Social services will continue to be provided to the area by the County. Other than City/County boundaries, no other agency or district boundaries are proposed to be changed.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:
See response to Question 1.

c. The local government structure of the County:
See response to Question 1 and 2a. In addition, other than flood control facilities generally located in the area, the County does not maintain facilities such as libraries, parks or law enforcement facilities in the area. Therefore the annexation will have no affect on the County's local government presence. Fire protection is provided to the area by the County and will remain so after the annexation.

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 facilities necessary to provide those services.

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

For FY2010/11, the City adopted an operating budget of just over $70.6 million on revenues of $82 million. Expenditures on capital projects on over $8 million make up the difference between the City’s operating budget and revenues. The City of Glendora is a full-service City providing a host of services to the community. The City maintains a police force of 55 sworn personnel and a civilian force of 40 personnel to support the community's law enforcement function. Overall the City has approximately 220 full-time staff that provide services to the residents of the City. The development project anticipated to be built on the area to be annexed will add another +/- 400 residents to the City representing a less than 1 percent increase in population (50,073 people as of the 2010 Census). The City provides its own development services (building, planning, engineering), library, public works, and water functions. Human services include senior, recreation, parks, and housing assistance services. The City does not forecast any significant increases in services needed to serve the area to be annexed. LAFCO's 2005
Municipal Services Review (MSR) for the East Azusa Islands did not reflect any significant deficiencies in the City of Glendora's ability to provide services to the area. The City is already the likely provider of human services, library services, and park and recreation services and facilities. Costs for serving the area are therefore already built into the City's budget. The cost of providing other property-centric services such as zoning, building, code enforcement and law enforcement is not considered to be significant given the extremely small nature of the annexation. Any on-going service costs associated with serving the area to be annexed can be met through the City's share of received property taxes from.

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

Within the specific plan area, the annexation and ultimate development of the property into 124 single-family homes is not anticipated to require a significant expansion of new services from the City. The project will provide all of the public infrastructure (roads, storm drain, flood control, sewer, water, open space) needed to adequately serve the development. The infrastructure needs to develop the site were evaluated and identified in the Monrovia Nursery Specific Plan which the City of Glendora prepared for the project and adopted in 2010. For the existing developed portion of the territory to be annexed the City retains service capacity within its existing framework of services provided to serve the additional territory. The area was included as part of the City's General Plan build-out scenario when it was updated in 2006. LAFCO's 2005 Municipal Services Review (MSR) for the East Azusa Islands did not reflect any significant deficiencies in the City of Glendora's ability to provide services to the area. Only the manner in which solid waste service are provided are likely to change due to the impending closure of the Puente Hills land fill in 2013 and the implementation of "waste by rail". However the City does not directly provide waste disposal service but instead would enter into a franchise agreement designating a waste hauler to provide services to the residents.

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?

If the area to be annexed is left within the boundary of Los Angeles County, the County will need to continue to maintain services needed when the property is eventually developed. County services for fire suppression are already present and would not be affected one way or the other. Other County services that are property-centric would be continued to be provided by the County. In the properties' present undeveloped condition, virtually no services are required to support the property. This would change as the property is developed for residential purposes. The County would continue to provide services for the existing developed territory consisting of over 60 homes if the annexation is not completed in the manner proposed. The City assumes the County is
already providing an adequate level of service for the services utilized by existing residents in the territory and that County costs would continue on as they have if the annexation is not approved.

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

Not applicable. See responses to Questions 1 and 2 under Government Services. The City maintains sufficient services to incorporate the +/- 68 acres without modifying existing service delivery systems. The aforementioned specific plan project is extending existing infrastructure into the area to be annexed or building new public facilities to serve the development and existing homes such as flood control and open space facilities. LAFCO’s 2005 Municipal Services Review (MSR) for the East Azusa Islands did not reflect any significant deficiencies in the City of Glendora’s ability to provide services to the 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.

As part of the City’s standard development fee and property assessment structure, the developer of the specific plan property would be required to pay to the City development permit fees for building permits, water, sewer, storm drain, grading, park development, and various fees related to development. The specific plan developer is also required to pay a per lot fee to the City for reimbursement of the preparation of the specific plan estimated to be around $4,000 per lot as permitted under Government Code 65450. New development is also subject to the school development fee of the Glendora Unified School District and the sewer connection fee for Sanitation District No. 22. Existing development would not be subject to any new fees or levies. The City has no utility users tax.

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?
   NA – No Sphere of Influence amendment is proposed.

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 this proposal?
   NA – No Sphere of Influence amendment is proposed.
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).

NA – No Sphere of influence amendment is proposed.

BOND INDEBTNESS

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

The City of Glendora has existing bonded indebtedness for water improvement bonds. There were three separate bond issues of $10,000,000 each - $30,000,000 total. The City’s Redevelopment Agency also maintains bonded indebtedness however the area to be annexed is not proposed to be included in a redevelopment project area. The bonded indebtedness of Los Angeles County is not known to the City.

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

For property developed in the specific plan area, as property is developed into single-family lots, each new lot would be subject to its fair share of repaying the water improvement bonds bonded indebtedness which is based on street frontage and property acreage. Since existing homes in the territory to be annexed are already served by the City for water, property owners are already paying toward retiring the water improvement bonded indebtedness.

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

No existing indebtedness exists. As property in the aforementioned specific plan area to be annexed is developed into single-family lots, each new lot would be subject to its fair share of repaying the City’s indebtedness for the issuance of water improvement bonds described above. Existing homes in the territory to be annexed are already paying toward retiring the water improvement bonded indebtedness. The territory to be annexed would not be liable for any debt of the redevelopment agency.

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

N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

On September 28, 2011 the City held a neighborhood meeting to advise the residents within the territory to be annexed of the City's proposal to annex. Residents who spoke at the event were generally opposed to annexation. A list of the property owners who were notified of the neighborhood meeting is included.

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

   Jeff Kugel
   Director of Planning & Redevelopment
   City of Glendora
   116 E. Foothill Blvd.
   Glendora, CA 91741
   (626) 914-8215
   jkugel@ci.glendora.ca.us

   Harriet Rapista
   Director of Development
   City Ventures
   2850 Redhill Avenue, Suite 200
   Santa Ana, CA 92705
   (310) 947-2416
   harriet@cityventures.com
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION--ATTACHMENT "A"
Plan for Municipal Services -- Annexation 2011-08 (Glendora)

1. Describe how this 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.

The proposal will result in the annexation of +/- 28 acres of territory into the City of Glendora for the purpose of facilitating the development of +/- 98 acres of land which is currently fallow which previously housed the Monrovia Nursery. In 2010 the City of Glendora approved a specific plan and two tentative subdivision maps over the 98 acres which included the Monrovia Nursery’s property in the City of Glendora and the referenced 28 acres of unincorporated territory in the County. Conditions of approval required the unincorporated territory of the Monrovia Nursery to be annexed into the City of Glendora. At the direction of LAFCO staff, the City is also proposing to annex an additional +/- 40 acres of unincorporated territory developed with over 60 single-family homes.

While the existing developed territory is substantially served by utilities, services and infrastructure already in place, it is also underserved by other infrastructure systems such as storm drain and flood control improvements. These “missing” infrastructure improvements will be installed as part of the development of the specific plan area. The unincorporated, undeveloped property within the specific plan is not served by the utilities necessary to serve the property and will be provided upon development. The territory to be annexed is already within the City’s service area for water and is already served by the Los Angeles County Fire Department which also provides the City’s fire and medical emergency services. No sewer or storm drain services are provided to the undeveloped territory to be annexed due to its undeveloped condition but the necessary services and facilities will be provided by the Sanitation District and L.A. County Department of Public Works. The existing homes in the territory to be annexed are already served by sewer and some storm drain improvements. The City of Glendora already provides library, youth, senior, and park and recreation programs to the area since it is the closest service provider in the area and will continue to do so after the property is developed.

Since the portion of the territory in the specific plan area to be annexed is presently undeveloped, sewer and storm drains for new development approved as a condition of subdivision will be built with the appropriate capacity to serve the project which the territory to be annexed is a part. In March of 2010, the Sanitation District notified the City that the project could be served by the District for wastewater, indicating that the sewer trunk line that would serve the project had a design capacity of 7.7 million gallons per day (mgd). The conveyed peak flow when last measured in 2005 was 6.2 mgd. For storm drain and flood control, new facilities will be built to provide accommodate new and existing storm water runoff and flood protection.
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For emergency services, the developed portion of the territory and the portion of the territory in the specific plan area to be annexed is already served by the Los Angeles County Fire Department which maintains a number of stations in Glendora, including a station within several hundred feet of the specific plan project site. For police protection, the territory to be annexed will transition from the Los Angeles County Sherriff’s Department to the Glendora Police Department. Emergency response provided by the Glendora Police Department is four minutes or less. The City’s police facility is located within two miles of the territory to be annexed. The nearest Sherriff’s Department facility is located in San Dimas which is approximately seven miles away.

New street, storm drain and flood control facilities and improvements that will serve the territory to be annexed will be constructed as part of the aforementioned specific plan. The costs of the improvements will be borne by the project developer of the specific plan, City Ventures. Once built, public facilities such as streets and water will be maintained by the City while sewer, storm drain and flood control facilities will be turned over to the County to be maintained (COSANL.A. District 22 for sewer and L.A. County DPW for flood control). Services are proposed to be financed by general property taxes.

Services provided will be financed through the general property tax levy. While the developed portion of the territory to be annexed will result in a slight transfer of property tax revenue from the County to the City of around $25,000 new development proposed which the annexation will facilitate, is conservatively estimated to generate property valuations of around $100,000,000 from the development of high end, for sale, single-family homes. Given the County’s share of property tax revenue the development would yield roughly $300,000. Property tax revenue to the City is estimated at $100,000. New development facilitated by the annexation would also provide additional fees and property tax revenues for other taxing entities, for example property tax revenue to the Fire Department is estimated at $160,000.

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.

Los Angeles County Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency service to the City of Glendora. The City is in the service area of Battalion 2 serving Glendora, Claremont and San Dimas. There are three fire stations located within the City serve the City of Glendora: Fire Station 85 located at 650 East Gladstone, Fire Station 86 located at 520 South Amelia Avenue and Fire Station 151 located at 231 West Mountain View Avenue. Fire Station 97, which is part of Battalion 16 is also literally located across from Area A of the proposed annexation.
Medical
The County of Los Angeles Fire Department provides Emergency Response Service (EMS). Although none of the stations located within Glendora have this section it is accessible through other stations in the county. However, each station is staffed with qualified emergency medical training (EMT) firefighters. In addition, Station 85 has an Emergency Service Team, which serves similar functions, and Station 151 is equipped with a paramedic unit. This means that the nine firefighters are also trained paramedics.

Response Times
According to the 2005 East San Gabriel Valley Final Municipal Service Review (MSR) response times for fire and medical emergencies is less than 5 minutes when measured in 2004 which is well below recommended response times identified by the National Fire Protection Association, the Commission on Fire Accreditation, and the California Emergency Medical Services (CalEMS).

2. Is annexation to a County Fire Protection District part of this request?
No. The area is already included within the boundaries of the Fire Protection District and the City of Glendora annexed to the Fire Protection District in the 1960s. No changes are required.

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.

See response to Question 1. No changes are proposed.

4. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?
Fire and Emergency Services are already available.

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

The increased property taxes generated by the project which the areas to be annexed are a part will contribute additional property taxes to the Fire District needed to provide service to the area.

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

The County of Los Angeles is responsible for the operations and maintenance of the fire services and facilities that serve the proposed annexation area. The City is not aware of any operational changes that will occur.
Flood Control Services

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

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works maintains a substantial system of flood control channels, debris basins, and storm drains within the City. As development occurs within the City and new flood control facilities are built, the City typically requires facilities to be constructed to County standards so that improvements can be turned over to DPW for maintenance.

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.

DPW is expected to provide flood control services to the territory to be annexed as well as the incorporated areas that will be developed. The aforementioned specific plan will involve new construction of several thousand feet of new storm drains to serve a development of 124 homes over +/- 95 acres. In addition a new water detention/water quality basin will be constructed encompassing about 3.6 acres of the +/- 95 acre project area. It is also possible one or more debris basins may be constructed on or off-site to accommodate around 16,000 cubic yards of debris that has the potential to inundate the project area. The construction of the project would increase the level of flood protection in an approximate 500-acre watershed area which is presently unprotected from a “bulked and burned” scenario where the foothills located north of the area to be annexed is burned followed by heavy rains creating mudflows similar to what La Canada experienced in 2010 after the Station Fire. The planned flood control improvements would protect 150 existing homes in the area in addition to new homes planned. The improvements planned for the specific plan development will also provide protection for existing homes in the area to be annexed.

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

It is anticipated that the water detention/water quality basin and debris basins would be constructed by December 2012. The exact timing and order of construction of accompanying storm drains is dependent upon project construction phasing. The facilities would be turned over to DPW as soon as practicable. Project build out is anticipated by 2014.
4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.).

Construction of the facilities will be borne by the developer. Maintenance will be supported by the increase in property taxes from development in the specific plan area. Currently the assessed valuation of the specific plan area is roughly $700,000. Upon completion the anticipated value of property and improvements will be well in excess of $100,000,000.

Library Services

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

The City Glendora maintains its own library and is the closest library facility to the area to be annexed. The nearest county library is located in San Dimas approximately 7 miles away from the proposed annexation area. The 2005 MSR identified the Glendora Public Library as having the highest circulation per capita. The Library does not limit any patron’s ability to use its facilities or material. To check out material a patron must have a valid identification and be able to prove their place of residency. Current library use statistics show that there are over 14,000 patrons who use the Glendora Public Library who are not residents of Glendora which is likely to already include the residents of unincorporated areas in Glendora since the County does not maintain any facilities

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

The Glendora Public Library would be available to residents of the area to be annexed and as described above is geographically the closest library to the area to be annexed and is located within 2 miles of the territory. The closest county public library is in San Dimas which is 7 miles from the area to be annexed. The Glendora Public Library provides the community with a full range of effective information and reader services that support work, lifelong learning, personal growth, enjoyment and civic involvement.

The Glendora Public Library is a full service library, offering information services and programs to all ages from infants (story times) to children (book groups, craft programs, bookmark contest) to teens (Battle of the Books, SAT workshops) to adults and seniors (wellness programs, leisure programs, adult literacy). Assistance at the adult and children’s reference desks is available during all library open hours.
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The Library's collection of approximately 143,000 items includes books, downloadable electronic books (e-books), digital and CD audio books, music CDs, software programs, educational and classic movies on DVD and VHS, magazines, newspapers and pieces of microform. The collection includes large type and international language materials. Materials from other lending libraries are available through interlibrary loan. The Library also offers a variety of online resources, which are accessible 24/7 from any computer.

The Glendora Public Library offers 14 public computer workstations, 2 laptops that are available for adult patrons to check out for in-library use, a copy center, study rooms and 2 larger meeting rooms. Other services offered include materials recycling (via the Friends Book Loft), homebound services and exam proctoring.

The Glendora Public Library is currently open 6 days a week, including night and weekend hours. The number of items circulated per registered borrower is 10.9.

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

The Glendora Public Library is already serving the area to be annexed as well as other unincorporated parts of Los Angeles County.

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

The Glendora Public Library is funded primarily through General Fund expenditures from the City of Glendora.

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

No. The City of Glendora already owns and operates the Glendora Public Library. No facility upgrades are required to accommodate the increase in patronage the annexation and ultimate development of the property would result in. Improvements are made to the Glendora Public Library as part of the City's nominal facility maintenance and capital improvement program.

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

Open space and recreational uses available to the City include city-owned active and passive facilities and shared facilities with other public or private parties. Glendora has an inventory
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of a total of approximately 4,911.63 acres of land designated in various open space
categories. Approximately 4,300 acres of land are designated as Conservation Open Space,
which includes Angeles National Forest areas, Big Dalton Wilderness Park and South Hills
Park. Big Dalton Wilderness Park and South Hills Park provide both recreational and open
space opportunities within Glendora. The Glendora Country Club also provides private
recreational facilities. The City also operates its own teen center and senior center. Within
the past 4 years the City recently completed a $12 million dollar renovation of one of its
major park facilities.

The Recreation Division of the Community Services Department provides seasonal
programs for all age groups including youth and adults. Programs include sports leagues,
educational classes, volunteer opportunities, leisure activities and trips, dance, fitness and
exercise classes, after school, summer and holiday activities, and a year-round tennis
program and summer swim program.

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.

The City of Glendora will continue to provide services. The territory to be annexed is part of
a larger site which when built out will add approximately 500 residents to the City’s
population. The City’s ability to serve these new residents will not be significantly
impacted. The level and range of services available will be the same as described in
Question 1 above.

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

These services are available now and will be available upon annexation.

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

The city’s recreation programs and park maintenance activities are funded primarily through
General Fund expenditures from the City of Glendora and revenue generated from activity
and facility fees.

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

As part of the development the territory is included in, the City will be receiving a
dedication of parkland of around three acres which will be used for passive park purposes.

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.
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.

Police protection will be provided by Glendora Police Department located at 150 South Glendora Avenue, located within 2 miles of the territory to be annexed. The police department has 52 sworn officers and 38 civilian employees. Sworn officers include one chief, one captain, five lieutenants, five sergeants, six corporals and 34 officers. In addition to the full-time officers and civilian employees, Glendora has a reserve officer force. The reserve officer force provides additional, equally qualified officers on a flexible, part-time status that provide valuable aid to the department. These seven reserve members assist the department in fulfilling their mission and typically provided over 2,000 service hours.

The department provides a full range of activities and programs that promote the community’s safety and security. Essential components of this mission include patrol and dispatch activities, investigations, traffic control, and crime prevention. The City also maintains its own temporary holding facilities. Services provided by the Sherriff’s Department in support of the Police Department include search and rescue, crime lab, bomb squad, and academy training.

The reported emergency response time for the Glendora Police Department is four minutes or less.

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

These services are available now and will be available upon annexation.

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

The City’s police function is funded primarily through General Fund expenditures from the City of Glendora. General fund expenditures are derived from property and sales tax revenue to the City. As indicated previously, the development of the specific plan area will generate property tax valuation well in excess of $100,000,000 of which the City will generally receive .001 percent to provide additional services to the area, in addition to property taxes from the existing developed property in the territory to be annexed, which are estimated to be $21,000.

5. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? If yes, please give details.
No. The City of Glendora maintains the appropriate police facilities to serve the community.

Road Maintenance Services

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

Road maintenance is presently provided by LA County. Because the territory to be annexed and adjoining City properties are undeveloped and full street improvements are lacking. Existing roadways are not fully improved and do not maintain typical minimum widths for local residential streets. The level of maintenance provided by LA County is unknown.

2. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory upon approval of this request?

Within the territory to be annexed street maintenance is going to be divided between the City and County since one agency or the other will control some or most of the right of way. The sum of the street frontage of the territory to be annexed is approximately 1,200 feet long and occurs on Milton Avenue, Yucca Ridge Road and Sierra Madre Avenue. Within those rights-of-way approximately half of the frontage will be located in right-of-way shared between the City and the County with the other half within proposed City limits.

3. 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 rights-of-way that occur partly within the jurisdiction of both the City and County would be maintained by both jurisdictions jointly. If the annexation is approved, the City of Glendora would maintain the right-of-way in areas where both sides of the street were incorporated into the City. This would include most of the right-of-way on Yucca Ridge contained in Area A, and portions of the right-of-way on Milton Drive contained by Areas B & C. The City provides a complete range of street maintenance services including signing and striping, street sweeping, slurry seal and reconstruction as needed. Once the streets are completed the City would begin to monitor its portions of the right-of-way for maintenance. The annexation of the proposed territory into the City would improve road maintenance over existing conditions since the annexation would facilitate the development of +/- 95 acres including completion of street improvements which presently lack curb, gutter, sidewalk and storm drain improvements.

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

Construction of the improvements is anticipated between 2012 and 2014.
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5. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.)

The City uses a variety of funding sources for its street maintenance function including expenditures from its General Fund (property and sales tax), Gas Tax funds, and Proposition C to name a few. There are no assessments for street maintenance.

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

The County will transfer control of approximately 1,200 feet of right-of-way to the City consisting mainly of local residential collector streets.

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

The County has placed the territory to be annexed in a franchise agreement area known as the "Citrus Franchise Area" to which Waste Management provides service. Services provided include twice annual unlimited bulky items curbside collection, an annual curbside clean-up event in unlimited amounts, four community clean-up projects, senior discounts and roll out services for qualifying residents, additional household hazardous waste round-up events (includes universal waste), and electronic waste collection events.

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.

Depending on contractual arrangements of the franchise agreement the County maintains with Waste Management to serve the area, City trash service may not be available until the expiration of the County’s franchise agreement with Waste Management. The services provided by the City’s waste hauler are equivalent to the services presently provided by the County for the unincorporated territory.

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

Unknown for the reasons described above.

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

Waste services are provided on a user fee basis.

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

Existing assessment districts associated with the territory to be annexed include the LA County Community College District and Metropolitan Water District as identified by information supplied by the County Assessor’s office.

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

The property would be annexed into the City’s Street Light and Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 as a result of new development. The property owner has consented to be included in the assessment district as a condition of development.

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

In addition to the assessments from the districts the territory will be annexed into described above, the territory to be annexed is already subject to a parcel tax for bonded indebtedness approved by voters in 2005 to make improvements to school facilities of the Glendora Unified School District and a parcel tax for bonded indebtedness in 2004 for improvements at Citrus Community College. The territory to be annexed is already included within the districts served by the referenced agencies.

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

LA County currently provides street lighting within the territory to be annexed on Sierra Madre Avenue according to GIS data obtained from the LA County DPW website. Two street lights are located across from Area A on the north side of the Sierra Madre right-of-way.

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.

If street lights are required by the City, the City’s policy is to transfer the street lights to Southern California Edison for maintenance. Since the area is not presently served by street lights except for along Sierra Madre Avenue there will be no change in service since the County will continue to maintain its street lights located on the north side of the Sierra Madre Avenue right-of-way. The territory to be annexed is located on the south side of Sierra Madre Avenue. The north side of Sierra Madre will remain in unincorporated territory under the jurisdiction of L.A. County.
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3. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.).

The territory to be annexed will become part of the city-wide street light and landscape maintenance assessment district. The operating costs of the district are established annually based on anticipated expenses. Each parcel in the district is then assessed its fair share of operating costs based on benefit derived from the district. For FY 09/10 the rate was set at approximately $40 for lighting and $100 for landscaping per parcel.

Water Services

1. Is annexation of water service part of this request? If yes, provide details.

No. The City of Glendora already provides water service to the area.

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?

The territory to be annexed represents about a 30-acre portion of a 95-acre project area. The project area is presently undeveloped. Within its service area, the City has prescriptive rights to pump groundwater as determined by the San Gabriel Basin Watermaster. The City can pump above its prescriptive right by purchasing replenishment water to return back to the basin, if available. “Total Production Right” from the Main San Gabriel Basin has been as follows: FY2004-2005: 7,395 AF/ FY2005-2006: 11,720 AF/ FY2006-2007: 11,810 AF/ FY2007-2008: 10,015 AF/ FY2008-2009: 9,216 AF. To meet water demand within the service area, the City has had to make average water purchases of approximately 2,500 AF/YR of water during the same time period. The development of the site will create an additional demand for water that did not previously exist since water used in the operation of the nursery was not provided by the City of Glendora. The Monrovia Nursery provided its own water through rights it maintained. New demand to serve the development is projected to be 194 AF/Year which the developer of the project is required to provide to the City as a condition of development approval. In the short term the availability of water is projected to be adequate due to the above average rain fall from the past rainy season. Longer term, the City expects replenishment water to be available as it has been in the past. During past periods of drought, the City has called for certain water use restrictions and mandatory reduction in water use by consumers to ensure water supply availability.

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 City of Glendora will provide the water service needed to serve the area. The City of Glendora Water Division serves approximately 6,520 acres including 6,158 acres within the City’s corporate boundaries, 335 acres of incorporated Los Angeles County areas, 17
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acres in San Dimas and 10 acres in Azusa. The system consists of 16 pressure zones that are consolidated to four zones for billing and ratemaking. Water facilities include three hydro pneumatic systems and two zones served through pressure regulating systems; 12 wells (nine of which are currently active), 23 pumping stations with 50 booster pumps, 27 water reservoirs, 196 miles of pipeline and approximately 13,000 service meters. Service to the project area will come off of existing 8-inch and 6-inch lines. A hydraulic analysis is required to determine if the existing lines can adequately serve the planned new development, although preliminary analysis has shown that existing lines are adequate to serve the area.

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

The cost of new water line improvements will be borne by the developer as a cost of construction.

Wastewater Services

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

Sewer and wastewater service are provided by District No. 22 of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (COSANLA), which is regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wastewater from the project will be treated at the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant adjacent to the City of Industry. According to COSANLA, the facility has a capacity of 100 million gallons per day. In 2006 District indicated the facility is operating well below the design capacity at +/- 88.7 million gallons per day.

Presently the site is not connected to the public sewer since it is undeveloped.

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.

COSANLA District 22 informed the City in October 2006 that the sewer trunk line that would serve the project site was operating at capacity. To ensure capacity was available to serve the project, the District indicated that the size of the project and the timing of project connection to the sewer would determine if the sewer system had adequate capacity to serve the project. Later, in 2009 the District notified the City that a planned sewer relief project had been completed that could provide the sewer system with the additional capacity needed to serve the project.

In March of 2010, the District notified the City that the project could be served by the District, indicating that the sewer trunk line that would serve the project had a design capacity of 7.7 million gallons per day (mgd). The conveyed peak flow when last measured in 2005 was 6.2 mgd. Upon completion of the development contemplated,
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which includes the territory to be annexed, the City's policy is to turn maintenance responsibilities of public sewers over to the Sanitation District but retain ownership of the lines.

The annexation will not result in a change in service levels. Development of the site will extend sewer service to the area to be annexed so that the property in question can be developed for single-family residences.

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

Construction of the improvements is anticipated between 2012 and 2014.

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request? If yes, provide details.

No. The property is already annexed into COSANLA District 22.

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

New improvements will be a cost of construction to the developer. Properties pay an annual service charge to COSANLA District 22 as part of their property tax bill.

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? If yes, provide details.

Yes. Upon the completion of improvements, the City will maintain ownership of the lines but transfer maintenance responsibility to COSANLA District 22. Construction of the improvements is expected between 2012 and 2014 in phases.
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AREA "A":

THAT PORTION OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 10 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:


COURSE 1 - NORTH 89°31'11" EAST 20.00 FEET TO SAID CENTERLINE OF YUCCA RIDGE ROAD, AND

COURSE 2 - NORTH 89°31'11" EAST 451.00 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY LINE

COURSE 3 - SOUTH 00°03'05" EAST 656.95 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 25, THENCE

COURSE 4 - NORTH 89°36'02" EAST 91.00 FEET TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE EASTERLY 260.00 FEET OF THE WESTERLY 542.00 FEET OF THE SOUTHEAST ONE-EIGHTH OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-EIGHTH OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 25; THENCE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE
COURSE 5 – SOUTH 0°03'05" EAST 136.00 FEET TO THE SOUtherLY LINE OF THE NORTHERLY 136.00 FEET OF SAID EASTERLY 260.00 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY LINE

COURSE 6 – SOUTH 89°36'02" WEST 90.00 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE LAND AS DESCRIBED IN THE GRANT DEED RECORDEd MAY 24, 2007 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 20071261821 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE AND THE SOUTHHWASTERLY LINE OF SAID LAND DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COURSE 7 – SOUTH 0°03'05" EAST 70.00 FEET,

COURSE 8 – SOUTH 20°23'00" WEST 56.85 FEET, AND

COURSE 9 – SOUTH 42°11'35" WEST 89.47 FEET TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 8 OF TRACT NO. 22161, IN THE CITY OF GLENDOra, SAID COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 587, PAGES 91 AND 92 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE AND THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 8 AND THE WESTERLY LINE OF LOT 9 OF SAID TRACT NO. 22161, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 10 – SOUTH 89°36'10" WEST 90.00 FEET, AND

COURSE 11 – SOUTH 0°03'05" EAST 145.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHERLY 160.00 FEET OF THE SOUTHERLY 350.00 FEET OF THE WESTERLY 282.00 FEET OF THE SOUTHEAST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 25; THENCE LEAVING SAID WESTERLY LINE OF LOT 9 ALONG LAST SAID SOUTHERLY LINE

COURSE 12 – SOUTH 89°36'12" WEST 282.00 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE OF SAID YUCCA RIDGE ROAD; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG SAID CENTERLINE

COURSE 13 – SOUTH 0°03'00" EAST 56.95 FEET TO THE EASTERLY PROLONgATION OF THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IN THE GRANT DEED RECORDEd NOVEMBER 22, 2010 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 20101687926 OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE ALONG SAID EASTERLY PROLONgATION AND SAID SOUTHERLY LINE,
COURSE 14 - SOUTH 89°38'06" WEST 221.52 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LAND; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LAND AND ITS NORTHERLY PROLONATION

COURSE 15 - NORTH 0°03'48" WEST 198.80 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF TRACT NO. 39760, IN SAID CITY OF GLENDALE AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 1046, PAGES 65 AND 66 OF MAPS RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY PROLONATION, ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE AND THE EASTERLY AND NORTHERLY LINES OF SAID TRACT NO. 39760, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 16 - NORTH 89°38'06" EAST 196.57 FEET,

COURSE 17 - NORTH 0°03'00" WEST 218.15 FEET,

COURSE 18 - SOUTH 89°36'02" WEST 205.00 FEET, AND

COURSE 19 -- NORTH 0°03'00" WEST 110.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF PARCEL 2 OF SAID PARCEL MAP NO. 2216; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY LINE ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE AND THE GENERAL EASTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 2, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 20 -- NORTH 89°36'02" EAST 27.75 FEET,

COURSE 21 -- NORTH 0°03'00" WEST 242.00 FEET,

COURSE 22 -- NORTH 89°36'02" EAST 182.25 FEET, AND

COURSE 23 -- NORTH 0°03'00" WEST 389.26 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 2; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY LINE ALONG THE PROLONATION OF SAID EASTERLY LINE

COURSE 24 -- NORTH 0°03'00" WEST 25.00 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

AREA CONTAINS 14.33 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.
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AREA "B";

THAT PORTION OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER AND THE NORTHWEST
ONE-QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 10 WEST, SAN
BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER
OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID
SECTION 25; THENCE SOUTH 89°42'29" WEST 317.06 FEET ALONG THE
SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST
QUARTER OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25 TO THE
NORTHERLY PROLONATION OF THE EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 3 OF TRACT
NO. 19082, IN SAID COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP
FILED IN BOOK 493, PAGES 14 AND 15 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID
COUNTY RECORDER, SAID POINT BEING THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY
PROLONATION

COURSE 1 – SOUTH 0°00'41" WEST 30.00 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER
OF SAID LOT 3; THENCE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE AND THE
NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 5 OF SAID TRACT NO. 19082, THE FOLLOWING
COURSES:

COURSE 2 – SOUTH 0°00'41" WEST 197.00 FEET, AND

COURSE 3 – SOUTH 88°56'27" EAST 100.92 FEET TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF
SAID TRACT NO. 19082; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY LINE ALONG
SAID EASTERLY LINE AND THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID TRACT NO.
19082, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 4 – SOUTH 0°05'04" WEST 430.71 FEET, AND

COURSE 5 – SOUTH 89°48'13" WEST 38.00 FEET TO A LINE BEING PARALLEL
WITH AND 254.00 FEET WESTERLY OF THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE
SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 25; THENCE LEAVING SAID
SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG SAID PARALLEL LINE

COURSE 6 – SOUTH 0°05'04" WEST 282.59 FEET TO A POINT ON A
NON-TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF
4713.75 FEET IN THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF THE PACIFIC RAILROAD
RIGHT-OF-WAY AS SHOWN ON SAID TRACT NO. 2285, A RADIAL OF SAID CURVE TO SAID POINT BEARS NORTH 07°11'22" WEST; THENCE LEAVING SAID PARALLEL LINE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY BOUNDARY, THE FOLLOWING TWO (2) COURSES:

COURSE 7 – NON-TANGENT 632.66 FEET SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 07°41'24"; AND

COURSE 8 – SOUTH 75°07'14" WEST 674.08 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY BOUNDARY

COURSE 9 – NORTH 00°08'50" WEST 597.37 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF TRACT NO. 21829, IN SAID CITY OF GLENDORA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 608 PAGES 44 AND 45, OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE ALONG THE EASTERLY AND NORTHEASTERLY LINES OF SAID TRACT NO. 21829, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 10 – NORTH 0°04'43" EAST 471.99 FEET, AND

COURSE 11 – NORTH 60°25'37" WEST 224.28 FEET TO THE MOST NORTHERLY CORNER OF SAID TRACT NO. 21829; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHEASTERLY LINE ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY PROLONGATION OF SAID NORTHEASTERLY LINE

COURSE 12 – NORTH 60°25'37" WEST 30.81 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE OF BALDY VISTA AVENUE AS SHOWN ON SAID TRACT NO. 21829 AS BEING A CURVE CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 500.00 FEET, A RADIAL OF SAID CURVE TO SAID POINT BEARS SOUTH 46°35'49" EAST; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHWESTERLY PROLONGATION ALONG SAID CENTERLINE, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 13 – NORTHEASTERLY 72.65 FEET ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 8°19'32", AND

COURSE 14 – NORTH 35°04'48" EAST 3.20 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 6 OF TRACT NO. 19570, IN SAID LOS ANGELES COUNTY, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 504, PAGES 38 AND 39 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE NON-TANGENT ALONG SAID SOUTHWESTERLY PROLONGATION AND SAID SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 6
COURSE 15 – NORTH 58°15'33" WEST 218.45 FEET TO THE MOST WESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 6; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHWESTERLY LINE ALONG THE GENERAL WESTERLY LINE OF SAID TRACT NO. 19570, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 16 – NORTH 38°47'13" EAST 35.80 FEET,

COURSE 17 – NORTH 16°19'43" EAST 162.69 FEET, AND

COURSE 18 – NORTH 0°27'17" WEST 123.30 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 3 OF SAID TRACT NO. 19570; THENCE LEAVING SAID GENERAL WESTERLY LINE ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 3 AND ITS EASTERLY PROLATION

COURSE 19 – NORTH 89°41'13" EAST 249.90 FEET TO SAID CENTERLINE OF BALDY VISTA AVENUE; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY PROLATION ALONG SAID CENTERLINE

COURSE 20 – SOUTH 0°04'48" WEST 6.74 FEET TO THE WESTERLY PROLATION OF THE NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 14 OF SAID TRACT NO. 19570; THENCE LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE ALONG SAID WESTERLY PROLATION AND SAID NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 14

COURSE 21 – NORTH 89°41'15" EAST 245.00 FEET TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID TRACT NO. 19570; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY LINE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE AND ITS NORTHERLY PROLATION

COURSE 22 – NORTH 0°04'43" EAST 218.75 FEET TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 25, SAID NORTHERLY LINE ALSO BEING THE CENTERLINE OF LEADORA AVENUE AS SHOWN ON SAID TRACT NO. 19570; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY PROLATION ALONG SAID CENTERLINE

COURSE 23 – SOUTH 89°41'13" WEST 61.30 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY PROLATION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF LOT 11 OF TRACT NO. 22161, IN SAID COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 587, PAGES 91 AND 92 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY PROLATION AND SAID WESTERLY LINE OF LOT 11 AND THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 11, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:
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COURSE 24 — NORTH 0°00'08" WEST 161.00 FEET, AND

COURSE 25 — NORTH 89°41'13" EAST 153.00 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 11; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY LINE ALONG THE GENERAL SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID TRACT NO. 22161, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 26 — NORTH 89°41'13" EAST 153.00 FEET,

COURSE 27 — NORTH 0°00'08" WEST 100.72 FEET,

COURSE 28 — NORTH 89°41'13" EAST 256.96 FEET,

COURSE 29 — NORTH 1°14'47" WEST 0.04 FEET, AND

COURSE 30 — NORTH 89°40'58" EAST 28.89 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 15 OF SAID TRACT NO. 22161; THENCE LEAVING SAID GENERAL SOUTHERLY LINE ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 15

COURSE 31 — NORTH 0°22'02" WEST 147.61 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY LINE ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 16 OF SAID TRACT NO. 22161

COURSE 32 — NORTH 89°36'12" EAST 137.00 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 16, SAID NORTHEAST CORNER ALSO BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 12 OF TRACT NO. 19322, IN SAID LOS ANGELES COUNTY, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 497, PAGES 8 AND 9 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 16 ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 12 AND THE NORTHERLY LINES OF LOTS 10 AND 11 OF SAID TRACT NO. 19322 AND THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 10, AND THE SOUTHERLY LINES OF SAID LOTS 10, 11 AND 12, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 33 — NORTH 89°36'12" EAST 314.96 FEET,

COURSE 34 — SOUTH 0°05'04" WEST 198.08 FEET,

COURSE 35 — SOUTH 89°41'13" WEST 11.14 FEET,

COURSE 36 — NORTH 0°05'13" EAST 3.00 FEET, AND
EXHIBIT "A"
ANNEXATION NO 2011-08
TO THE CITY OF GLENDORA, CALIFORNIA
PAGE 8

COURSE 37 -- SOUTH 89°41'13" WEST 303.67 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 12; THENCE ALONG THE SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 12

COURSE 38 -- SOUTH 0°02'21" WEST 215.00 FEET TO SAID CENTERLINE OF LEADORA AVENUE; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF LEADORA AVENUE

COURSE 39 -- SOUTH 89°41'13" WEST 178.60 FEET TO THE NORTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IN THE GRANT DEED RECORDED JUNE 10, 1964 IN BOOK D2503, PAGE 517 OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY PROLONGATION AND SAID EASTERLY LINE

COURSE 40 -- SOUTH 0°04'29" WEST 325.15 FEET TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE LAND AS DESCRIBED IN THE DEED RECORDED APRIL 5, 1991 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 91-484396 OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY LINE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE AND THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LAND, THE FOLLOWING COURSES:

COURSE 41 -- NORTH 89°41'14" EAST 158.50 FEET, AND

COURSE 42 -- SOUTH 0°03'29" WEST 4.82 FEET TO THE WESTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IN THE QUITCLAIM DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 5, 1992 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 92-194534 OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY LINE ALONG SAID WESTERLY PROLONGATION AND SAID NORTHERLY LINE

COURSE 43 -- NORTH 89°40'25" EAST 240.00 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LAND; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTH LINE ALONG THE EASTERLY PROLONGATION OF SAID NORTHERLY LINE

COURSE 44 -- NORTH 89°40'25" EAST 110.15 FEET TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 6 OF LA PETRA PARK, IN SAID COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FILED IN BOOK 30, PAGE 35 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID COUNTY RECORDER; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY PROLONGATION ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 6, AND THE EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 5 OF SAID PETRA PARK AND THE SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION OF SAID EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 5
COURSE 45 — SOUTH 0°01'25" WEST 330.00 FEET TO SAID SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHEAST ONE-QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SECTION 25, SAID SOUTHERLY LINE ALSO BEING THE CENTERLINE OF MILTON DRIVE ON SAID MAP OF THE LA FETRA PARK; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE

COURSE 46 — NORTH 89°42'39" EAST 13.00 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

AREA CONTAINS 53.69 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.
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City Ventures
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-FEBRUARY 2012

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

February 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of January 18, 2012.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

South Gate SD-Los Angeles USD/October 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

None

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

February 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of January 18, 2012.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen 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 Wischurn 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 reschedule. 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 Bram, then Superintendent of Wischurn 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 Wischurn USD petition and order the election to be conducted within the territory of the Wischurn 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 Wischurn 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 Wischurn 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 Wischurn 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 Wischurn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wischurn SD requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently, there is no date.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status Date: January 18, 2012

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

On 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 (CVRA) 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 informed the County Committee of the district’s progress at its January 4, 2012, regular meeting, where a district representative provided details about recent activities and coming plans to conduct demographic studies, hold public hearings, and present alternative trustee area plans in compliance with the CVRA. Staff informed the chief petitioner of developments and advised him of the status of the petition review by the County Committee, as well as upcoming agenda items for review by the Pomona USD governing board.

*Status: Pomona USD studying petition and CVRA requirements pending public hearings, demographic studies, and development of alternative trustee area maps.

Status Date: January 18, 2012

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 approved by the Los Angeles County BOS on November 15, 2011.

Status Date: November 15, 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

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

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to BC §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.

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

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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; action ended.

Status Date: August 16, 2010

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

* Indicates update from previous summary.
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: May 11, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD), November 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

• ABC USD/June 2011
• Compton CCD/June 2011
• Cerritos CCD/July 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.