May 23, 2011

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary

County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee— Wednesday, June 1, 2011

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 1, 2011, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of June 1, 2011.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6336.
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Attachments
AGENDA

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
June 1, 2011
9:30 a.m.

I. Information
D Discussion
A Action
* Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Mr. John Nunez

II. FLAG SALUTE—Mr. Nunez

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES I, D, A*

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on April 6, 2011, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS—Secretary Mr. Matt Spies I, D*

Newspaper Articles

• A May 9, 2011, article from Bakersfield.com—“Districts to kick off overhaul of election systems.” (Attachment 1)

• A May 16, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Times—“Jim Newton: Compton’s racial divide.” (Attachment 2)

Informational Correspondence


• A May 19, 2011, State Legislative Update concerning community college district trustee area elections. (Attachment 4)

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC I, D

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter may do so at this time. (Form must be completed and submitted to the Secretary.)
VI. DISCUSSION OF THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA), AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES

The Secretary will discuss recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee area issues in Los Angeles County.

VII. REVIEW OF REGIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED FORMATION OF A WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of recent activities and issues related to the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD and discussions among impacted districts in the region.

VIII. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization. The County Committee may take action to support or oppose the legislation or provide comments to the authors.

IX. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD.

(Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals”)

X. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY SD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school districts other than the Los Angeles USD.

(Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District]”)

XI. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

XII. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

Regular Meeting
April 6, 2011

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, April 6, 2011, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. by Chairperson Mr. John Nunez, who lead the flag salute.

Members Present
Frank Bostrom
Maria Calix
Lloyd de Llamas
Owen Griffith
Joan Jakubowski
Maurice Kunkel
John Nunez
AJ Willner

Members Absent
Frank Ogaz
Suzan Solomon

Staff Present
Matt Spies, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Mary Bracanontes, Recording Secretary

Approval of
the Regular Meeting
Minutes of
January 5, 2011
Motion #17

It was MOVED by Mr. Bostrom and SECONDED by Mr. Griffith that the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 5, 2011, be approved. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Spies reviewed and discussed correspondence contained in the County Committee agenda packets and member folders.

There were no members of the public to address the County Committee.

Communications

Presentations from
the Public

Mr. Nunez called on Mr. Spies to provide an overview of recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee areas, and the impact of the data released from the 2010 U.S. Census.

Discussion of the
California Voting Rights Act (CVRA),
Trustee Area Issues,
and U.S. Census Data

Mr. Spies stated that staff has continued to take steps to continue monitoring what is going on throughout the state concerning the CVRA as well as the steps needed internally within LACOE to update the Interim Superintendent. He commented that the Lawyers Committee did file an appeal against the Madera case and per the contact at Madera COE, the case could last approximately 18 months before a decision from the court.
Mr. Spies stated that on January 20, 2011, he and Ms. Deegan attended a workshop that was sponsored by the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s (Registrar-Recorder) office. Attendees included representatives from school and community college districts, city, and other agencies that have elections. He stated that the speakers included Mr. Dean Logan, Registrar-Recorder, and some of his staff; an attorney from a major legal firm that has been providing guidance to several counties and school districts statewide; representatives of the Asian-Pacific American Legal Center; the National Association for Latino Elected and Appointed Officials; and the Rose Institute for State and Local Government at Claremont University. Mr. Spies stated that the workshop provided great insight and practical considerations in regards to compliance with the CVRA such as: trustee areas have to be equal in population and up to a ten percent variance, and if you have the variance it must be justified; and boundaries cannot dilute minority voters nor pack minority voters to create a “super” trustee area. He went on to state that per the Election Code, race cannot be a factor when establishing trustee areas, however, you can use such factors as common languages, occupations, or reliance upon similar services; trustee area lines can be drawn to avoid incumbents running against each other; and future development in the area must be considered. Mr. Spies stated that the speakers stressed getting the community involved in the process early on to avoid conflict and complications, and to expect community members to submit their own plans because of access to the internet. He stated that the Registrar-Recorder’s staff also spoke regarding their requirements and deadlines for changing their database and emphasized the need to have the data from the districts by March 2012 in order to be ready for the November 2013 election.

Ms. Calix arrived at 9:38 a.m.

Mr. Spies commented that internally at LACOE, a board member inquired regarding the role of the LACOE board and the CVRA. He stated that staff drafted a memo in March indicating to the board that as far as a legal perspective, they have a very limited involvement in the process because districts will submit plans to the County Committee to establish trustee areas and some may want to waive their upcoming election until the trustee areas are complete. Mr. Spies stated that the County Committee does not have the authority to seek waivers of the Education Code from the State Board of Education (SBE) so any request of waivers would have to go through the LACOE board on behalf of the school districts and/or the County Committee. He stated that the Director of Business Advisory Services, Mr. Mel Iizuka, spoke to the Interim Superintendent, Mr. Jon Gundry, concerning the CVRA issues and as a result, Mr. Gundry sent a letter to the County Committee members that should have been received already. Mr. Spies stated that as a result of the LACOE board’s inquiries, that he and Ms. Deegan will be doing a presentation to them on April 19, 2011, regarding the CVRA and the relationships that are in play between the LACOE board, LACOE staff, County Committee, and the districts.
He added that the presentation will also cover the law and challenges that are occurring regarding at-large elections, factors from the Registrar-Recorder’s workshop concerning studies, how to proceed once districts are notified, and whether they are choosing to establish trustee area elections or there are conditions and/or logic that they do not choose to do anything.

Mr. Nunez asked members if they had any questions or comments.

Mr. Bostron stated that he had received and read Mr. Gundry’s letter but felt that some type of assessment was needed to determine compliance or non-compliance or if there was a potential. He went on to say that it seemed that LACOE was taking a position that there is no money to do any type of assessment so you wait for the consequences to come. Mr. Bostron asked if it was possible to send a letter to the districts informing them of the issue and as a board we urge you to determine, through self-assessment, whether they are in compliance or non-compliant or if they have an issue.

Mr. Nunez asked if Mr. Bostron was talking about school boards or county boards.

Mr. Bostron responded that he was talking about school boards because it would be the appropriate pro-active thing to do to get the districts thinking about the issue so that they could do their own self-assessment and decide what to do since districts have their own counsel for guidance.

Mr. Spies responded that the internal plan is to send communication to the districts to allow them to assess their own communities and what compliance means to them, and take action or not take action as necessary. He went on to say that the districts would be provided information background regarding what the law is, what has been going on in the state and why, as well as the basics of what a study of the community would mean, and what compliance means. Mr. Spies stated that this would include significant follow-up effort by staff to assure that they are doing their due diligence and if not, the issue could be submitted to the County Committee if they choose to do nothing since the County Committee has the authority to do this.

Mr. Bostron concurred with Mr. Spies regarding LACOE’s approach to the issue.

Ms. Deegan added that a lot of the actions the districts may take in Los Angeles County, will be guided by what is provided by LACOE either by bulletin or correspondence. She added that the 2010 Census Data was released recently and districts who have been dealing with the issue were waiting for this information so that additional studies would not have to be done. Ms. Deegan commented that many county offices and/or districts are dealing with or not dealing with the issue in many different ways, and there may be even more now with the census data.
Ms. Deegan stated that staff’s role would be to ferry the information to the County Committee, and that the word “compliance” is not accurate to use because, at this time, no one is under a burden to comply with anything until a court verdict is made directing anyone on how to interpret the CVRA in this way, so it is still up in the air and still on a case by case basis. She stated that those who do move to establish trustee areas will never get a review from the Lawyers Committee or anyone else of their trustee areas, so that will be the greatest challenge because districts will not want to do another study or make any changes. She commented that if this is the case, then the County Committee may have to take a role to advise them to go through the process.

Mr. Nunez inquired that if a district needs to make an assessment of itself but decides not to and the County Committee directs the district to do the assessment, who pays to have this done?

Ms. Deegan responded that LACOE would pay for the assessment as an expense of the County Committee.

Mr. Nunez responded that if that is the case, then it would open a whole strange can of worms because what is the drive to make an assessment?

Mr. Spies responded that the County Committee could choose to pick up the cost to study the area or it can take an approach that from the perspective of covering themselves and doing their due diligence of advising the districts, you have a series of communications encouraging the districts to do this but if they chose not to and they get sued, the County Committee will cover themselves if included in the lawsuit; and can say we have sent several communications encouraging to do it and they chose not to which is their choice.

Ms. Deegan added that one other important issue that has not been settled, is the notion of permissive authority where if a district does not act the County Committee has a duty to act. She continued saying that the County Committee certainly has the duty to draw the lines if they choose to in the normal course of their authority as a County Committee, but in this instance with the CVRA it has not been settled that County Committees “shall,” therefore your drawn into the lawsuit. Ms. Deegan went on to say that if a district chooses not to act and the County Committee has communicated with them and encouraged them to do the study, that will be the County Committees due diligence.

Mr. de Llamas inquired about the state budget and asked whether this issue should be put off instead of giving the districts another issue to deal with, and he felt that it was unnecessary and the districts did not have time to deal with this until after the May Revision with the Governor and the state legislature?
Mr. Willmer responded that he understood Mr. de Llamas' concerns, but with the information provided regarding the CVRA issue, he agreed with Mr. Bostrom that there is great concern to the County Committee and felt that the districts in Los Angeles County should know, in very explicit terms, what the concerns are instead of facing a district at a later time who says they were not told about the issue. He commented that he felt that something should go out earlier than later expressing the County Committee's concerns, and that the districts should be made aware.

Mr. de Llamas stated that if the issue were approached in that since, then he would agree.

Mr. Nunez stated that staff had recently drafted a letter to Centinela Valley Union High SD (Centinela Valley UHSD) and he felt the letter was too vague and not strong enough, but after surveying board members it seemed that a strong letter was not needed. He went on to say that now in hearing the discussions being held, the districts need stronger communication so he feels that the County Committee needs to decide how strong they want to be in communicating with the districts.

Mr. de Llamas stated that was his point, the districts need the information but the information now is very vague. He agrees that the information should be sent to the districts but it should indicate what the issue is and what needs to be done, but not to demand that they do something.

Mr. Nunez reiterated that the County Committee needs to make a decision and agree on how to approach the communication sent to the districts.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that the districts need to be alerted about the CVRA issue and especially with the census data being released because she would hate to see a community member blindsided a school board member and the school board member not being aware. She then asked for clarification concerning whether school boards could delay elections?

Mr. Spies responded that yes school boards could delay elections and that is part of the reason why the Lawyers Committee is focusing on school districts because they are the only government agency that can have an election waived. Ms. Jakubowski commented that she felt that was something, especially in these budget times, the districts might think that there will be an issue they might decide to waive their elections. She continued stating that they also need to know because what happens with the current board members and what is the process for keeping them in office and extending their term. Ms. Deegan responded that it was not that type of an election, it was an election concerning the establishment of trustee areas because you need to ratify the trustee areas not school board members, that was the type of election waiver involved.
Ms. Calix brought up the issue of Centinela Valley UHSD stating that the issue has been going on for such a long period of time and maybe the word “should” would work in this case, but in the case of trustee areas and having come from an at-large election, it is an individual school board member and a lot more expensive for board members in that district, so districts may choose to narrow it down so it will not be so expensive and especially because money is tight at this time, and it may be hard to get support for an election. Ms. Calix agreed that the information should be given to the districts and let them know what the concerns are and use the word “encourage” to have them look at the census data, and review and evaluate other information and let the districts decide on their own what the outcome will be. She feels that words of encouragement work better instead of using “should” or “should not.”

Mr. Nunez asked if she felt that the letter to Centinela Valley UHSD should be made “stronger” and more informational on a countywide letter, and is this something that the County Committee could look at?

Mr. Bostrom stated that he agreed that the bottom line is the census data, and this information coming together at the same time is a matter of timing, and his interpretation of the legal side of this is the need of the census data to justify the cause of action. He stated that it is an issue of timing because if the census data is being looked at, the districts should also keep in mind that the information is before them and they should be talking to counsel to see if they are potentially exposed and subject to this type of action even if a court decision has not been made, they should still be looking at it because the County Committee is looking at it. Mr. Bostrom went on to say that the issue of should they do an assessment or who does the assessment is premature and should be off the table, first of all the information needs to be out there so that they can be thinking about it then see what comes back.

Ms. Calix inquired about the timeframe and whether there is one?

Mr. Nunez responded that he felt a letter should be sent to county districts asking that they look at the CVRA issue because there can be legal ramifications if they don’t. He stated that most letters are directed to the superintendents but sometimes the superintendents do not pass the information along and he felt a stronger message is received when letters are addressed to board members and superintendents.

Mr. de Llanas asked if the letter would include an attached analysis so that the districts can understand what the issue is, what the criteria is to do an assessment, what things to look for, where the court case is going, what are the ramifications, or a general letter indicating that they have to review the information. He stated that if a letter is going to be sent to the districts, then give them something useful with a full analysis of what the issue is, here’s where it’s at, here’s the ramifications, an assessment is probably in order, and here’s the criteria when you do the assessment because this is what the courts are looking at-a useful tool.
Mr. Bostrom suggested that the board members be cc'd on the communication to show a sign of urgency.

Mr. Spies responded that the intent has always been to send a bulletin with appropriate attached documentation, but what he was hearing now is that the County Committee would like to be involved, and suggested that once the bulletin is mailed to the districts, that a letter from the County Committee be addressed to the board presidents referencing the bulletin and the County Committee's concerns regarding district compliance.

Several County Committee members concurred with Mr. Spies approach to the districts.

Mr. Willner stated that the timeline should be now because there is no other information being sent that will make a difference one way or the other and the concerns are now.

Mr. Nunez agreed that school board members need to know the information so that they can start asking questions about the CVRA process and requirements. He continued and asked what should be done with Centinela Valley UHSD and whether a stronger letter should be sent?

Mr. Bostrom and other members responded that they wanted to hear about what was discussed at the feeder district meetings before a decision was made.

Mr. Spies responded that he would provide the feeder district meeting information on the next agenda item.

Ms. Deegan asked to make final comments concerning the Lawyer's Committee. She stated that at the Registrar-Recorder's workshop they learned from the attorney speakers who are involved in litigations, that school districts were sought after for these actions because of their ability to waive approval of the lines. Ms. Deegan commented that another course of action was for them to target another entity like a city by doing all their R & D, all their research, and all their expensive expert fees which is what is bringing all the large settlements when the costs are so high and settling that one, then with the same research and effort sue the school district. She went on to say that the news reports out of northern California is that the city and school district are receiving letters and being targeted, which causes some concern regarding the City of Compton because they received a letter and have already entered into litigation, so it appears to be happening in our locality even if it seems that the school districts have not been targeted first; the technique is to do the research on one entity then sue the entity that borders around it. Ms. Deegan stated that no predictions can be made as far as what is going to happen but it does show the sense of urgency on the issue.

Mr. Nunez asked if Compton USD went beyond the City of Compton?
Ms. Deegan responded yes.

Mr. Nunez commented that if this is the case of Compton USDs boundaries, how will this be approached by the Lawyers Committee?

Ms. Deegan responded that it is unknown at this time because it's anyone who has at-large elections, so even districts that have trustee areas are still subject to these actions.

Mr. Nunez inquired as to how many districts are voting at-large?

Ms. Deegan responded that there are approximately six districts and most are community college districts and the other 79 districts have no trustee areas. She commented that it is unpredictable and nothing could happen, but until the City of Compton happened nothing had happened even though the issue has been going around for two to three years throughout the state so you can't predict, but when it hits there will be districts asking why they were not told so it is essential to be proactive at this time since the census data is available.

Mr. Nunez stated that in order to wrap this agenda item he wanted to confirm the process the County Committee members wanted to take as far as providing the information to the districts; first, a bulletin will be sent to all school district superintendents; second, a follow-up letter to the district board presidents from the County Committee referencing the bulletin in order to get the boards asking questions.

Mr. Spies responded that the documents would be drafted and sent to the members for their review.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bostrom and SECONDED by Ms. Calix to direct staff to develop a bulletin followed by a letter from the County Committee to all school districts concerning the CVRA issue and strongly encouraging the districts to take some type of action. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Spies provided an overview of recent activities and issues related to the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD and discussions among the impacted districts within the region. He stated that because there had been some confusion about how strong the letter to the Centinela Valley UHSD should be, he had made a judgment call to not send the letter because by the time follow-up work had been done on the letter, it was too close to the scheduled meeting of the feeder districts and he did not want the letter to be the focus and not a local solution. Mr. Spies stated that the scheduled meeting of the feeder districts was then delayed for a month and they met in March. He then called on Ms. Deegan to provide an overview of the meeting because he was on vacation at the time.
Ms. Deegan stated that all five districts were represented and LACOE employee Ms. Sharon Harvey, Staff Development/Diversity Coordinator, was the moderator, and that she attended as an observer and did not do any type of presentation nor did she speak. She went on to say that a lot of the discussion held had to do with previous meetings since representatives of the Centinela Valley UHSD had not attended previous meetings, and there also seemed to be a lot of animosity due to issues from previous meetings. Ms. Deegan stated that Ms. Harvey tried to move the discussion to the subject at hand but four of the districts kept referring to the “Wiseburn deal,” and that Wiseburn SD had crafted some secret deal with Centinela Valley UHSD that they knew nothing about so that was the main topic of discussion as well as Wiseburn SDs litigation attempt (members had a copy of the language in their folders). She went on to say that the discussion focused on the assessed valuation and Wiseburn SD pulling away to unify while leaving the commercial assessed valuation with the high school district. Ms. Deegan stated that another topic of discussion referred to local collaboration, local cooperation, curriculum articulation between K-8 and the high school district, and she felt that they had made a lot of progress on that particular issue.

Mr. Spies commented that the copy of the draft legislation from Wiseburn SD had just been received the day before. He went on to say that the Wiseburn SD hired an attorney to draft language concerning the high school district retaining the assessed valuation from the industrial and commercial portion of the Wiseburn SD, and Wiseburn SD would retain the residential assessed value with conditions that in doing this, if the issue were brought before the SBE again then the SBE would restrict the area of election to the Wiseburn SD; otherwise if it's an area wide election then Wiseburn SD does not want to proceed because they feel that it will be shot down due to the majority of voters being outside the district. He continued stating that the draft legislation was the districts first attempt to structuring language and they feel that they can get a local legislator to support it. Mr. Spies went on to say that he felt he was not sure if the district could get support for this because they are giving up a lot forever in regards to potential monies and financing options they may need in the future. He stated that he spoke to the Wiseburn SD Chief Business Official, Mr. Tom Cox, and told him that the issue would be discussed at the County Committee meeting and that the members could come up with other possible options for the district to consider. Mr. Spies went on to say that the long term petition was still a viable option to the district according to Mr. Larry Shirey, contact at the California Department of Education (CDE). He continued that because Centinela Valley UHSD had stopped the process due to a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) challenge that indicated the CDE did not do a scoping meeting to solicit possible environmental concerns of the community, the CDE responded by preparing a full environmental impact report that has a life span of five years and three years have already passed. Mr. Spies went on to say that Mr. Shirey indicated that the SBE would consider adopting the impact report if either Wiseburn SD, the
chief petitioners, or the County Committee would request that it be done. He continued and stated that it would be in the best interest of the district or encouragement to the district by the County Committee, to make the request to keep the window open for the petition so that if a solution to unify the area were agreed upon then the petition could move forward and eliminate a potential challenge Centinela Valley UHSD could have concerning environmental issues. Mr. Spies provided information concerning an e-mail message he received from Mr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn SD, responding to Lawndale SD regarding whether or not Wiseburn’s proposal would require an election of the community (and it does); assessed value of proposal; and bond debt obligation to the Centinela Valley UHSD.

Mr. Nunez inquired whether Wiseburn SD citizens still had to pay for the bonds?

Ms. Deegan responded yes they would have to pay under this current formula.

Mr. Nunez asked whether this was taxation without representation?

Ms. Deegan responded that no it was not taxation without representation because what she learned at the CDI’s workshop she attended, under the Revenue and Taxation Code, parties involved in reorganization use to negotiate who would get what, it was not wherever the line was that indicated that particular address would be taxed to what area.

Mr. Spies added that at the last meeting of the districts involved, the Wiseburn SD superintendent was asked if they would participate in a local solution and he indicated they would to the extent that they could but with the understanding that their constituency has let it be known that they want to unify, so they have to consider that when they move forward and can not ignore what the community is telling them.

Ms. Bostrom inquired about the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and where Wiseburn SD stood on the issue?

Ms. Deegan responded that the district is interested in adopting and using the report because of the charter high school they intend to build. She continued that the CDE was surprised that the district is not requesting that the EIR report be adopted.

Mr. Bostrom commented that he felt that the EIR would have to be completed in order for the district’s legislation to move forward.

Mr. Spies commented that he was not sure that was the case but he too felt that the EIR report would have to be adopted and accepted before the district could move forward with its legislation.
Mr. Bostrom asked if Wiseburn SD understood what the adoption of the EIR meant?

Ms. Deegan responded that the CDE was not sure if they did or not but the subject was discussed with the Wiseburn SD because of the new charter high school they wanted to build. She went on to say that the contact at the CDE did mention that his office requested that the EIR be adopted, especially because of the new membership in the SBE, but that it was gaining no traction and that another agency or entity involved would have to make the request for adoption.

Mr. Bostrom commented that he felt the EIR was going to preempt everything once the recommendations and decisions were made because it would be hard to go against the report.

Mr. Nunez asked if there were other charter high schools in the area and how large they were, and also if these were comprehensive high schools.

Ms. Deegan responded that the high school in Wiseburn SD is in its second year with two schools and has approximately 100 to 150 students; the other schools are in Lennox and Lawndale and more established but she did not know the number of students; Hawthorne also had one. She went on to say that these are small academies that have a certain focus like science, environmental, design, etc.

Mr. Nunez asked if having a special focus was the only way a charter high school could be built.

Ms. Deegan responded that charter schools now have to be K-12 schools not just a high school.

Mr. Bostrom asked what staff’s opinion on the issue was.

Mr. Spies responded that he and Ms. Deegan had spoke about this and felt that possibly talking to Wiseburn SD to maybe have them change their approach because it seemed like they had done more harm to their case to unify by not letting the community vote on the proposal, and it has now been ten years since the proposal started. He went on to state that the main reason for the unification was due to education but yet the student test scores have not improved so the district should be focusing on moving the proposal forward to the SBE and request that the voting area be the Wiseburn SD only. Mr. Spies stated that the district could at least start with the CEQA then approach the SBE, and if they can not come to terms with just a Wiseburn SD voting then the petition would be done. He continued that if this happens, then the district could either initiate a new change or the local solution option by the districts involved.
Ms. Deegan commented that the initial petition was approved by the SBE with the decision to have Wiseburn SD be the voting area and sending some of the taxes back, but then Centinela Valley UHSD filed the CEQA lawsuit and the SBE rescinded its decision. She continued that when SBE reviewed the petition again, many years later and after the EIR, the SBE then had a different decision in that the petition be approved but with area wide voting instead of just Wiseburn SD area because Centinela Valley UHSD had incurred additional debt between the two review periods of the petition. Ms. Deegan went on to say that the SBE felt that because the assessed value would be taken away, Centinela Valley UHSD could not pay for their outstanding debt and it would be a real fiscal challenge. She stated that she asked the CDE contact that because three years have passed since the last review and some or all the feeder districts have passed bonds, would or could changes be made to the study, and he responded that yes changes could be made and a new study would have to be done and an area wide voting area could also change, and the SBE could disagree with the CDE’s recommendation. Ms. Deegan stated that was the reason Wiseburn SD did not want to move forward with the petition because of the fear of area wide voting.

Mr. Nunez asked that because there could be considerable changes, would the County Committee have to have another hearing on the petition?

Ms. Deegan responded that the County Committee could request that the petition come back to them and the SBE could agree to that and direct the County Committee to look at certain areas of the petition.

Mr. Bostrom inquired as to why the EIR was not moving forward, did someone stop it, and was it Wiseburn SD who stopped it?

Mr. Spies responded that Wiseburn SD requested that the petition be taken off the SBE's agenda because their recommendation did not indicate Wiseburn SD as the voting area and the EIR may have been adopted if this had not occurred.

Ms. Deegan added that the EIR is part of the unification process but the CDE contact is suggesting that the EIR and petition be separated and let the EIR be adopted first then have the petition processed.

Mr. Bostrom asked whether the content of the EIR was still valid?

Ms. Deegan responded that per the CDE contact, the EIR is still valid and the feasibility study is different because it deals with more finance and other issues, and the EIR dealt more with the building of the high school as the main environmental impact of the area.

Mr. Spies commented that over the years when the petition was placed on the SBE’s agenda, the CDE requested updated information each time it went on the agenda for their feasibility study.
Mr. Bostrom asked what needs to be done to initiate the process to move forward on the petition.

Ms. Deegan responded that an interested party has to make a request to the SBE and the CDE contact felt that it should be the Wiseburn SD and/or the County Committee, but the district would probably be better. She went on to say that the contact did not understand why the district had not made the request, and because staff had just received the information, they had not had a chance to discuss the matter with the district.

Ms. Jakubowski asked if Wiseburn SD gives up all this money what does it do to their future fiscal accountability?

Mr. Nunez commented that with all the changes being made as far as district funds, the County Committee’s hearing on the petition years ago has changed completely.

Many members agreed with Mr. Nunez and commented that because of this, it would seem that the petition would be subject to EIR review and if this is the case then the County Committee needs to start all over again, and the question would then be who should do the EIR the County Committee or the SBE in order for it to be current, address the issues, and make a recommendation.

Ms. Deegan responded that the EIR is still in effect for two more years.

Mr. Spies added that he felt that if the EIR were adopted at this point, it would be difficult for Centinela Valley UHSD to challenge on environmental issues because there would be no Wiseburn SD students crossing the boundary into Centinela Valley UHSD.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee members what they wanted to do about sending correspondence to the involved districts concerning processing the unification petition for Wiseburn SD.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested sending a letter to the involved districts with a timeframe to find a solution due to the fact that it seemed like progress was being made at the joint meetings, but with the understanding that they find a solution within six months to a year or the County Committee will have to step in and find a solution for them.

Mr. Nunez asked if the timeframe would be enough and should they be allowed to continue meeting to find a solution for the two year period left on the EIR report.

Mr. Bostrom stated that this should not be the case, and felt that the letter should contain language to the effect that if they cannot find a solution, the County Committee is prepared to step in and request that the EIR report be adopted and that new hearings will be scheduled, and also give them 360 days to find the solution which would be a very strong request.
Ms. Deegan commented that at the last meeting of the districts, it was made clear that the proposal would only move forward if there was a full agreement of funding distribution and/or language of legislation before it could be settled.

Members discussed the issue and agreed that student test scores have not improved and that the proposal had been going on long enough. They agreed that by giving the districts a year to find a local solution it would be too close to the deadline of the two years left on the EIR, and they were concerned about the proposed legislation being heard by the SBE because all bills had already been introduced for the current session.

Mr. de Llamas asked what authority the County Committee had to force a solution and if the proposal comes back to the County Committee can an election be forced to be held?

Ms. Deegan responded that yes the County Committee can impose an election be held by all five districts involved and it will only go back to the SBE if it is appealed.

Mr. Spies added that if it’s a unification, the County Committee only has recommendation authority that would go to the SBE, but if it was a territory transfer then the County Committee has legal authority to approve or deny a proposal.

Mr. de Llamas asked for clarification of the letter and what the committee should indicate in the letter as far as finding a solution and forcing the districts to move forward.

Members discussed how to approach the districts through a letter indicating a timeline, years of the proposal, student test scores, the County Committee processing the proposal, and how to force the SBE to hear the petition so that it can be concluded after ten years.

Ms. Deegan commented that there were two issues: 1) resolving the procedural question marks that have not been answered about the unification process, the EIR has not been adopted, and the legislation; 2) the core issue that prompted the petition of the academic status of Centinela Valley UHSD. She went on to ask what does the County Committee want to address in the letter?

Mr. Bostrom responded saying that he felt it was the process of bringing the proposal to a conclusion.

Ms. Jakubowski asked how can the County Committee force a conclusion?

Ms. Deegan responded that the County Committee can send a letter to the SBE requesting that they hear the petition, but they can refuse not to hear it or other parties involved or affected by the proposal can request that the SBE not hear the item, so the committees letter may not be enough.
Mr. Bostrom commented that the proposal may not be heard without the EIR being adopted.

Ms. Deegan responded that the EIR is complete and the CDE is just waiting for a request to adopt at least within the next two years. She added that a previous letter from the County Committee requesting that the SBE hear the proposal was sent and the SBE did respond by agendizing the item but then Wiseburn SD requested that it be taken off.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested that a follow-up letter be sent to the SBE requesting that the EIR be adopted, followed by another letter requesting that the proposal be agendized.

Mr. Bostrom asked how the County Committee could get the proposal back from the SBE?

Ms. Deegan responded that the County Committee would have to send a letter to the SBE requesting that the proposal be sent back to them because it has been over ten years and the SBE has not made a decision. She stated that if the SBE were to send the proposal back to the County Committee, then they could also direct the committee to only look at certain factors of the proposal, it is just unknown what they could be.

Mr. Spies asked the County Committee if they wanted staff to meet with the Wiseburn SD to find out if they really have any intent to continue to move towards having the petition go to a vote, and if yes then under what structure is it going to happen and when, and if its no then the County Committee can consider the options discussed?

Mr. Bostrom responded that a letter should be sent to the SBE indicating that the County Committee has done their fiduciary duty, test scores have not improved, ten years has gone by, voters demand an answer, it has been delayed long enough so do something with the EIR, and put it back on the agenda or send it back to the County Committee for further study.

Several members agreed with Mr. Bostrom’s approach to the letter especially the part of student test scores, and that the affected districts be cc’d on the letter so that they can be aware of the County Committee’s desire to get the proposal to a conclusion.

Mr. de Llamas asked that staff provide a detailed analysis to the County Committee of options available to process the proposal.

It was MOVED by Mr. de Llamas and SECONDED by Mr. Bostrom that a letter be sent to the SBE concerning the Wiseburn SD proposal and indicating a timeframe, student test scores, ten years lapsed, certification of the EIR, and that they have a responsibility to the students and the parties involved with cc’s to the affected districts. The second part of the motion is to have staff provide a detailed analysis to the County Committee of options available to process the proposal. The motion CARRIED unanimously.
Mr. Spies provided an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization.

Mr. Spies stated that there were no updates on Los Angeles USD reorganization proposals.

Mr. Spies provided an update on school district reorganization proposals excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD.

Mr. Bostrom inquired as to the status of Inglewood USD's financial issue.

Mr. Spies responded that Inglewood USD has been a priority of LACOE staff and that an administrator for the district had been hired to oversee their financial issues. He stated that the district was going to participate in a mid-year TRANs issue but could not show enough cash flow to demonstrate that they could pay back the TRANs so they dropped out, and are now in the process of making salary and non salary cuts. Mr. Spies stated that staff is currently working with the district and CDE for some type of loan to keep the district going.

Mr. Bostrom asked if the loan would come from the county or the state?

Mr. Spies responded that the loan would come from the state and would require legislation to authorize the loan. He stated that the district's building fund was also being looked at to borrow from but because of the cash flow ability to pay back it would be difficult to do.

Mr. Bostrom asked about County Counsel's report on voting rights requested from the last meeting.

Mr. Spies responded that staff had just started working with LACOE's County Counsel and she stated that she has experience concerning the CVRA so a report to County Committee will be forthcoming.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.
Districts to kick off overhaul of election systems

BY JORGE BARRIENTOS, Californian staff writer, jbarrientos@bakersfield.com

Monday, May 09 2011 05:33 PM

The Bakersfield City and Kern High school districts on Tuesday will be two of the first locally to start changing how their school board elections are held.

Trustees for both will meet during special meetings to discuss changing from an "at-large" election system to a "by-trustee area" system. In the former, all voters living in the district choose among all the candidates. In the latter, the district is divvied up into pieces and voters choose among people living in their area, like with the Bakersfield City Council.

Panama-Buena Vista Union and Greenfield Union school districts, among others, are also expected to change their systems to avoid potential lawsuits, give minorities better representation and to cut election costs.

The new system will be based on newly released 2010 Census numbers, and changes would take effect in 2012.

Kern High Superintendent Don Carter has called it a potentially "historic change" for the largest high school district in California, which opened in 1893. His district has more than 200,000 active voters within 3,500 square miles.

The move is largely in response to the California Voting Rights Act passed in 2002 that allows voters to challenge at-large systems characterized by "racially polarized voting" patterns. Voters can demand changes to give minority groups a greater opportunity to influence elections and elect candidates.

Several county, city and school entities across the state have been sued by voters -- largely by Latinos -- and lost multi-million dollar suits. As of last year, when schools decided to start the switch, 75 percent of school boards in the state ran "at-large" elections.

Only two school governing boards in Kern County use the "by-trustee area" system: Kern County Board of Education, since the 1950s, and Kern Community College District, since 1991.

Throughout Kern County schools, 60 percent of students are Latino. Local Latino rights advocates have said school boards need more Latino representation.
During an April 2010 meeting, Kern High trustees discussed the potential changes, some calling it a "worthwhile endeavor," others calling it "legal blackmail."

On Tuesday morning, a public hearing will be held on the matter for KHSD, and trustees will hear presentations from Schools Legal Service and representatives from the National Demographics Corporation. The board will discuss legal criteria and consideration for drawing trustee areas, and a timeline for potential changes.

Also Tuesday, KHSD could appoint assistant principals at four campuses: Frontier, Centennial, Independence and North high schools. Its meeting will be at 8:15 a.m. at 5801 Sundale Ave.

BCSD's board meeting will be at 5:45 p.m. at 1300 Baker St. The board will also discuss the interim superintendent position in closed session -- that person will replace retiring Michael Lingo.

And the board is expected to hear an appeal from Manuel Carrizalez, who is requesting he be allowed to give presentations on BCSD campuses. The board recently approved a policy to not automatically exclude school presenters with a criminal past. Carrizalez, a minister who speaks to youth about staying out of trouble and in school, had been excluded because he was convicted of felony burglary in 1983.

In other school board meetings this week in Kern County:

* Rosedale Union School District trustees will vote Tuesday on the employment of Wendy Camara as principal of Rosedale North Elementary School, and also vote on eliminating four non-teaching jobs. One position is being cut because of changes in special education needs. The other three are aide positions whose one-year funding is no longer available. That meeting will be at 7 p.m. Tuesday at 2553 Old Farm Road.

* Panama-Buena Vista Union School District's board will vote on an extension of Superintendent Kip Harron's contract. Trustees will honor retirees. In closed session, the board will discuss administrative appointments. The meeting is at 7 p.m. Tuesday at 4200 Ashe Road.

1 Comment

hankmeister 1 week ago

It sounds to me like KHSD is doing the politically expedient thing and hiring an outside consultant to blame when the board members don't like the new districts. Also, if I'm not mistaken most of the cities in Kern County elect their council people in at-large elections.
Jim Newton: Compton's racial divide

In a city that is about two-thirds Latino, not one elected official is.

Jim Newton

May 16, 2011

Imagine if today's Los Angeles were governed by a white mayor and an all-white City Council. And then imagine if that anomaly was protected by city election rules that virtually guaranteed no Latino candidate could land a spot in elected office. The civil rights community would be apoplectic and the public justifiably enraged.

Now consider Compton, a city that's about two-thirds Latino but in which no Latino has ever held elected office. Instead, thanks in part to the kind of voting rules that were challenged and abandoned in many cities long ago, an all-black City Council and a black mayor maintain a firm hold on public office.

In Compton, City Council members run in citywide elections, which means all voters can vote in all races. If instead, as happens in Los Angeles, council members represented specific geographic areas and were voted on only by residents of those areas, heavily Latino neighborhoods would have a better chance of electing Latino council members. And then, having cracked the city's closed politics, a group of experienced officeholders who could vie for mayor and other citywide offices would develop.

Compton's commitment to at-large voting, which has been challenged in a lawsuit alleging violations of the California Voting Act, is the manifestation of a particularly noxious brand of racial politics that plays out in schools, elections and even civic events. The conflicts are neither new nor deniable. To take just one example: In 1994, when Californians voted on Proposition 187, exit polling found that 64% of Compton's non-Latino voters supported it; less than 1% of its Latino voters did so. One expert who analyzed Compton's voting patterns said the evidence of racialballotting was "clear and convincing."

Meanwhile, the city's demographics are rapidly changing and apparent everywhere. Barbecue and soul-food restaurants still have their place in the 10-square-mile city of 95,000 residents, but they now stand alongside taco stands and Oaxacan cafes; Stella's Beauty Salon caters to "hombres, mujeres y..."
ninos." Evangelical storefront churches draw a multiplicity of faiths, with the Iglesia de Dios Pentecostal M.E. sitting just down the block from Greater Zion Church Family. Rap music thumps from car radios, but so does ranchero. According to the census, more than half of Compton's families speak Spanish at home.

So why hasn't that meant an automatic transformation of Compton politics? Some of the city's Latinos are in the country illegally and thus can't vote; even those here legally may not be citizens or feel themselves ready to join the electorate. And many are too young to vote. Despite their demographic dominance, Latinos make up only about 44% of Compton's voting-age population, so the city's black leadership, by insisting on citywide elections, has been able to dilute Latino voting strength. If Compton were broken into geographic districts, voting-age Latinos would almost certainly be a majority in at least one, and perhaps more (depending on how the lines were drawn). This would give them, finally, a foothold of political influence.

In the civil rights movement of the 1950s, blacks relied on the Constitution and found an ally in the courts. Now, the black leadership of Compton is defending its system in the courts against three Latino plaintiffs seeking to replace Compton's at-large council elections with district-by-district ballots.

So how do Compton officials explain their opposition to the very process that empowered so many African Americans in an earlier era? I first tried Mayor Eric J. Perrodin. His assistant has a pleasant voicemail message asking callers to leave a name, number and message. Calls, the message promises, will be "graciously returned." Mine wasn't.

I also tried asking the city clerk. She was out of town. Her office referred me to the city manager; that office forwarded me to City Atty. Craig J. Cornwell, who was more forthcoming.

In court filings, the city attorney has maintained that the challenge to Compton's voting rules violates the city charter, which specifically calls for at-large elections and thus can be changed only by a vote. Moreover, he challenges the assumption that Latinos need districts to elect candidates, suggesting instead that boosting turnout would accomplish those ends.

In our conversation, Cornwell elaborated: "We don't believe that it's our system that's the problem. We believe that Compton is plagued with low voter turnout of all ethnicities, including Latino voters."

Royce Esters, a businessman and civil rights leader who has lived in Compton since 1956, put it more bluntly. Blacks in Compton, he said, "kept on it until we got elected.... Latinos just have to get out there and vote."

But there's more to it. Today, the very practices once employed by Southern whites -- diluting the voting power of blacks, evading media inquiries, defending their political power against demographic trends -- is now the province of Compton blacks. "It's unfortunate," said Joaquin G. Avila, executive director of the National Voting Rights Advocacy Initiative at Seattle University Law School and a lawyer in the Compton case. City leaders could open the city to political diversity, make it a model of inclusion. But they won't. As Avila noted, "They've had plenty of opportunities."

It is, he added, a bit ruefully, an example of "one minority politically oppressing another minority."

The judge in the voting rights case declined to order an immediate change in Compton elections as the plaintiffs requested. So, on June 7, Compton voters will go to the polls to select a new council member (one incumbent retained his seat in April by winning a majority of the votes cast in the first
round). Voters in the election will pick between two black candidates. No Latino made the runoff.

jim.newton@latimes.com
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NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Office of Supervisor Antonovich
Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department – Enforcement Bureau
Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County
Sanitation Districts for Los Angeles County
City of Palmdale — City Clerk
City of Palmdale – Planning Department
Lancaster Cemetery District
Antelope Valley – East Kern Water Agency
Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley Health Care District
Palmdale Water District
Antelope Valley Union High School District
Palmdale School District
Westside Union School District


Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 20 acres of uninhabited land to the City of Palmdale. The project site is located east of 11th Street West, between Avenue O-4 and Avenue N-12, in the unincorporated area adjacent to the City of Palmdale.

The proposed application, map, and legal are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by June 3, 2011.

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

Doug Dorado
Local Government/
Information Systems Analyst

Date: May 3, 2011
Exhibit "A"

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-07 (2008-02)
TO THE CITY OF PALMDALE

BEING A PORTION OF SECTIONS 9 AND 16, TOWNSHIP 7 NORTH, RANGE 12 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

COMMENCING AT THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 16, THENCE, S88°58'50"W,
333.18 FEET ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 16 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER
OF PARCEL 7 AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY 1763 IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA AS PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 65, PAGE 18, RECORD OF SURVEYS IN THE
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, BEING THE TRUE POINT OF
BEGINNING, SAID POINT ALSO BEING ON THE BOUNDARY OF THE CITY OF PALMDALE AS
SAME EXISTED ON JUNE 19, 2006, THENCE, FOLLOWING ALONG SAID BOUNDARY DESCRIBED
AS FOLLOWS:

L-1 THENCE, S0°11'12"E, 674.87 FEET ALONG SAID BOUNDARY TO THE NORTHEAST
CORNER OF PARCEL 10 OF SAID RECORD OF SURVEY 1763;

L-2 THENCE, CONTINUING ALONG SAID BOUNDARY S0°11'12"E, 674.87 FEET TO THE
SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 10;

L-3 THENCE, DEPARTING FROM SAID BOUNDARY, S88°10'21"W, 333.36 FEET ALONG THE
SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 10 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL
10;

L-4 THENCE, N0°10'44"W, 674.32 FEET ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 10 TO
THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 10;
THENCE, N0°10'44"W, 674.32 FEET ALONG THE WESTERNLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 7 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 7; SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PARCEL 50, OF RECORD OF SURVEY 1769, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA AS PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 65, PAGE 30 OF RECORD OF SURVEYS IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY;

THENCE, N0°21'00"E, 662.94 FEET ALONG THE WESTERNLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 50 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 50;

THENCE, N89°00'25"E, 332.75 FEET ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 50 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 49; SAID POINT ALSO BEING ON SAID BOUNDARY OF THE CITY OF PALMDALE;

THENCE, N89°00'25"E, 302.75 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF PARCEL 49 OF SAID RECORD OF SURVEY 1979;

THENCE, S0°17'05"W, 662.35 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF PARCEL 49; SAID SOUTHEAST CORNER BEING A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 16;

THENCE, S88°58'50"W, 303.18 FEET ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 16 TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

TOTAL ANNEXATION AREA CONTAINS 20.0 ACRES.
DESCRIPTION OF ANNEXATION NO. 2011-07 (2008-02) TO THE CITY OF PALMDALE

BEING A PORTION OF SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 1 NO. 7, RANGE 3 WEST, 3RD MERIDIAN, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

COMPARING AT THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF SAD SECTION 14, THE N1/2, W1/2 OF S1/2, E1/2 OF SAD PARCEL 1.5
ALONG THE INTERSECTING LINE OF SAD PARCEL 1, TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF PARCEL 2, AS SHOWN ON RECORDS OF SURVEY TDB IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BEGINNING AT THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAD PARCEL 1, AS SHOWN ON THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAD COUNTY, BEING THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAD PARCEL 1, SAD POINT 10 BEING THE TRUE
RECORDING OF THE CITY OF PALMDALE, AS METERED ON JUNE 18, 1909, THEREBY FOLLOWING ALONG SAD
BOUNDARIES AS FOLLOWS:

L.7. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG SAD EASTBOUNDARY TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF
PARCEL 14, AS BOUND ON FILED RECORD OF SURVEY 177.

L.6. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG THE SOUTHBOUNDARY OF SAD PARCEL 12, TO THE
SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAD PARCEL 12.

L.5. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG THE WESTBOUNDARY OF SAD PARCEL 10, TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAD PARCEL 10.

L.4. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG THE INTERSECTING LINE OF SAD PARCEL 7, TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAD PARCEL 9.

L.3. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG THE INTERSECTING LINE OF SAD PARCEL 8, TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAD PARCEL 7.

L.2. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG THE INTERSECTING LINE OF SAD PARCEL 6, TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAD PARCEL 5.

L.1. THENCE, SOUTH 90 DEGREES WEST, 768.59 FEET ALONG THE INTERSECTING LINE OF SAD PARCEL 3, TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAD PARCEL 1.

TOTAL ANNEXATION AREA CONTAINS 25.1 ACRES.

LINE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L2 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L3 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>L4 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>L5 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>L6 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>L7 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>L8 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>L9 of Parcel 10 Containing 0.20 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL ACRES = 25.1

EXHIBIT "B" ANNEXATION NO. 2011-07 (2008-02) TO THE CITY OF PALMDALE

ROBERT L. NIELSEN, L.S. No. 7783
612 Nonaubay Drive
Monrovia, CA 91016

EXHIBIT "C" MAP OF ANNEXATION NO. 2011-07 (2008-02) TO THE CITY OF PALMDALE

DATE: JUNE 1, 2006
REV: 4th REVISION
SIGNED: 1 OF 5
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: City of Palmdale Annexation 2011-07 (2008-02)

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Palmdale
2. Los Angeles County Hazard Abatement
3. County Library

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

1. Annexation to the City of Palmdale
2. 
3. 

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: City of Palmdale, Resolution No. CC 2008-105

APPLICANT: City of Palmdale

TITLE: Richard Kite, Planning Manager

ADDRESS: 30250 Sierra Highway

CITY: Palmdale STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 93550

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Susan Koleda, Senior Planner

TELEPHONE: (661) 267-5200

E-MAIL ADDRESS: skoleda@cityofpalmdale.org

By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.
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: 4/23/01

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

Annexation 2011-07 consists of a total of 20 acres including eleven (11) parcels of land, with six (6) parcels of land located between 10th Street West and 11th Street West north of Avenue O and five (5) parcels located on the east side of 11th Street West from Avenue O to Avenue O-4.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY: 20 acres

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

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

This proposal area contains eleven (11) parcels of land; seven (7) of the parcels are vacant land, three (3) of the parcels are developed with a single-family home, and one parcel contains a commercial building.

10th Street West, an existing four lane regional arterial roadway, is located on the eastern boundary of the site; 11th Street West, a two lane roughly paved private road is located on the western boundary. To the south is Avenue O-4, a two lane paved roadway. All of Avenue O-4 within the project site is currently private. Avenue O, a two lane paved public right-of-way, bisects the site. Both of the intersections at Avenue O and 10th Street West and Avenue O-4 and 10th Street West are currently signalized.
2. **TOPOGRAPHY**: Describe the topography, physical features, (rivers, drainage basins, etc.) and natural boundaries of the subject territory.

The proposal area is generally flat sloping gently to the northeast. There are no unique physical or natural boundaries contained within the proposed annexation area.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

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

   Approximately seven residents

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

   Seven

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory:

   Seven – pursuant to Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, dated October 7, 2010

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory:

   Six

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

   On the west side of 11th Street West are scattered large lot single family homes.

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

   Low likelihood for rural residential areas to the west, but very high likelihood for the subject proposal area since one commercial project has been approved subject to annexation and two other commercial development proposals are under review by the City.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

   There are four existing single-family dwelling units within the project areas, two from the 1950's, one constructed in 1979, and one constructed in 1987.

8. Give a summary of regional housing needs and to what extent the proposal will assist in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs as determined by SCAG.
The City of Palmdale regional housing needs was 17,910 units for the 2006-2014 cycle. A General Plan Amendment was recently approved, amending the land use designation from Equestrian Residential (minimum 2.5 acre lots) and Office Commercial to a Commercial Center designation. Therefore, if the territory is developed for commercial purposes, it will not contribute to regional housing needs.

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

At this time there is no plan to include any public facility within the proposed annexation area. Once properties develop, public services such as water and sewer will be extended into the area to service such development. Any future commercial development will provide retail opportunities for all races, cultures and income levels.

**LAND USE AND ZONING**

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

$3,271,652 - Los Angeles County Tax Assessor information (FY 2009-2010)

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

Los Angeles County:
Zoning A-2-2 Heavy Agricultural and C-M-DP (Commercial Manufacturing -- Development Program)
Land Use N-1 (Non-Urban, 0.5 du/acre)

City of Palmdale:
Zoning C-3 PZ (General Commercial -- Pre-Zone)
Land Use CC (Community Commercial)

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

The subject site has recently been rezoned to a C-3 PZ (General Commercial -- Pre-Zone) designation and it is anticipated that it will develop as commercial property over time.

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):

A General Plan Amendment and Zone Change were approved on November 3, 2010, to amend the General Plan Land Use designation to CC (Community Commercial) and the zoning to C-3 PZ (General Commercial -- Pre-Zone)
5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.

The surrounding land use consists of primarily vacant land with scattered single-family homes on large acreage lots to the north and west, existing commercial development to the south and vacant land with the odd commercial development to the east.

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 recently adopted a General Plan Amendment, changing the Land Use designation to CC (Community Commercial).

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

Yes

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

The City’s Planning Commission approved a commercial development application for a 79,805 square foot commercial center south of Avenue O on September 9, 2010, subject to approval of City Annexation No. 2008-02, General Plan Amendment 09-02, and Zone Change 09-02. Two other development applications are currently on file with the Palmdale Planning Department, to include a gas station at the southwest corner of Avenue O and 10th Street West and the other for a 36,700 square foot commercial center on the north side of Avenue O between 10th Street West and 11th Street West.

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

Site Plan Review 1-07-1, which has been approved subject to annexation, would need to be redesigned to include only those parcels currently within the City of Palmdale.

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 subject territory is not located within a redevelopment area; however, properties immediately to the east of the subject territory are located within Palmdale Redevelopment Area 4-D.

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

There is no agricultural or open space lands within the subject territory and the proposal
will have no effect on any agricultural or open space lands.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

The northeast, southeast and southwest corners of the intersection of 10th Street West and Avenue O are currently within the City of Palmdale, with the northwest corner being within unincorporated Los Angeles County. The annexation of the subject territory would mean that the entire signalized intersection of 10th Street West and Avenue M, both designated major arterial roadways, would be under the sole jurisdiction of the City of Palmdale. Additionally, if the City has jurisdiction over all parcels fronting onto 10th Street West and Avenue O within the area, access onto the arterial streets could be limited to improve overall safety within the vicinity.

By annexing all properties on the eastside of 11th Street West within the subject territory, both those parcels currently within unincorporated Los Angeles County and those within the City limits adjacent to 10th Street West can be developed in a logical manner while avoiding impacts to existing residential uses to the west. 11th Street West presents a more logical boundary for the development of commercial uses than the existing boundary.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

If annexed, adjacent areas will see very few changes from the current situation in the short term. Although properties on the east side of 11th Street West may be developed in the future with commercial uses, the infrastructure required to serve such uses would not be extended to the west side of 11th Street West. There would be no requirement to connect to a public sanitary sewer, streets within adjacent areas would remain private, and there would be no streetlights installed within unincorporated areas.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

If the property is not annexed, applications for a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, as well as applications to develop the properties, could be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning for processing. However, as a single landowner owns three of the eleven parcels subject to the annexation, as well as two adjacent parcels already within the City limits, this would result in some of the properties being developed in conformance with City of Palmdale standards and adjacent parcels being developed under Los Angeles County standards.
c. The local government structure of the County:

If annexed, there will be no changes required to the local government structure of the County. The City of Palmdale has the ability to assume maintenance responsibility for any and all infrastructure necessary to serve future development on the site.

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 areas.

The majority of the governmental services received by existing residents are from County offices and facilities located within the City of Lancaster, a minimum of four miles to the north of the site. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department provide police and fire services respectively from facilities located within the City of Palmdale. Existing residents do not currently receive sewer, lighting or road maintenance services from Los Angeles County. The cost of services provided to properties within the annexation area is generally covered through direct assessments collected as part of the property tax for services such as fire, parks and library.

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

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

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

3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?
The City of Palmdale is a full service municipal government that provides the following services: Animal Control Services (through contract with Los Angeles County Animal Control); Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (through the CFPD); Law Enforcement (through contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department); Public park maintenance, recreational programs and services; Land use planning and building regulation; Library services; Street maintenance; Street lighting (through Southern California Edison); Flood control and storm water disposal; Transit services (by the Antelope Valley Transit Authority).

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

If the annexation is approved and commercial development occurs, the developer will be required to construct and connect with existing infrastructure, which will then be maintained by the appropriate entity. There will be additional costs, in the form of special assessments, to the property if this occurs. If the property is annexed but commercial development does not occur, there will be no additional services provided and no additional costs to property owners.

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

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

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

Parcels within the annexation may be developed at some point in the future with commercial uses. At that time, the developer will be required to form or annex into assessment districts such as Sewer ($4,000) and Streetlights ($3,500). At the time permits are issued for construction, developer impact fees including traffic (currently $10.90 gsf for retail, $4.64 per gsf for general office and $15.25 per gsf for medical office), drainage (currently $19,966/acre), public facilities (currently $171 per 1,000
square feet) and fire facilities (currently $0.4420 per square foot) will be charged based upon the use, acreage or building area. Additionally, a sewer capacity fee (currently $778/1,000 square feet of retail, $1,556/1,000 square feet of general office and $2,334/1,000 square feet of medical office) will be charged.

Residents would no longer be required to pay Los Angeles County’s utility surcharge on their utility bills.

**SPHERE OF INFLUENCE**

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

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

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

   There are no known communities of social or economic interest within the proposed area or immediately adjacent.

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

   The request does not include a request for an update of the City’s sphere of influence.

**BONDED INDEBTEDNESS**

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

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

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

   The properties will remain within the County Parks district after annexation and will continue to be assessed on a yearly basis in order to pay off this obligation.

   Upon annexation, each parcel will be obligated to pay an assessment, voter approved in 2005, for the issuances of bonds to pay for City of Palmdale park improvement projects. The assessment for commercial property will be one single family equivalent (SFE) per each 1/5 acre for the first five acres and one SFE per acre for each additional acre, or portion thereof. The SFE rate for FY 2010-11 is $45.24.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?

Landowners will remain liable for all existing indebtedness of the following districts:
Water District - $0.317372 per $1000 of assessed value
Community College - $0.024595 per $1000 of assessed value
High Schools - $0.024211 per $1000 of assessed value
Elementary schools - $0.019877 per $1000 of assessed value
Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District -- Proposition A (1992)
and Proposition A (1998)

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 addresses 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
Carl Fink  540 S. Mills Avenue, Lodi, CA 95242
Mike Carouba  1420 S. Mills Avenue, Suite M, Lodi, CA 95242
Lev Yasnogorodsky  2520 E Palmdale Blvd., Palmdale, CA 93550
Gene & Margartet Picou  40432 11th St W., Palmdale, CA 93551
Gladys Horn  40458 N. 11th St W., Palmdale, CA 93551

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

Name  Address
Susan Koleda, Senior Planner  38250 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA 93550
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 provisions of services.

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.

At the time development occurs on the currently vacant parcels within the annexation area, the developer will be required to install all new infrastructure required to serve the development, including streets, streetlights, water, sewer, and drainage facilities. All such facilities will be maintained by either the City of Palmdale directly or through an assessment district or the applicable water purveyor. Additionally, other municipal services such as libraries, public parks and parks and recreation programs will be available to the residents. The capacity of services will be analyzed and increased at the time of any future development applications.

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.

Fire protection and emergency medical services are currently provided by the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County, North Region, Division 5, Battalion 17.

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

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

Following annexation, the Los Angeles County Fire Department will continue to provide fire protection and emergency medical services. During development, the project developer will construct all necessary on and off-site fire hydrants required to serve the site.
4. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?

Services will be uninterrupted since all infrastructure required to serve the site is currently in place and the area is already within the boundaries of the Consolidated Fire Protection District.

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

Funding of fire protection and emergency medical services is through a portion of the ad valorem tax and special tax assessment of property owners. Replacement, upgrading and construction of new facilities are also offset by a Fire Facility Impact fee, the amount of which is based on the square footage of building area.

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

Flood Control Services

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

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently provides flood control services within unincorporated Los Angeles County by means of infrastructure including curb and gutter, retention basins and drainage channels.

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.

The City of Palmdale Department of Public Works will provide flood control services upon annexation. The level of service provided will increase upon development of the uninhabited area, since new flood control infrastructure will be required as a condition of development in accordance with the City's Master Plan of Drainage. A Drainage Impact fee will be applied to any future development of the uninhabited portion of the proposed annexation area for development of regional detention facilities.

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

Upon annexation, permanent flood control services will be provided upon development of vacant parcels. Temporary flood control services during an emergency will be provided by the City of Palmdale immediately upon annexation.
4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.).

Permanent flood control facilities will be financed by individual development projects as they are constructed and regional facilities through the assessment of applicable Drainage Impact fees and general property taxes where necessary.

Library Services

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

The County of Los Angeles Public Library system currently provides service to the existing residents within unincorporated Los Angeles County through a direct assessment on parcels. The closest library to the subject properties is located at 42018 North 50th Street West in Quartz Hill. Additionally, residents within Los Angeles County are able to utilize the services of the City of Palmdale Library free of charge.

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.

Once annexed, the City of Palmdale Library will provide service to the area. The City of Palmdale Library is located within four miles of the proposed territory to be annexed. Books, audios, videos, and study spaces are currently provided as well as Internet service stations. Library patrons will be able to check out books, audios and videos as they do now. No changes in the level of service are expected. Additionally, the residents within the annexed area will still be able to utilize the services of the County of Los Angeles Public Library system.

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

This service is currently provided. The City of Palmdale Library is located approximately four miles southeast of the proposed annexation and currently may be utilized by residents of the proposed annexation area.

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

Development fees, including the Public Facility Impact fee, and general property tax will continue to provide funding for library services for the proposed territory that is to be annexed into the City. Upon annexation the developed properties will no longer be subject to a special assessment for the County Library system.
5. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Park and Recreational Services

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

The County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation currently provides park and recreational services to all Los Angeles County pockets within the City limits. There are only two parks within 10 miles of the subject site, George Lane Park located at 5520 West Avenue L-8 in Quartz Hill and Apollo Community Regional Park at 4555 West Avenue G in Lancaster.

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

Following annexation of the project site, the City of Palmdale will provide parks and recreational services to the subject site. There are eight parks within four miles of the subject site: Marie Kerr Park at 39700 30th Street West; Manzanita Heights Park at 431 Mesa Verde Avenue; Desert Sands Park at 39117 3rd Street East; Joe Davies Heritage Airpark at 2001 East Avenue P; Melville J. Courson Park at 38226 10th Street East; Poncitlan Square at 38315 9th Street East; Aravender Park at 2820 Greenbrier Street; and Pelona Vista Park at 37800 Tierra Subida Avenue. The Department of Parks and Recreation provides a variety of recreational services at parks locations and those services are not expected to change as a result of the proposed annexation.

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

Parks and recreation services are currently provided by the City of Palmdale and will continue to be available upon approval of the annexation.

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

Existing park facilities are financed through a mixture of general fund, parkland development fees, Proposition A funds, and specific program 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? 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. The County of Los Angeles currently pays for police protection services within the unincorporated area.

2. 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 any changes in service level.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department currently provides service to the area of the proposed annexation and will continue to upon annexation; however, upon annexation the City of Palmdale will pay for this service. Those services include emergency services, traffic control, and security services for citywide events. Police services are provided to the City of Palmdale through an annual contract. When the vacant portion of the annexation site is developed, the need for additional staffing will be evaluated at that time.

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

The services of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department are currently available to the proposed annexation area.

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

Services will be financed through the City's general fund.

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

Road Maintenance Services

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

Within the boundaries of the proposed annexation, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently provides road maintenance service along 10th Street West between Avenue O and 660 feet north of Avenue O and Avenue O between 10th Street West and 11th Street West. 11th Street West and Avenue O-4 are currently private streets and are maintained by the applicable property owners.
Westside Park Mutual Water Company has indicated that they have sufficient water supply to accommodate the proposed uses. The El Dorado Mutual Water Company has stated that the water company is prepared to provide water service as the property owners are shareholders of the water company. Additionally, El Dorado Mutual Water Company has granted permission for Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40-34 to provide fire flow only for any future commercial development within the boundaries of the El Dorado Mutual Water Company. The availability of water for future development on the unimproved portion of the site will be subject to the approval of the applicable water purveyor.

3. 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 in which those services will be made available.

The annexation territory is located within the boundaries of two different water purveyors; all parcels south of Avenue O are within the Westside Park Mutual Water Company, all other parcels located north of Avenue O are located within the El Dorado Mutual Water Company.

Westside Park Mutual Water Company has the ability to provide water immediately upon annexation and installation of on-site lines, as all necessary off-site infrastructure to support commercial uses is existing or was previously installed by an adjacent development, including two wells that pump 800 and 950 gpm respectively and a 0.9 MG tank.

El Dorado Mutual Water Company has the ability provide water service to the subject properties upon the installation of necessary on- and off-site infrastructure, including water mains, services or other appurtenances, as required by the Mutual Water Company. The capacity level of El Dorado Mutual Water Company is dependant upon water availability in terms of future propose development.

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

Water services for future development will be financed directly by the property developer, with on-going maintenance and operational expenses paid for through the service connection fees of the applicable water purveyor.

Wastewater Services

1. Give a brief description of how this service is currently provided and by which agency.
Each of the developed parcels is currently served by individual septic tank and maintained by the individual property owner. No wastewater service is currently provided to existing vacant parcels.

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

Upon annexation, those residential properties currently served by individual septic tank will continue to operate in the same manner and remain unserved by any wastewater service provider.

Wastewater services will be available for any future development at the time development is proposed by both the City of Palmdale and the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, District No 14. The installation of necessary infrastructure to serve the site will be a condition of approval of any development application. In 2009, the City of Palmdale withdrew from the Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District and now operates and maintains all City owned public sewer lines within the City limits, and will provide this service to the affected area upon annexation and development of the individual parcels.

The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County will undertake the treatment of wastewater at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant (LWRP). According to the County Sanitation District, as of 2007, the LWRP has a design capacity of 16 million gallons per day (mgd) and was currently processing 14.9 mgd. In 2004, the District adopted the "Lancaster Water Reclamation Plan 2020 Facilities Plan" to identify the wastewater treatment and effluent management facilities needed to accommodate the projected wastewater flow and effluent generated through the year 2020. The wastewater flow rate projected for District No. 14 in 2020, based on the population forecast from SCAG 2001, is 26.0 mgd. Since the current capacity of the LWRP is 16.0 mgd, both the wastewater treatment and effluent management systems for District No. 14 must be expanded in order to meet the needs of the projected service area for District No. 14 through the year 2020.

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

At the time properties develop, the City of Palmdale Department of Public Works and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County will provide wastewater services.

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request?
   □ Yes □ No
The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County has notified the City that the annexation area is outside the jurisdictional boundaries of the Districts and will require annexation into District No. 14 before service can be provided.

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

The County Sanitation District charges new users or developers a connections fee, which goes into a separate Capital Improvement Fund to finance any future improvements as needed. This includes the upgrade of the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant and the City of Palmdale Sanitary Sewer Collection System.

Additionally, as of August 2010, all new development will be required to pay a Collection System Capacity fee to the City of Palmdale to pay for the on-going maintenance and upgrade of sewer lines within the City.

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

As no wastewater infrastructure currently exists within the subject territory, there will be no transfer of facilities upon approval of the annexation. At the time the existing vacant property is developed, the installation of new infrastructure to serve the site will be required as a condition of approval of the development and appropriate facilities will be owner and maintained by the City of Palmdale Sanitary Sewer Collection System.
May 19, 2011

State Legislative Update

Overview

The deadline for Legislative Policy Committees to approve bills with a fiscal impact in their house of origin was Friday, May 6. Legislative Appropriations committees are now in full swing and will be holding committee hearings throughout the month of May. At this point in the legislative process we know which of the more complex bills dealing with community colleges passed out of Appropriations committees, and which ones were referred to Suspense Files. Bills placed on Suspense Files will be considered at the end of May—the deadline for fiscal committees to consider bills. Given the fiscal climate, it is unclear how strict the Legislature will be in determining which bills move off the Suspense File.

* * *

AB 684 (Block) Community College Districts: Trustee Elections

Analysis/Summary: This bill would allow community college districts that wish to switch from at-large trustee elections to trustee area elections to do so via a waiver process. The waiver would be approved by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors.

Comments: This bill is sponsored by the League of California Community Colleges. The intent is to assist districts to comply with the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) in a cost effective manner. The CVRA makes it difficult for districts to maintain at large elections. A district can be challenged under the CVRA and spend millions defending their election system and if they lose they will spend more to trustee area elections. The waiver process will allow districts to avoid costly litigation and consulting fees. The State Board of Education already approves similar waivers for K-12 districts.

Location: The bill was heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee and referred to the Suspense File.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION (LACOE)  
DIVISION OF BUSINESS ADVISORY SERVICES  

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION  
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)  
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-JUNE 2011

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 821/Fuller  
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11  
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 05/17/11: Read second time and amended. Ordered to consent calendar.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 684/Block
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/17/11
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 05/16/11: Read second time. Ordered to third reading.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
Existing law provides for California community college districts to receive general supervision from the California Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In addition, each community college district is under the control of its own elected board of trustees. Those independent boards of trustees develop the election structure that each community college district uses.

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

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

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

This bill requires the Los Angeles CCD to establish trustee areas. If successful, this bill seeks compensation as a mandated local program for any cost associated with this directive.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

- **Support**  
  The County Committee actively supports the bill.

- **Oppose**  
  The County Committee actively opposes the bill.

- **Disapprove**  
  The County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
AMENDMENTS REQUIRED
If staff's recommended position is based on the need for amendments to the bill language, suggested alternative language is attached.

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

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

June 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of May 23, 2011.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date
None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date
None

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

June 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of May 23, 2011.

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On April 27, 2004, LACOE received a copy of the CDE’s final feasibility study. On April 29, 2004, LACOE received notice from the CDE that the petition hearing had been delayed indefinitely at the request of the Wiseburn SD. Subsequently, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE hear the petition, along with its request for two waivers. A hearing was scheduled for July 7, 2004. On July 7, 2004, staff was notified by the CDE that Centinela Valley UHSD requested a delay in review by the SBE. Wiseburn SD agreed to withdraw its petition for consideration before the SBE to accommodate additional review requested by Centinela Valley UHSD. Subsequent to granting this delay, legal counsel to Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD presented additional information (at the CDE’s request) regarding the legality of Wiseburn SD residents maintaining responsibility to pay Centinela Valley UHSD 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 issued a preliminary injunction barring the conduct of the March 8, 2005, scheduled election regarding the formation of the Wiseburn USD. The Petitioners also contacted the Court and requested that the Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Injunction) scheduled for December 13, 2004, vs. the County Committee and County Superintendent, be taken off the calendar. The Petitioners stated that they would consult with the court’s clerk to re-schedule. This action was taken because the Petitioners received the Injunction that day. A hearing on the motion was scheduled for March 30, 2005. Staff received notice from County Counsel that both the County Committee and the County Superintendent were dropped as parties to the lawsuit in which they were named.

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

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

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

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

On October 22, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE was scheduled for the SBE’s January 7-8, 2010, meeting. On December 8, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would not be heard until March 11, 2010. On January 6, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would not be heard until some time in July 2010. On March 25, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would be heard at the May 12-13, 2010, meeting of the SBE. On April 30, 2010, the CDE issued its revised feasibility study on the Wiseburn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wiseburn SD

* Indicates update from previous summary.
requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently, there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
May 19, 2011, but it was cancelled due to scheduling conflicts. It is anticipated that another regional meeting will be scheduled and that it will be facilitated by LACOE staff.

*Status: Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD circulating proposed legislation.

Status Date: May 19, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

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

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder’s office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staff contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011,

* Indicates update from previous summary.
staff from the Registrar-Recorder’s office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway.

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

Status Date:  May 12, 2011

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

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

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

Status:  Petition in circulation.

Status Date:  August 30, 2010

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; action ended.

Status Date: August 16, 2010

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

On February 26, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019(a) and (c) to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting, within the Mount San Antonio CCD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On March 12, 2010, County Counsel notified staff that the petition was sufficient. On March 12, 2010, the petition was forwarded to the chief petitioner for circulation.

Please note that this is a new, additional petition, separate from other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, although it requests the same changes within the Mount San Antonio CCD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas with trustee area voting).

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 19, 2010

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

Status: Petition currently in circulation.

Status Date: February 21, 2008

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: May 11, 2007

**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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD, RETAINING THE AT-LARGE VOTING METHOD

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: January 17, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: October 2, 2006

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 11, 2006

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 11, 2006

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: July 21, 2003

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: June 16, 2003

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2001

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

* None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

* Hermosa Beach City SD to Manhattan Beach USD or Redondo Beach USD/January 2011

** Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/May 2011

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

* None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

* None

* Indicates update from previous summary.