May 22, 2012

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 6, 2012

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m.
on Wednesday, June 6, 2012, 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 for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of June 6, 2012.

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

MFS/AD:mb
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
June 6, 2012
9:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action
*  Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix

II. FLAG SALUTE—Ms. Calix

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  I, D, A*

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on
March 7, 2012, will be submitted for approval.

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

Newspaper Article

- A May 18, 2012, article from the San Gabriel Tribune—“Pomona board
  recommends not expanding its members or creating trustee areas.”
  (Attachment 1)

- A May 21, 2012 article from the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin—“Hearing
  on proposed Pomona Unified school board expansion, trustee areas set
  for Wednesday.” (Attachment 2)

Informational Correspondence

- April 26, 2012, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice
  to Interested Agencies regarding the following (Attachment 3):
    • Annexation No. 55 to County Sanitation District No. 2;
    • Annexation No. 292 to County Sanitation District No. 15;
    • Annexation No. 416 to County Sanitation District No. 22;
    • Annexation No. 706 to County Sanitation District No. 21; and
    • Annexation No. 733 to County Sanitation District No. 21.
May 3, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies regarding the following (Attachment 4):

- Detachment No. 2012-03 from Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Val Verde; and,
- Annexation 2012-04 to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley.

May 17, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies regarding Annexation 2012-06 to Mesa heights Garbage Disposal District.
(Attachment 5):

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC.

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. PRESENTATION OF A REFERENCE REPORT ON THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, AND TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE POMONA USD.

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of the proposal and review the findings of the reference report.

Pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019, public hearings were scheduled for May 23, 2012, in the Pomona USD.

VIII. COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF PETITIONER AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE POMONA USD.

Ten minutes will be allotted for the chief petitioner and representatives of the Pomona USD to provide final comments regarding the proposal.
IX. COUNTY COMMITTEE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, AND TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE POMONA USD

The County Committee will consider the reference report and presentations by the parties involved and may take action to approve or disapprove the proposal in accordance with EC §5019.

X. UPDATE ON THE PETITION PROPOSING TO FORM A WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition to form a Wiseburn USD, including a review of proposed agreements and legislative proposal.

XI. 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”)

XII. 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]”)

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

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

Regular Meeting
May 2, 2012

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, May 2, 2012, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. by Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix who asked Maurice Kunkel to lead the flag salute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Allen</td>
<td>Joan Jakubowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Bostrom</td>
<td>John Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Calix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Edmiston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen H. Griffith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Kunkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Ogaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan T. Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ Wilmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Spies, Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Deegan, Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bracamontes, Recording Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Heredia, Recording Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was **MOVED** by AJ Wilmer and **SECONDED** by Mr. Bostrom that the minutes of the regular meeting held on March 7, 2012, be approved with two abstentions, Mr. Ogaz and Mr. Bostrom.

Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 2, 2012 Motion #13

Communications

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

Presentations from the Public

There were no members of the public to address the County Committee.
Mr. Spies provided an overview of the proposed formation of a Wiseburn Unified School District. He stated that at the January 2012 County Committee meeting members requested that staff draft a letter to the State Board of Education (SBE) requesting that they accept the Wiseburn School District (SD) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the purpose of keeping the unification proposal alive. At the March 2012 County Committee meeting, Dr. Tom Johnstone, the Superintendent at Wiseburn SD presented a new local solution to staff on the formation of a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and spot legislation that would authorize continued payment by property owners within the Wiseburn SD to pay off existing outstanding debt of the Centinela Valley School Union High School District (UHSD). At this same meeting, the County Committee heard testimony from Dr. Ellen Dougherty, the Superintendent of Lawndale (SD) stating that they were opposed to the JPA because they had not been involved in the negotiations. Since the March County Committee meeting, all five impacted school districts have had five meetings and the objections from the feeder districts have been resolved. There has been an agreement by all parties to form a JPA with different conditions. There is no opposition from districts and legislative support to carry spot legislation. At the conclusion of Mr. Spies' overview he asked members if they had any questions.

Ms. Calix called Dr. Helen Martin, Superintendent, Hawthorne School District; Jose Fernandez, Superintendent, Centinela Valley UHSD; Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent, Lawndale SD; and Dr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn SD, to come forward as a group, introduce themselves and address the County Committee.

Dr. Johnstone explained that they have had five meetings to discuss the unification of Wiseburn SD. There had been an initial JPA approved on February 8, 2012, however the feeder districts were in opposition because they had not been part of the process. At this point, all districts and attorneys have been working together to form a 2nd JPA that has resolved the issues the feeder districts had and it is now in the approval process. Once the 2nd JPA has been approved, a copy will be provided to the County Committee. He stated that there are side agreements being made, an example of which is for Wiseburn SD to limit the number of inter district permits from Lawndale and Hawthorne; a similar agreement is already in place in Lennox School District. JPA 2 outlines an agreement by all districts that they will not oppose the Wiseburn SD unification, so they can go forward with legislation that is currently on hold in Sacramento. Once that process is completed they will meet with staff to work on what is the most expedient route to Wiseburn SD unification, which would probably occur sometime in 2013.

Dr. Deegan asked the panel to describe the “bones” of the JPA, its function and the roles the districts will play.
Dr. Johnstone clarified that there are in fact two JPAs, JPA (1) and JPA (2). He explained that JPA (1), the JPA between Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD, will deal with the economic impact of unification upon Centinela Valley UHSD, servicing of the current bonds and the ability of Centinela Valley UHSD to not lose 90 percent of its existing assessed valuation so that future bonds could be issued not only now but for future generations. JPA (2) is all five districts that deal with the fiscal integration of the region, also dealing with the parcel tax and going before the voters in November. The proceeds will be divided among the five districts to deal with the economic impact of the Wiseburn SD unification.

Mr. Wilmer asked if there are any triggers on the parcel tax passing or not passing.

Dr. Johnstone explains that if JPA (2) is not successful, Wiseburn SD would be able to continue with the unification process with no opposition from the districts, however, JPA (1) would be in force, for JPA (2) districts could come back to voters at a future date to seek another parcel. Side agreements in JPA (2) are taking the language out of the JPA for dealing with restrictions on the new high school and would have agreements like the other feeder districts. He went on to explain that for over a decade they have been dealing with this at opposite ends, however they are now building trust and now have an agreement that not only benefits Wiseburn SD but the entire region, if the parcel is successful it could help stabilize funding for all five districts.

Mr. Allen congratulated the districts for coming together and reaching an agreement. He asked if the districts had polled the parcel tax, and how important its passing was to unification.

Dr. Johnstone stated that they are getting their polling data from credible pollsters from Santa Monica and Berkeley and that it is now polling at 71 percent. If all five districts do a good job of explaining the need for the resources to the public, it should pass.

Mr. Fernandez responded that Centinela Valley UHSD’s main concern is JPA (1), the ability to tap into the assessed valuation that currently exists for current bonds and futures bonds as well. The issue of JPA (2) is to fiscally integrate the area, and also deal with the immediate economic impact of the Wiseburn SD unification to Centinela Valley UHSD and other feeder districts.

Dr. Dougherty added that this has been a very respectful process and that she has learned a lot from it. She stated that their taxpayer’s main concern was the $100 million in unissued bonds that Wiseburn SD is responsible for. They had been worried that legislation could change if Wiseburn SD pulls out of the unification. There is an addendum that states legislation will remain relatively the same and Wiseburn SD will continue to be held financially responsible in the JPA.
Mr. Ogaz asked if there had been any public input regarding the JPAs?

Dr. Dougherty responded that the JPA will go to board tonight and once it passes, the city manager will take it to the city council and present it to them due to the importance of the parcel tax.

Dr. Johnstone added that for JPA (1), there have been public meetings and that the main concerns came from the feeder districts whose concerns have been resolved and that for JPA (2), it has been board approved, there have been no comments or oppositions. The reporter from the Daily Breeze was made aware of it, and he failed to show to these public meetings. State Senator Rod Wright has legislation in Sacramento and will proceed when all five district boards are in agreement.

Mr. Ogaz asked Mr. Spies how this circumvents the decision and recommendation the County Committee made to the State Board.

Mr. Spies replied that it is a new plan, that the original petition is still in Sacramento and may be agendized and placed before the SBE. This new option has consistencies with what the SBE ultimately adopted, which was some financial commitment from the Wisburn SD to pay off existing debt. Mr. Spies stated that the County Committee has concluded their legal obligation ten or eleven years ago when it was brought to the SBE.

Mr. Ogaz asked when it will be heard?

Mr. Spies responded that at this point there is no scheduled date to hear nor a requirement that it ever get brought back to them.

Dr. Deegan stated that the County Committee members requested that staff draft a letter to the SBE requesting that they accept the Wisburn SD EIR, [which was prepared by the California Department of Education (CDE)], she added that the letter is ready to be mailed.

Mr. Spies stated that the letter is written and ready, however we waited to send the letter until the County Committee heard all the information and at that time may want to reconsider sending the letter.

Dr. Deegan added they could send it as a companion to this agreement and state that they have reached an agreement and request to have it agendized and adopt the EIR.

Mr. Bostrom asked Dr. Dougherty if only her district city council is involved, how and why?

Dr. Dougherty responded that first all five districts have to be in agreement and if all five boards pass it they can move forward and begin conversations with others involved. Due to the importance of the parcel tax, the city must be informed as a courtesy and also to obtain political support. All other five districts would follow this same procedure to keep the public and city council informed.
Mr. Bostrom had a question of how the JPA is funded.

Mr. Fernandez stated that it is based on a percentage of the proceeds of any parcel tax. It will be a paper agency and the divisions are as follows: 40 percent for Centinela Valley UHSD, 20 percent for Wiseburn SD; 16.8 percent for Hawthorne SD; 14.6 percent for Lawndale and 8.7 percent for Lennox SD. These numbers were agreed upon by the three feeder districts for the three feeder districts.

With reference to the governance, Mr. Fernandez replied that the governance for JPA (2), consists of one representative from each district, an elected member, which would generally be the board president. For JPA (1) Wiseburn SD would have two members and Centinela UHSD has four. The reason being is that all future bonds issued by Centinela Valley UHSD would have to have 2/3 majority so we maintain 2/3 vote for JPA (1). The duration of JPA (1) would be continuous, basically an umbrella or shadow of the Centinela Valley UHSD, when it comes to assessed valuations with the exception of the 9 percent, which is the residential part of Wiseburn SD. That is how Centinela Valley UHSD will issue future bonds. On JPA (2) the tax will be on the books for twelve years, there will then be advisory election on whether to continue or terminate. The JPA board of JPA (2) would then determine whether to continue or terminate that tax. Every four years there would be advisory election to determine whether there is support or no support for the parcel. The unification and parcel tax election occur in 2012 and should the unification election fail the special legislation as well as the JPA bylaws would cease to exist, if Wiseburn does not have unification by July 1, 2015, then the JPAs will dissolve. Mr. Fernandez offered to have their legal counsel present to the board at a future date to answer questions in more detail.

Mr. Allen asked about the advisory election mechanism.

Dr. Johnstone explained that it is nonbinding and there will be an advisory vote of whether to continue the parcel. Each representative of each board would determine whether to take the advice of the electorate. After twelve years the board can at any time get rid of the parcel with unanimous consent of all five districts.

Mr. Allen inquired of whether there is opposition to the parcel tax.

Mr. Fernandez stated that there is none to his knowledge, however without a campaign, it is the belief of the pollster that it would not be successful.

Dr. Deegan had a question about the polling and the opposition, in prior concerns that if there were a vote on Wiseburn unification, it would not be successful due to financial implications.
Mr. Fernandez stated that they would link the Wiseburn SD unification to the parcel tax, which has been a huge desire of the community for the last twelve years.

Dr. Deegan inquired about the SBE decision to send revenue back to some of the districts, and if there had been discussions with the assessor due to concerns about the legality of taxing residents and sending revenue back to a district that they are not in.

Mr. Fernandez stated that he would prefer legal counsel to answer those questions but that it is his understanding that this issue has been resolved between the legal councils of each district.

Mr. Wilmer stated that everything these districts have done has accomplished all the intents, and purposes and stated that he is in favor of not sending the letter.

Mr. Spies stated that he had conversation with one of Centinela Valley UHSD's attorneys and Larry Shirey of the CDE, about the proposal. The plan at that time has this group going before the SBE and getting their approval and moving forward. Several years ago the CDE was successful in getting some changes in the law allowing the County Committee to take on some of the role of the SBE, including the right to approve petitions like this. Due to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) becoming an issue the SBE would want to be held harmless in any potential CEQA environmental issues that could come up as a result of this moving forward. In talking with legal counsel we would have the same concerns. It would be necessary to have more conversations with legal counsel in that there may be a new board at Wiseburn SD and there may be CVRA issues, due to by-trustee areas not having been addressed, and that if approved we need to make sure we are not stepping into a potential challenge to their actions if they were doing the at-large election method.

Mr. Ogaz had a concern about the JPAs being subject to the EIR.

Dr. Johnstone stated that they will be talking to Mr. Shirey after all district boards approve the JPAs, he further stated that the JPAs are not subject to EIR, however they are currently working on an EIR if the issue is raised that the current EIR is not viable.

Mr. Spies stated that the challenge was using the CEQA law as a tool to stop the unification process, until the agreement was reached. They are proposing a financial arrangement, that is not really having an impact on the operations other than funding that they have already planned, they will not use money to build schools, money will be re-directed from the JPA to districts on agreed upon proportions. There is also an agreement that Wiseburn SD will continue to pay some level of taxation in the future for a Wiseburn SD only unification election, in exchange for the money they get back.
Mr. Ogaz had the concern about CEQA issue being raised again.

Dr. Deegan stated that in the initial petition, the County Committee did not determine that there was a need for a CEQA review and that the SBE concurred and approved it. A CEQA review came up only after the fact because a scoping meeting was not held. It was assumed that if a high school was built it would do its own EIR.

The County Committee has agreed to hold off on sending the letter to the SBE.

D. Johnstone stated that once all boards approve the JPAs they will hold conversations with State Senator Wright and obtain his full support.

Dr. Deegan stated that the County Committee would like to be informed throughout the whole process, due to the election clock that is very specific to getting the unification approved.

Ms. Calix requested that a timeline be provided to the County Committee.

Mr. Fernandez stated that the actual unification is set to happen in 2013 and that they will provide a timeline to the County Committee at the next meeting.

Mr. Wilmer asked if the County Committee should be in a position of advocacy to this matter.

All were in agreement.

Mr. Spies provided an overview of the proposed increase of the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. He stated that at the March 7, 2012, County Committee meeting, the members requested that staff be involved in the efforts of the Pomona USD and during the month of February, staff participated in three community outreach meetings that the district conducted, at which staff provided an overview of the petition process as well as the CVRA process, explaining that there are two distinct, separate processes before the district. Mr. Spies stated that Pomona USD has demonstrated good faith in soliciting community input and that while there were some public comments that supported the changes, the majority was against making the changes. Mr. Spies stated that since the March 2012 meeting, staff has attempted to contact the education deputy for Gloria Molina to seek input from the Supervisor of the current petition and the process going on with the City of Pomona without success. Staff also met with in-house Counsel, Vibiana Andrade to discuss the impact of the Madera decision on the County Committee, County Superintendent, and the processing of both the Pomona and Mt. San Antonio College petitions. Mr. Spies further stated that he has invited Richard Martinez, Superintendent of Pomona Unified and Kasey Haws, the district’s legal counsel to share what has been done with regards to studying the Community.

Update on the Petition Proposing to Increase the Number of Trustees from Five to Seven and to Establish Trustee Areas Within the Pomona USD
Mr. Martinez stated that in the last few months it has been good for the community, that there has been opportunity for the public to come together and share their thoughts and feelings with the Board of Education on potentially going to trustee areas from an at-large electoral process. The board has heard from the public, consultants, and legal counsel and it has become clear that the majority is in favor of keeping the electoral process as is. Mr. Martinez introduced Kasey Haws, Pomona USD’s legal counsel to speak on the study that the district has conducted.

Mr. Haws presented information regarding the demographics of the Pomona Unified School District and gave examples of districts that have been challenged by the CVRA, he also provided a PowerPoint presentation of the analysis of the last six elections at Pomona USD.

Mr. Martinez gave information regarding the overall makeup of Pomona USD with reference to socioeconomic status (SES). Mr. Martinez stated that the areas of Pomona USD, which include Diamond Bar and Phillips Ranch have a higher SES and sections of the North which include Ganesha Hills also have a higher SES. The lowest SES would fall in the Southern part of Pomona USD. Mr. Martinez pointed out that overall diversity is rich and throughout, and that there is not one single area that is made up of one group of people. At the three public meetings which were located in the northern, middle and southern part of Pomona, Mr. John Mendoza, the petitioner was present and had the opportunity to speak. The total public attendance for the three meetings was one hundred fifty six.

Mr. Ogaz stated that this was a very low turnout.

Mr. Martinez then stated that Pomona USD advertised the public meetings in the newspaper, gave notices at each school site, as well as using the school building marquees. Mr. Martinez further stated that the district went over and beyond in advertising and was unsure why there was such a low turnout.

Based on the analysis prepared by Mr. Haws and public input, the Pomona USD board has agreed that Pomona USD has no CVRA liability, as shown in the PowerPoint presentation depicting the last six election cycles, the board has represented all groups fairly. As far as moving from an at-large to a trustee electoral process, Pomona USD could use the city council as an example of how an at-large electoral process is working. City residents want to move away from the trustee electoral process, having garnered support of more than 11,000 signatures for this change. There was consensus with the board that it should remain the same and the recommendation is that the petition be denied. The district has taken a step further and has hired a demographer who has come up with four different potential plans for by trustee area voting; two with five areas and two with seven areas that are currently being discussed in the event that the County Committee decides to go to a trustee electoral process after the analysis has been presented. Pomona USD would like
the opportunity to submit the suggested maps and provide input on how they can be drawn and take it to the public at a public board meeting and have one approved after receiving public input.

Mr. Martinez responded to the question if anyone had brought up the lack of representation in the southeast part of Pomona. Mr. Martinez stated that the staff had brought the issue up, but that Mr. John Mendoza, the petitioner did not bring it up.

Mr. Ogaz added that this part of Pomona is an industrial area and is not as heavily populated at the northern section.

Mr. Wilmer requested that Pomona USD provide the total number of registered voters and the percentage of turnout at elections at the public hearing or the next meeting.

Mr. Allen requested that the PowerPoint presentation be sent to the County Committee members.

Mr. Spies stated that he would email the PowerPoint presentation today.

Mr. Ogaz had a question with reference to the waiver process.

Mr. Haws explained that in the event the County Committee wanted to impose going to a trustee area, there would be an option to seek a waiver, but that Pomona USD had not taken a position at this time.

Mr. Bostrom inquired that if a future district comes to the County Committee and gives a presentation much like Pomona USD, can the County Committee accept it and have no other action taken.

Mr. Spies stated that this was correct, that the County Committee would have in good conscience met their legal obligation but that this decision could still be subject to a challenge.

Mr. Spies stated that after discussions with legal counsel, and referring back to the Madera decision, the court of appeals concluded that the Madera County Committee had not violated the CVRA because it had not taken action to implement trustee area election or to order a board election. The decision further states, that as long as the County Committee does not affirmatively act to impose or apply an election method, it has not violated the CVRA. If County Committee were to take action to approve Mr. Mendoza’s petition, it would step into more legal liability or the ability to be challenged by forcing the system, a system where they have done their own analysis and concluded differently. Legal counsel recommends to the County Committee that by law they have to have a public hearing out in the jurisdiction and listen to input in greater detail, ultimately the County Committee has to make a motion to deny or approve Mr. Mendoza’s petition. The petitioner could still come back with another petition or seek to challenge and include the County Committee on their election method or decision making process.
Mr. Ogaz requested minutes of the hearing and all materials associated with the 2006 hearing of the petitioner’s previous similar petition.

Dr. Deegan informed him that there are no minutes of the 2006 hearing, but that other materials would be made available to the County Committee.

Mr. Haws stated that the Board voted 5-0 to recommend denial of petition, on the view that the current system is operating fine, and that the change would either produce no benefit or make things worse.

Mr. Wilmer inquired about setting the hearing date.

Mr. Spies responded that we will survey the County Committee for dates to schedule the Public Hearing. Mr. Spies also stated that he will work with staff to get the date and email the County Committee as soon as possible.

Mr. Wilmer added that every effort should be made to set the date for the hearing before the end of the school year.

Mr. Spies called on Dr. Deegan to provide an overview of staff activities related to the Mount San Antonio Community College District (CCD).

Dr. Deegan stated that Mount San Antonio (CCD) has studied the issue ahead of hearing the petition for CVRA challenges. Because of the actions of the community college chancellor passing legislation to facilitate community college specifically in implementing trustee area voting, other districts besides Mount San Antonio (CCD) have made the move to add trustee areas. The district hired a demographer, and has studied the issue. They had multiple trustee area plans to review and have adopted a 7 member trustee area plan which will go into effect at the next election. Dr. Scroggins said after they approved the trustee area plan selected, the board requested their legal counsel to provide a legal review just to make sure they are on the same page and understand how to interact with the board of governors for community colleges and get it implemented. The chief petitioner was present at that Mount San Antonio board of trustees meeting and study sessions where they discussed the trustee area plan. They are moving forward and since then Mr. Spies has had conversations with LACOE legal counsel of whether the County committee has to hold a hearing, and the answer is no. He stated that a letter was sent to the college and the petitioner stating that the petition process had been concluded.

Mr. Spies spoke to the chief petitioner and the chief petitioner stated that he was happy that they have taken action and that the only criticism he had was that they had split the City of Pomona in their trustee boundaries.
Dr. Deegan stated that we will get a report from the demographer. Typically districts are asked to provide the process from their demographer to assure that they are giving us a report that is compliant with the CVRA, and we will hold Mount San Antonio College and other districts that adopt trustee areas to the same standard.

Mr. Spies stated that Staff has been working on another bulletin to go out to districts providing updates of activities around the State as well as in L.A. County pertaining to the CVRA update and the Madera decision. Staff is working with legal counsel to make sure statements are accurate and legal, staff will provide the County Committee with a draft after the process is complete and hopes to have the bulletin out shortly under the Superintendent's signature.

Dr. Deegan stated that there has been discussion with in-house legal counsel with regards to the liability of the County Superintendent. The County Superintendent is required by code to order elections, and if a CVRA challenge comes along, it will not be assumed that he is taking an active role advocating a noncompliant election.

Mr. Spies made a reference to the time Compton Community College was challenged under CVRA and LACOE got pulled into a lawsuit and was asked by plaintiffs and the college to not have the Superintendent order the November board election. Our in-house counsel and the County Counsel for the Registrar-Recorder could not find any education codes or election codes stating that the County Superintendent has the discretion not to order the election. We got out of the court action by stating that the function of ordering the election is a ministerial function by the County Superintendent. If we are challenged in the future we have some court decisions as a basis for any decisions we make.

Dr. Deegan stated that the resolution we have is that County Superintendent and County Committee should not be held liable, however districts will remain liable if they do not have a trustee area election and are challengeable under CVRA. In the bulletin we will caution districts that they can receive a demand letter at any time and if they have to settle, it could be costly. We are advising them to do a study and understand their own district to get a sense within the community whether or not they are moving in the direction of CVRA. In neighboring counties there are county wide studies that districts paid to buy into, some decided to move to trustee areas, others made no change. There are approximately 1100 districts and community colleges and the SBE has received requests from 70 to move to trustee areas.

Mr. Allen inquired about waiving the election that approves the trustee areas.

Mr. Spies stated that once the plan is adopted by the board it could go to the community to accept the education code that requires that approval election can be waived and then the plan gets implemented.
Mr. Ogaz inquired about modifying the CVRA.

Mr. Spies stated that there has not been any discussion in regards to amending the CVRA, it would probably be perceived as being against minority representation and would most likely not receive any legislative backing. The only movement there is comes from the Community College effort to make the process easier to adopt. The Madera decision did give some clarity in regards to the responsibility of the County Committee, in which if they actively take steps to implement a change in elections they step into potential liability.

Mr. Allen inquired whether it was possible to have a predominantly white area challenge a district under CVRA, specifically in the Malibu-Santa Monica area.

Dr. Decgan’s answer to this was no, due to whites not being a protected class. However, every time an area is creating a new district, they must address the issue of the CVRA.

Ms. Solomon asked if the CVRA applies to County Boards of Education.

Dr. Decgan answered yes, that it does apply to County Boards of Education.

Mr. Spies reviewed proposed legislation related to school district reorganization.

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

Mr. Spies stated that Centinela Valley UHSD has trustee areas but an at large election method. Discussion has occurred with in-house counsel about this, and in light of the Madera decision, it is not going to cause the County Committee to step into any liability if it were to accept modifications as presented. Counsel has requested that staff contact Centinela Valley UHSD and request that the district provide input of whether CVRA issues were considered.

Mr. Allen stated that tomorrow there will be a board meeting at the Malibu City Hall, where the Chief Business Official will give a report on the financial implications of the Malibu unification. The video will be online.

Mr. Ogaz requested that with regards to the Wiseburn SD unification, all five districts provide each districts’ indebtedness at the next meeting.
Ms. Calix would like to add something to the LACOE newsletter on behalf of the County Committee.

Dr. Deegan offered to help Ms. Calix write something for the newsletter.

Mr. Allen commented that he had a difficult time finding the County Committee web page.

Mr. Spies informed the group that effective July 1, 2012, a new LACOE web page that is user friendly will be up and running.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:49 a.m. 

Adjournment
Pomona board recommends not expanding its members or creating trustee areas

By Monica Rodriguez Staff Writer San Gabriel Valley Tribune

POMONA - Pomona Unified School District residents will soon have a chance to give the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization their opinions on how future PUSD board members should be elected.

Committee members are expected to conduct a public hearing in late May or early June where they'll take comments on a proposal to establish trustee areas and expand the district board from five to seven members, said Matt Spies, assistant director of the division of Business Advisory Services with the county's Office of Education.

At a future meeting, committee members will either grant or deny district resident John Mendoza's petition to make the changes.

Pomona Unified school board members came to unanimous agreement last week to forward a recommendation to the committee calling for a denial of Mendoza's petition.

"This is the most diverse board in the history of the district," board President Jason Rothman said.

Mendoza, who was not present at the board meeting, said he doesn't agree with the board's action.

The board had a chance to create opportunities for district voters to participate in greater numbers in the electoral and policy setting processes of Pomona Unified, Mendoza said.

Instead "they just might be short-changing the community," he said.

Mendoza's petition, submitted last year to the Office of Education, calls for expanding the board and creating seven trustee areas as part of an effort to give parts of the district - particularly those in the central, southern and southeastern portions - greater representation on the board.

Most school board members now come from the western end of the district, such as the Phillips Ranch neighborhood and the Diamond Bar portion of the district.

Under the current system, school board members are elected at-large. Under Mendoza's proposal, voters from each trustee area would elect a candidate from within the area to represent them on the board.

School board members made their decision following a presentation by the district's lawyer, Kasey Hawe. Hawe said in the course of the past six district elections the make-up of the board has changed and become more ethnically diverse.

The district is one where the majority of the population consists of people of color - 65.4 percent Latino, 12.2 percent Asian and 6.5 percent African-American, Hawe said.
Prior to 2001, the board consisted of three Caucasians and two Latinos. By 2003, the board had three Latinos and two Caucasians and has continued to change so that it is now made up of an Asian, an African-American, a Latino and two Caucasians, Haws said.

Mendoza said the key issue is a different one.

"The primary issue is whether they are complying with the (California) Voting Rights Act," Mendoza said.

During the meeting, two members of the public spoke on the topic.

Resident Virginia Madrigal said she opposes the creation of trustee areas on the basis it creates divisions. She said if the trustee areas must be established, then five areas should be created in order to hold down costs.

John Muscente, a resident, parent and teacher in the district, opposes Mendoza's proposal and said district voters can have an impact on elections.

"If the people who signed the petition simply voted, they would have changed the elections," he said.
Hearing on proposed Pomona Unified school board expansion, trustee areas set for Wednesday

By Monica Rodriguez, Inland Valley Daily Bulletin
Created: DailyBulletin.com

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization will conduct a public hearing Wednesday in Pomona to gather comments on a proposal to increase the size of the Pomona Unified School District board of education and create trustee areas.

The hearing will begin at 7 p.m. Wednesday at the Village at Indian Hill Conference Center, 1460 E. Holt Ave, according to a district statement.

Last year Pomona resident John Mendoza submitted a petition to the Los Angeles County of Office of Education calling for expanding the school board from the current five members to seven and establishing trustee areas.

Establishing trustee areas would mean the district would have seven areas in which voters of each would be able to nominate and elect someone from their area to represent them on the school board.

At this time school board members are elected at-large.

Information: Los Angeles County Office of Education at 562-922-6336 or the Pomona Unified School District at 909-397-4800, ext. 3882.
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
City of Los Angeles
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 55 to County Sanitation District No. 2

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 1.108± acres to the district. The subject territory is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Noakes Street and Indiana Street, all within the City of Los Angeles.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, May 28, 2012.

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

Date: April 26, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO. : A-2-55

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 2 of Los Angeles County

2. ___________________________________________

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

1. Annexation

2. Sphere of Influence Amendment

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 2 of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.org

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

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.
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:  March 29, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:
Describe the location of the proposal area including major streets and highways that border the project area.

Thomas Brothers Map Page 675, Grid D2
Located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Noakes Street and Indiana Street, all within the City of Los Angeles.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
1.108 acres or 0.002 square miles

Is the proposal area Inhabited (having 12 or more registered voters residing within the territory)?
☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

   The subject territory consists of a parking lot with a guard shack and restroom.

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

   The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

   0

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

   0

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

   0

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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?
   N/A

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $110,140.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is truck and trailer storage. The current zoning is M-3-1 Heavy Manufacturing (City of Los Angeles)

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

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):
   N/A

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

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?
   N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or 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).
   N/A
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?
   Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?
    No

11. Are there any agricultural or open space lands within the proposal area? What is the effect of this proposal on agricultural or open space lands?
    No

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.
   All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 2 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

2. What will be the effect of the proposal and of alternative actions on the following: (Include the names of other local agencies having the authority to provide the same or similar services as those proposed.)
   a. Adjacent areas:
      N/A
   b. Mutual social and economic interests:
      N/A
   c. The local government structure of the County:
      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

1. Estimate the present cost and describe the adequacy of government services and controls in the area.
   The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:

The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.

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?

N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

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

The property owner will be paying a service charge for the District's services.

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: County Sanitation District No. 2 of Los Angeles County ☐ No ☑ a sphere amendment is required.

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

N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

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

Because all of the District's existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District's Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District's Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

**NOTIFICATION**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
City of La Puente
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 292 to County Sanitation District No. 15

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 2.926± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Hacienda Boulevard approximately 150 feet southeast of Sandy Hook Avenue, all within the City of La Puente.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, May 28, 2012.

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

Date: April 26, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-15-292

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. County Sanitation District No. 15
   of Los Angeles County
2. 

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)
1. Annexation
2. 

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager  CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 15
   of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998  CITY: Whittier  STATE: CA  ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt  TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708
E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsdo.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.
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: March 29, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 638, Grid D4
Located on Hacienda Boulevard approximately 150 feet southeast of Sandy Hook Avenue, all within the City of La Puente.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

2.926 acres or 0.005 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of vacant land and is located within a commercial area.

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

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   0

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

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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?
   N/A

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $256,392.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant. The current zoning is General Commercial [C-2].

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

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

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

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?
   N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or 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 territory is being developed to include a proposed shopping center.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

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?

Yes. City of La Puente Community Development Commission.

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?

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 15 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:

      N/A

   b. Mutual social and economic interest:

      N/A

   c. The local government structure of the County:

      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
   Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.

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?
   N/A

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.
   The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future.
   The property owner will be paying a service charge for the District’s services.

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: County Sanitation District No. 15 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?
   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?
   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

**NOTIFICATION**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
City of San Dimas
Three Valleys Municipal Water District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 416 to County Sanitation District No. 22

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 1.390± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on De Anza Heights Drive approximately 700 feet east of Walnut Avenue, all within the City of San Dimas.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, May 28, 2012.

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

Date: April 26, 2012

Paul A. Novak
Executive Officer
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/SPECIAL REORGANIZATION

(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-22-416

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 22
   of Los Angeles County

2. ______________________________

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

1. Annexation

2. ______________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 22
   of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkit1@lacsd.org

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

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.
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: March 29, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:
Describe the location of the proposal area including major streets and highways that border the project area.

Thomas Brothers Map Page 600, Grids C3, 4
Located on De Anza Heights Drive approximately 700 feet east of Walnut Avenue, all within the City of San Dimas.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
1.390 acres or 0.002 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of vacant land and is located within a residential area.

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

The topography is an ascending slope from the street to the rear of the lot.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   0

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   6

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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?
   N/A

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $479,988.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant residential.
   The current zoning is Single-Family Hillside, Private Horse Overlay (San Dimas) [SF-H (PH)].

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

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):
   N/A

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

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?
   N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or 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 territory is being developed to include 1 proposed single-family home.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 22 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

   N/A

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

   N/A

c. The local government structure of the County:

   No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District’s sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
   Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.

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?
   N/A

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.
   The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future.
   The property owner will be paying a service charge for the District's services.

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: County Sanitation District No. 22 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?
   Because all of the District's existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District's Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District's Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
City of La Verne
Three Valleys Municipal Water District

LAFCO File:  Annexation No. 706 to County Sanitation District No. 21

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 0.779± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Foothill Boulevard approximately 200 feet north of Towne Center Drive, all within the City of La Verne.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, May 28, 2012.

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

Date:  April 26, 2012

Paul A. Novak
Executive Officer
LAFCO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-21-706

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. County Sanitation District No. 21 of Los Angeles County
2. ______________________________________

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

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 21 of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708
E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.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.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
80 South Lake Avenue, Suite 870, Pasadena, CA 91101
TELEPHONE: (626) 204-6500  FAX: (626) 204-6507

Page 1
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:**  
Grace L. Chen  
**DATE:** March 30, 2012

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:**

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 600, Grid H1

Located on Foothill Boulevard approximately 200 feet north of Towne Center Drive, all within the City of La Verne.

**TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:**

0.779 acres or 0.001 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☐ No

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

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

   The subject territory consists of an 11-unit apartment complex and is located within a residential area.

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

   The topography is flat.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   
   25

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   
   35

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.
   
   138 (see note in application package)

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   11-unit apartment complex

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

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?
   N/A

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $1,367,666.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential. The current zoning is Public [P].

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

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):
   N/A

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.
   The land use in the surrounding territory is residential and commercial.

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?
   N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or 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).
   N/A
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 21 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:
      N/A
   
   b. Mutual social and economic interests:
      N/A
   
   c. The local government structure of the County:
      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

   The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.

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

   The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.
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?

N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future. The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

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: County Sanitation District No. 21 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

   N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

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

   Because all of the District's existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District's Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District's Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

   N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXHIBIT "B"

COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 21
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER

ANNEXATION NO. 706
TO
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 21

LAND DATA
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COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 21
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER
GRACE ROYACHANDCHI
CHIEF ENGINEER & GENERAL MANAGER

Copyright 2023. All rights reserved. The information contained herein is the property of the agencies involved prior
and may not be reproduced without the express written permission.

T.O. 600, PM 1
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
City of Claremont
Three Valleys Municipal Water District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 733 to County Sanitation District No. 21

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 1.195± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Towne Avenue approximately 150 feet south of Hillsdale Drive, all within the City of Claremont.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, May 28, 2012.

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

Date: April 26, 2012

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

**LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-21-733**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED AGENCIES (Cities and/or Special Districts)</th>
<th>RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES (Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. County Sanitation District No. 21 of Los Angeles County</td>
<td>1. Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**APPLICANT:** Grace Robinson Chan

**TITLE:** Chief Engineer and General Manager

**CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER:** County Sanitation District No. 21 of Los Angeles County

**ADDRESS:** P.O. Box 4998

**CITY:** Whittier

**STATE:** CA

**ZIP CODE:** 90607-4998

**E-MAIL ADDRESS:** dkitt@lacsd.org

**TELEPHONE:** (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

**DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON:** Donna Kitt

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.
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: Grace L. Chen  
DATE: March 29, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:
Describe the location of the proposal area including major streets and highways that border the project area.

Thomas Brothers Map Page 601, Grid B1
Located on Towne Avenue approximately 150 feet south of Hillsdale Drive, all within the City of Claremont.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
1.195 acres or 0.002 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of two single-family homes and is located within a residential area.

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

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   7

2. If the proposal included development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   7

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.
   6

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   2 single-family homes

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

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?
   N/A

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $434,848.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential. The current zoning is Single-Family Residential on 10,000 sq.ft. lots [RS-10000].

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

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):
   N/A

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

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?
   N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or 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).
   N/A
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 21 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

N/A

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

N/A

c. The local government structure of the County:

No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
   The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.

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?
   N/A

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.
   The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal or that may be levied in the near future.
   The property owner will be paying a service charge for the District’s services.

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: County Sanitation District No. 21 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?
   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g., open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

**NOTIFICATION**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Val Verde

Office of Supervisor Antonovich

Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office

Los Angeles County Office of Education

Consolidated Fire Protection District

Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District

Castaic Lake Water Agency

Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District

Castaic Union School District

LAFCO File: Detachment No. 2012-03 from Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Val Verde

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 detach 116.68 acres of uninhabited territory from the boundaries of Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Val Verde. The project site is located west of the intersection of Avenue Penn and Witherspoon Parkway, in the unincorporated community of Val Verde.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by June 4, 2012.

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

Doug Dorado
Local Government/
Information Systems Analyst

Date: May 3, 2012
EXHIBIT “A”

DETACHMENT NO. 2012-03 FROM L.A. COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT 36 (VAL VERDE)

That portion of lot A of Tract No. 8599 in the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California per map recorded in Book 101 Pages 87 and 88, of Maps, Records of said County described as follows:

Beginning at the northeasterly corner of said lot A, said corner also being the northeasterly corner of the northeast quarter of Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 17 west, San Bernardino Meridian as shown on map of Parcel Map No. 19784 filed in Book 298 Pages 61 to 67, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, said corner also being a point in the boundary of Los Angeles County Waterworks District 36 (Val Verde) as the same existed on March 06, 2012; thence

(L1) along the easterly line of said lot A and along the easterly line of said northeast quarter of Section 10 and along the boundary of said District 36 South 00°32'20" West 2642.45 feet to the east quarter corner of said Section 10; thence
(L2) continuing along said easterly line of lot A and the easterly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 10 and the boundary of said District 36 South 00°31'38" West 445.08 feet to the southeasterly corner of the land described in deed to Sterling Gateway, L.P., a California limited partnership (“Sterling”) recorded June 21, 2006 as instrument no. 06-1362500, of Official Records, Records of said county; thence
(L3) leaving last said easterly line and said boundary of District 36 and along the general southerly line of said land of Sterling North 74°07’53” West 685.09 feet; thence
(L4) South 00°07’53” East 489.03 feet; thence
(L5) South 85°43’30” West 254.34 feet; thence
(L6) North 66°48’21” West 38.23 feet; thence
(L7) South 45°00’23” West 46.14 feet; thence
(L8) South 08°07’55” West 53.23 feet; thence
(L9) South 72°28’41” West 203.24 feet to an angle point in the general southwesterly line of said land of Sterling; thence
(L10) along said general southwesterly line North 42°16’48” West 130.98 feet; thence
(L11) North 09°39’14” West 262.57 feet; thence
(L12) North 72°04’52” West 126.95 feet; thence
(L13) North 23°16’08” West 176.79 feet; thence
(L14) North 43°05’19” West 340.00 feet; thence
(L15) North 13°26’09” West 207.00 feet; thence
(L16) North 48°33’27” West 159.68 feet; thence
(L17) North 14°39’30” West 174.20 feet to an angle point in the
general westerly line of said land of Sterling; thence
(L18) along said general westerly line North 30°26’19” East 179.12
feet; thence
(L19) North 02°04’35” West 156.83 feet; thence
(L20) North 32°06’31” East 218.32 feet; thence
(L21) North 17°37’14” East 168.72 feet; thence
(L22) North 50°00’56” West 159.09 feet; thence
(L23) North 10°51’02” East 205.36 feet to a point on the northerly
line of said lot A; thence
(L24) along said northerly line South 89°15’36” East 477.85 feet
to the westerly line of said lot A; thence
(L25) along last said westerly line North 00°36’20” East 1323.13
feet to the northerly line of said lot A also being the northerly
line of said northeast quarter of Section 10; thence
(L26) along last said northerly line South 89°09’40” East 1315.89
feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 116.68 Acres, more or less.
LAFCO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF
ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/SPECIAL REORGANIZATION
(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000,
Division 3, Title 6 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2012-03

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. Castaic Area Community Standards District
2. Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 38
3. Valencia Water Company
4. 

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)
1. Detachment from LA County Waterworks District No. 38
2. Extension of water service from Valencia Water Company
3. 
4. 

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

APPLICANT: Sterling Gateway, L.P.

TITLE: Property Owner
CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: 

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 681007

CITY: Park City
STATE: UTAH
ZIP CODE: 84068-1007

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Hunt Williams
TELEPHONE: 4359013488

E-MAIL ADDRESS: huntwilliams2002@yahoo.com
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: 3/29/2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The subject property is located at the westerly terminus of Witherspoon Parkway between Del Valle Road and Ave Penn in the Newhall District. Access to proposed development is provided by the westerly extension of Witherspoon Parkway, an 84-foot-wide public street and proposed "A" Street, an 84-foot-wide public street lying west of Ave. Penn.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

116 Acres ±

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

☐ Yes

☒ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The project site is currently zoned MPD-DP (Manufacturing Planned Development Development Program) which was established by ordinance No. 2002-00032Z and became effective on February 7, 2002. Surrounding zoning includes A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural - Two Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) to the north, south and east; and M-1-B-DP (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing Development Program) to the west. The subject property consists of one lot currently unimproved. Surrounding uses include unimproved land to the north, west and south; and industrial uses to the east. The project is consistent with the proposed MPD-DP zoning classification. Industrial condominium developments are permitted in the MPD-DP zone pursuant to Section 22.32.160 of the Los Angeles County Code (“County Code”). The overall project of 39 lots (31 industrial lots and five debris basins lots) on 116.6 gross acres would be consistent with the MPD zone requirement of a parcel of land having, as a condition of use, not less than five acres. The proposed development is also consistent with the access and parking provision of the MPD zone and is providing 2,913 parking spaces (including 92 handicap spaces, 13 required).

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

The irregularly-shaped property is 116.6 gross acres (69.6 net acres) in size with slightly sloping topography.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 0

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

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 1

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

Subject property is located approximately 1/4 mile south and west of Castaic/Hasley Canyon area.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

With the exception of development of the subject property for industrial use, the likelihood for additional development is fairly remote.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

There are no dwelling units on the subject property.

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

At full build out, the project will create 2,572 direct jobs and 2,315 to 3,215 indirect jobs to the local area. This will help offset the current housing/jobs imbalance.

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?

There is no evidence that the proposed project will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvement will not cause serious public health problems, since sewage disposal, storm drainage, fire protection, and geologic and sols factors are addressed in the condition of approval. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvement will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantial and avoidable injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject property is located in a Significant Ecological Area and does not contain any stream courses or high value riparian habitats. The housing and employment need of the region were considered and balanced against all public service needs of the local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources. The project was determined to be consistent with the General Plan.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$914,046 as per Old Republic Title Report Dated 10/12/2011

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

Subject Property is currently zoned MPD-DP.

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

The project shall be developed as an industrial park, consistent with the MPD-DP zoning classification.
4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city).

The project site is currently zoned MPD-DP (Manufacturing Planned Development-Development Program) which was established by Ordinance No. 2002-0003Z and became effective on February 7, 2002.

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

Surrounding land uses include unimproved land to the north, west and south; and industrial uses 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?

N/A

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

The subject property is depicted in the HM (Hillside Management) and M (Industry) categories on the Land Use Policy Map of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan ('Plan'), a component of the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan ('General Plan'). The Industry category of the plan identifies area particularly suitable for industrial uses that are clean, nonpolluting, attractively landscaped, visually attractive and do not emit obtrusive odors. Emphasis is placed on developing designated sites to industrial park standards.

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).

Approved Tentative Parcel Map No. 080030 (Subject area) proposes an industrial development of 36 lots (31 industrial lots and five debris basin lots) on 116.6 gross acres. The project will be 1.3 million square feet of industrial buildings at full build out.

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

There would be no water service to the subject property. The property would not be able to be developed. LA County Waterworks No. 36 does not have facilities to serve this project.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No.

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

Yes, of the 116.6 gross acres of site, approximately 47 gross acres will be designated as open space lots. Areas to the west and south of proposed area are and will remain open space lands.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

LA County Waterworks District No. 36 does not have facilities in place to serve this project. It is not economically or environmentally feasible to for LA County Waterworks District No 36 to provide water service to subject area. The property is adjacent to and abuts the service area for Valencia Water Company. Valencia Water Company has designed and fully improved water service facilities (including water tanks and off site water lines) to serve the subject property.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

Detachment from LA County Waterworks District No. 36 will have no negative impact on LA County Waterworks District No. 36. There is currently no water service to subject property.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

Both LA County Waterworks District No. 36 and Valencia Water Company support this detachment.
c. The local government structure of the County:

Subject area is located in the unincorporated Los Angeles County area. Governed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The reorganization of the subject site will not affect the current disposition of the site, other than it will be served by Valencia Water Company rather than Water Works District No. 36. All other infrastructure will continue to be provided by Los Angeles County.

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

Unknown, any existing government services would be extended westerly from the existing Valencia Commerce Center Industrial Park.

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?

Valencia Water Company has indicated that it has the capacity to serve the site. The other facilities that were adequate previously would not change.
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.

None, the water company has adequate water and facilities to serve the entire site.

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

Standard LAFCO and State Board of Equalization filing fees.

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 ___________________________ No [X]

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?

   Project area is located in the Castaic area. Project will provide economic benefits and important jobs to the local area.

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

   N/A
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

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

NOTIFICATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castaic Area Town Council</td>
<td>P.O. Box 325, Castaic, CA 91310</td>
<td>(861) 295-1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Commerce Center Association</td>
<td>28245 Ave Crocker, #103, Valencia, CA 91355-0940</td>
<td>(861) 319-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Horn, Matt Benveniste-Stkand Engineering</td>
<td>15230 Burbank Blvd., #100 Van Nuys, CA 91411</td>
<td>8187878560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt Williams</td>
<td>5018 E. Meadows Dr. Park City, UT 84098</td>
<td>4359013488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley
Office of Supervisor Antonovich
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley / East Kern Water Agency
Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
City of Palmdale
Palmdale Union School District

LAFCO File: Annexation 2012-04 to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 20.35 acres of uninhabited territory into the boundaries of Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley. The project site is located north of Avenue P-8 between 22nd and 23rd Street West, in the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by June 4, 2012.

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

Doug Dorado
Local Government/Information Systems Analyst

Date: May 3, 2012
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
EXHIBIT "A"
ANNEXATION NO. 2012-004
TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT 40,
ANTELOPE VALLEY

A PORTION OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER, OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 6 NORTH, RANGE 12 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT CENTER SECTION OF SAID SECTION 20;

THENCE, EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTH LINE, OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER, OF SAID SECTION 20, NORTH 89°55'10" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 663.62 FEET, TO BE THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

THENCE, NORTHERLY, L1, NORTH 01°01'37" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1335.88 FEET;

THENCE, EASTERLY, L2, SOUTH 89°59'53" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 664.06 FEET;

THENCE, SOUTHERNLY, L3, SOUTH 00°59'38" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1334.93 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER, OF SAID SECTION 20.

THENCE, WESTERLY ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER, OF SAID SECTION 20, L4, SOUTH 89°55'10" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 663.39 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

TOTAL AREA = 886,211 = SQ. FT. (20.35± ACRES)

REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO EXHIBIT "B" ATTACHED HERETO FOR THE FORGOING DESCRIPTION. THIS DOCUMENT IS PREPARED BY ME RONALD VELASCO, LS 7424, DATED APRIL 10, 2012

RONALD VELASCO
L.S. NO. 7424
REGISTRATION EXPIRES: 12-31-13

April 11, 2012
DATE

PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LS No. 7424
EXPIRATION DATE
12-31-2013
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: 2012-04

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities or Districts)
1. Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40
2. 
3. 
4. 

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(annexation, detachment, sphere of influence amendment)
1. Annexation
2. 
3. 
4. 

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: Land owners

RESOLUTION: ____________________________
LANDOWNER / VOTER PETITION

APPLICANT: Palmdale School District - David G. Millen Intermediate School

TITLE: ____________________________
(City, District or Chief Petitioner)

ADDRESS: 39139 North 10th Street East

CITY: Palmdale
STATE: CA.
ZIP CODE: 93550

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Al Tsai
TELEPHONE: 661-947-7191
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: [Date]

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

Northeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 20, Township 6 North, Range 12 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 20, Township 6 North, Range 12 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

MAJOR STREETS AND HIGHWAYS:
North side of Avenue P-8 between 22nd Street West and 23rd Street West.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY: 20 ± Acres
GENERAL DESCRIPTION

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

The proposed area of APN 3003-034-900, 3003-034-901, 3003-034-902, 3003-034-903, and 3003-034-904 consist of vacant lands without any improvements.

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

The topography of the proposed area is relatively flat with natural sheet flow to the North East. No defined natural drainage courses exists on the site.

POPLULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 0

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

3. Number of Registered Voters (give source and date of information): 0
4. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   Tract 54399 to the North, Tract 45742 and 45559 to the East of subject property. Tract 54399 and 45742 to the West of subject property. Tract 54058 to the South of subject property. Avenue P-8, a major partially improved street, abuts the South side of the property. 22nd St. West, a residential street, abuts the East side. 23rd St. West, a residential street abuts the West side.

5. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas, within the next ten years?
   Unknown due to the current economic conditions.

6. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   No existing dwellings on subject property.

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the per capita assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)? $0 Los Angeles County Assessor Website
2. What is the present land use in the subject area? Be specific.
APN 3003-034-900, 3003-034-901, 3003-034-902, 3003-034-903 and 3003-034-904 are presently vacant with no structures or occupancy.

3. What is the proposed planned land use of the subject area? Be specific.
The School District plans to construct a new public school within APN 3003-034-900, 3003-034-901, 3003-034-902, 3003-034-903 and 3003-034-904

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):
Land use will change to public school and zone will remain the same.

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.
Single-family residences

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?
N/A
7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and other adopted land use policies?
Yes, City of Palmdale General Plan.

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities):
This proposal will result in the development of the property near future. The proposed project consist of a public school to provide education to students and faculty members, with parking area, planters, and open fields.

9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?
Denial of this proposal will preclude water service to subject area and therefore cease development of the school.

10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?
No in both cases.

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?
No
12. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
Yes.

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

1. Describe any existing or future areas of social or economic interest within the proposal area?
   N/A

2. Describe the present and probable need for public facilities and services in the proposed area:
   N/A

3. Describe in detail the present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
   N/A
4. Provide documentation regarding consultation that has occurred between the City and the County, with regards to an agreement on boundaries, development standards, and zoning requirements within the sphere. N/A

THE PROPOSAL

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

   The proposal is necessary to provide domestic water to support building and students. Including daily needs.

   Also the proposal will provided for fire life and safety protection of Students as well as structural housing classrooms, labs...etc.

2. What are the alternate courses of action, if any? (Include the names of other local agencies having the authority to provide the same or similar services as those proposed.)

   No water providers other than Los Angeles County Waterworks are available in the immediate area of the project.

3. What will be the effect of the proposal, or exclusion and of alternative actions, on the adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county?

   Approving the proposal will provide for school to serve a demand in the area. Also will provide for economic growth through jobs and consumption.
4. If the service level(s) to be provided exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase the existing capacity (i.e., new facilities, additional personnel, etc.). The existing level may be enough for the requested proposal especially when schools are seasonal demand, i.e. at times of most water need (summer) schools are normally off.

5. List any assessments, fees or other charges to be levied as a part of this proposal:
   Fees will be determined by Jurisdictional Authority.

6. List the division, acquisition, improvement, disposition, sale or transfer of any property, real or personal, belonging to a city or district that is involved in this proposal:
   None

7. List the disposition, transfer or division of any money or funds and any other obligations of a city or district involved as part of this proposal:
   None
8. To what extent will residents or landowners within the subject area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district to or from which the change of organization/reorganization/special reorganization is proposed?  
None

9. List any terms or conditions requested as part of this proposal:  
None

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?  
No

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

1. Is there a need for centralized community services in the proposed area?
   No.

2. Describe the present and probable need for public facilities and services in the proposed area:
   Present services are provided by local city (City of Palmdale). There may not be need for additional services due to the exclusive approval of this proposal.

3. Provide a detailed description of the present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services in the proposed area:
   Public services are constructed and allocated by City of Palmdale.
4. What is the present cost and adequacy of existing governmental services and controls in the area? What are the probable future needs for those services and controls?

Public services are constructed and allocated by City of Palmdale.

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

No effect

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

None

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

Water services is provided by Los Angeles County Water Works District #40
8. Plan for Providing Services:
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 area or will be financed. (Proposals initiated by cities must also fill out the information in Attachment "A" Plan for Municipal Services).

Essential services i.e. sewer, police, medical emergency, etc. are available and operating in the area. The utility infrastructure is already in place. Thus the proposal will require minor modification which will be financed by the developer.

---

GENERAL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. ANY OTHER COMMENTS YOU MAY WISH TO MAKE:

None

---

3. Names and addresses of up to three persons who are to receive notice of hearing, staff report and minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Jacob</td>
<td>33336 Agua Dulce Canyon Rd, Suite 103, Agua Dulce, CA 91390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Tsai</td>
<td>39139 North 10th Street East Palmdale, CA 93550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4. Complete Party Disclosure Form (*Not required for public agencies.)
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District
Office of Supervisor Ridley-Thomas
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Los Angeles County West Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District 5
West Basin Municipal Water District
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
Los Angeles Unified School District
Inglewood Unified School District

LAFCO File: Annexation 2012-06 to Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal 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 88.13 acres of inhabited territory into the boundaries of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District. The subject territory is broken up into 8 areas generally located south of Stocker Street, west of Crenshaw Blvd., east of Culver Blvd., and north of Jefferson Blvd., in unincorporated territory adjacent to the City of Los Angeles.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by June 18, 2012.

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

Doug Dorado
Local Government/Information Systems Analyst

Date: May 17, 2012
EXHIBIT “A”
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
ANNEXATION NO. 2012-06 TO
MESA HEIGHTS GARBAGE DISPOSAL DISTRICT

PARCEL 1

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Ballona Rancho, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of Centinella Boulevard (now known as Centinela Avenue), as said centerline is shown on map of Tract No. 10038, recorded in Book 141, pages 53 and 54, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N 1815998, E 6437464; thence along said boundary,

(L1) North 45°35'40" East 33.00 feet to the boundary of the City of Los Angeles, as same existed on same date; thence along said last-mentioned boundary the following courses:

(L2) South 44°24'20" East 251.05 feet,
(L3) South 62°06'00" West 316.88 feet,
(L4) North 27°08'30" West 150.01 feet,
(L5) South 62°08'00" West 780.60 feet, and
(L6) North 27°08'30" West 276.29 feet to said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District; thence along said last-mentioned boundary the following courses:

(L7) North 62°06'00" East 680.00 feet,
(L8) South 27°08'30" East 136.28 feet,
(L9) North 62°06'00" East 115.97 feet,
(L10) South 44°24'20" East 111.55 feet, and
(L11) North 45°35'40" East 170.00 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing: 6.07± Acres

PARCEL 2

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Rancho Aguaje De La Centinella, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of Centinela Avenue, as shown on map of Parcel Map No. 8135, filed in Book 90, pages 62 and 63, of Parcel Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N 1814174, E 6444670; thence along said boundary,
(L1) South 29°34'03" West 39.00 feet to the "NORTHERLY LINE OF 50' WIDE P.E. RAILWAY R/W", as shown on said parcel map; thence along said "NORTHERLY LINE",
(L2) North 60°34'45" West 184.00 feet to the boundary of Culver City, as same existed on said date; thence along said last-mentioned boundary,
(L3) North 29°34'03" East 630.86 feet and
(L4) South 84°19'07" East 201.24 feet to said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District; thence along said last-mentioned boundary,
(L5) South 29°34'03" West 672.87 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing: 2.84± Acres
PARCEL 3

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Section 17, Township 2 South, Range 14 West, S.B.M., in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of Charlton Avenue, as shown on map of Tract No. 50618, filed in Book 1218, pages 61 to 68, inclusive, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, and the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N 1820044, E 6449530; thence along said boundary the following courses and curves:

(L1) North 89°59'03" West 138.14 feet,
(L2) North 0°37'30" East 124.22 feet,
(L3) North 2°52'52" West 148.57 feet,
(L4) North 5°53'12" West 152.73 feet,
(L5) North 7°17'28" West 789.28 feet,
(L6) South 82°40'50" West 1300.86 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave to the northeast and having a radius of 40 feet,
(C1) northwesterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 57°16'12", an arc distance of 39.98 feet,
(L7) North 40°02'58" West 129.09 feet to the northeasterly terminus of a non-tangent curve concave to the northwest and having a radius of 270 feet, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to said last-mentioned terminus bears South 46°30'58" East,
(C2) southwesterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 19°34'21", and arc distance of 92.23 feet, and
(L8) North 26°55'18" West 125.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 1 of Tract No. 49778, as shown on map filed in Book 1190, pages 39 to 45, inclusive, of said Maps, said corner also being the southwesterly terminus of a curve concave to the northwest and having a radius of 145 feet, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to
said last-mentioned terminus bears South 26°57'41" East; thence along the boundary of said last-mentioned tract,
(C3) northeasterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 25°11'33", an arc distance of 63.76 feet,
(L9) North 40°02'58" West 439.86 feet, and
(L10) North 48°30'36" East 190.42 feet to a point in the most southerly designated sideline of Stocker Street, as shown on said last-mentioned map, said point being the westerly terminus of a non-tangent curve concave to the north and having a radius of 2050 feet, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to said last-mentioned terminus bears South 20°49'38" West; thence along said sideline,
(C4) easterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 34°21'46", an arc distance of 1229.47 feet, and
(L11) North 76°27'52" East 366.12 feet to the northwesterly corner of said Tract No. 50616; thence along the boundary of Lot 45 of said last-mentioned tract the following courses:
(L12) South 7°19'10" East 75.93 feet,
(L13) North 77°39'23" East 66.39 feet,
(L14) North 88°51'17" East 33.37 feet,
(L15) South 83°23'21" East 28.86 feet,
(L16) South 71°40'51" East 22.46 feet,
(L17) South 59°04'15" East 20.25 feet,
(L18) South 37°00'06" East 19.62 feet,
(L19) South 21°23'34" East 16.95 feet,
(L20) South 11°27'24" East 76.08 feet,
(L21) South 10°12'03" East 50.13 feet,
(L22) South 2°03'14" East 4.99 feet,
(L23) South 24°04'04" East 16.01 feet,
(L24) South 7°16'32" West 53.87 feet,
(L25) South 12°01'38" West 55.31 feet,
(L26) South 8°08'15" East 55.02 feet,
(L27) South 8°12'21" East 60.02 feet,
(L28) South 9°54'05" East 55.09 feet,
(L29) South 10°07'31" East 20.74 feet,
(L30) South 24°38'42" East 36.26 feet,
(L31) North 82°12'39" East 7.76 feet,
(L32) South 21°43'36" East 44.43 feet,
(L33) North 64°29'18" East 11.26 feet,
(L34) South 19°03'39" East 65.41 feet,
(L35) North 64°29'18" East 10.47 feet,
(L36) South 20°46'26" East 21.57 feet,
(L37) South 11°24'27" East 44.86 feet,
(L38) North 74°47'35" East 9.78 feet,
(L39) South 8°31'47" East 64.27 feet,
(L40) North 69°01'40" East 9.00 feet,
(L41) South 8°32'34" East 61.44 feet,
(L42) North 69°01'40" East 9.43 feet,
(L43) South 8°54'18" East 61.44 feet,
(L44) North 69°01'40" East 9.11 feet,
(L45) South 9°52'27" East 56.05 feet,
(L46) North 69°01'40" East 8.85 feet,
(L47) South 10°52'48" East 88.02 feet,
(L48) North 69°01'40" East 7.91 feet,
(L49) South 14°17'39" East 70.36 feet,
(L50) North 76°38'06" East 9.01 feet,
(L51) South 13°28'54" East 65.00 feet,
(L52) North 76°36'06" East 16.32 feet,
(L53) South 12°47'22" East 65.00 feet,
(L54) North 76°36'06" East 3.71 feet,
(L55) South 12°55'56" East 40.11 feet,
(L56) South 10°48'59" East 40.28 feet,
(L57) South 10°35'42" East 53.82 feet,
(L58) South 51°08'37" West 20.80 feet,
(L59) South 7°45'02" West 46.88 feet,
(L60) South 61°37'23" East 52.99 feet,
(L61) South 31°51'57" East 35.00 feet,
(L62) South 6°30'26" East 120.00 feet,
(L63) South 2°18'24" East 133.27 feet, and
(L64) South 87°07'25" West 108.92 feet to said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District; thence along said last-mentioned boundary,
(L65) North 89°59'03" West 169.62 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing: 29.05± acres

PARCEL 4

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Fractional Section 17 and Fractional Section 20, Township 2 South, Range 14 West, S.B.M., in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of La Cienega Boulevard (now known as Fairfax Avenue), as shown on map of Tract No. 16658, recorded in Book 395, pages 28 to 30, inclusive, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the centerline of Slauson Avenue, as shown on said map, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N1818040, E6451737, said intersection also being an angle point in the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012; thence along said boundary the following courses and curve:
(L1) North 88°21'40" West 264.48 feet,
(L2) South 1°38'20" West 126.59 feet,
(L3) South 49°31'10" East 126.59 feet,
(L4) South 40°28'50" West 672.79 feet,
(L5) North 88°21'40" West 88.81 feet to the southerly terminus of a non-tangent curve concave westerly and having a radius of 470.00 feet, a radial of said curve to said southerly terminus bears South 73°04'39" East,
(C1) northerly along said curve, through a central angle of 15°17'01", an arc distance of 125.37 feet,
(L6) North 1°38'20" East 608.11 feet,
(L7) North 88°21'40" West 1216.87 feet,
(L8) North 85°51'30" West 715.77 feet,
(L9) North 20°27'00" East 52.10 feet,
(L10) South 85°51'30" East 83.22 feet,
(L11) North 60°22'35" East 28.26 feet, and
(L12) North 26°36'40" East 475.07 feet to the southwesterly prolongation of that certain course having a bearing and distance of N 58°51'03" E 137.76 feet, in the generally northerly boundary of Parcel Map No. 20546, as shown on map filed in Book 241, pages 17 to 20, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, in the office of said Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk; thence along said southwesterly prolongation and said course,
(L13) North 58°51'03" East 380.02 feet to the northeasterly terminus of said course; thence through the northeasterly corner of said parcel map,
(L14) North 89°25'29" East 1647.88 feet to a point in that certain 500-foot radius curve in the old centerline of Fairfax Avenue, as shown on Parcel Map No. 16446, filed in Book 179, pages 51 to 54, inclusive, of said Parcel Maps, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to said last-mentioned point bears South 83°28'32" West; thence along said last-mentioned centerline,
(C2) southerly along said last-mentioned curve, through a central angle of 13°35'50", an arc distance of 118.66 feet to the southerly terminus of said curve; thence along said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District,
(L15) South 20°07'18" East 729.06 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing: 42.87± acres
PARCEL 5

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Section 21, Township 2 South, Range 14 West, S.B.M., in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Commencing at the intersection of the centerline of SIXTY-SECOND STREET, as said centerline is shown on map of Tract No. 9676, recorded in Book 187, pages 1 to 4, inclusive, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the centerline of ORANGE DRIVE (now known as LA BREA AVENUE), as said last-mentioned centerline is shown on said map, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N 1616685, E 6453059; thence
(L1) South 14°16'40" West 160.00 feet and
(L2) North 75°43'20" West 40.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Parcel 3, as described in deed to LADERA TOWNHOUSE APARTMENTS, LLC, recorded on October 28, 1998, as Document No. 98-1975326, of Official Records, in the office of said Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, said corner being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, said corner also being a point in the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012; thence
(L3) North 75°43'20" West 130.00 feet to the most northerly corner of said Parcel 3; thence along said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District the following courses:
(L4) North 14°16'40" East 160.00 feet,
(L5) South 75°43'20" East 130.00 feet, and
(L6) South 14°16'40" West 160.00 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing: 0.48± acres
PARCEL 6

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Rancho Cienega o' Paso de La Tijera, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Commencing at the intersection of the centerline of MOUNT VERNON DRIVE, as said centerline is shown on map of Tract No. 21687, recorded in Book 633, pages 36 to 43, inclusive, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the centerline of VALLEY RIDGE AVENUE, as said last-mentioned centerline is shown on said map, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N1823398, E6455865; thence along said last-mentioned centerline

(L1) North 16°43'40" East 58.72 feet to the beginning of a of a tangent curve concave to the east and having a radius of 500 feet and

(C1) northerly along said curve through a central angle of 6°51'00", an arc distance of 59.78 feet to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 139 of said tract, said intersection being an angle point in the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012, said intersection also being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence along said boundary the following courses:

(L2) North 66°25'19" West 136.77 feet,

(L3) North 13°40'33" East 81.89 feet, and

(L4) North 41°05'54" East 369.37 feet to the boundary of Lot 137 of said tract; thence along said last-mentioned boundary,

(L5) South 64°10'18" East 50.00 feet and

(L6) South 48°17'05" West 99.99 feet to the northeasterly line of Parcel 3, Parcel Map No. 7527, as shown on map filed in Book 68, page 7, of Parcel Maps, in said office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk; thence in a direct line through the most easterly corner of said Parcel 3,

(L7) South 41°42'55" East 125.00 feet to said centerline of VALLEY RIDGE AVENUE; thence along said last-mentioned centerline,
(L8) South 48°17’05" West 29.25 feet to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of that certain parcel of land described in deed to Sarah Humphrey, recorded on August 11, 2000, as Document No. 00-1259926, of Official Records, in said office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk; thence along said northwesterly prolongation and said northeasterly line,

(L9) South 37°22’03" East 122.82 feet to said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District; thence along said last-mentioned boundary the following courses and curve:

(L10) South 32°36’36" West 138.79 feet,

(L11) North 81°27’31" West 57.67 feet,

(L12) North 59°21’24" West 96.65 feet to the easterly terminus of a non-tangent curve concave to the southeast and having a radius of 500 feet, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to said easterly terminus bears North 59°21’24" West, and

(C2) southwesterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 7°03’55”, an arc distance of 61.66 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing: 1.81± acres

**PARCEL 7**

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Rancho Cienega o’ Paso de La Tijera, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of PRESIDIO DRIVE, as shown on map of Tract No. 12516, recorded in Book 235, pages 37 through 40, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the centerline of STÖCKER STREET, as shown on said map, said intersection being the northeasterly terminus of a curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 1000 feet, a radial of said curve to said northeasterly terminus bears South 25°46’02" East, said intersection also having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N1824297, E6458242, said
intersection also being a point in the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on January 3, 2012; thence

(C1) southwesterly along said boundary and curve through a central angle of 10°13'41", an arc distance of 178.51 feet to the northerly prolongation of the westerly line of Lot 11 of said tract; thence along said northerly prolongation,

(L1) North 15°31'21" West 40.00 feet to the southwesterly terminus of a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 960 feet, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to said southwesterly terminus bears South 15°31'21" East, said southwesterly terminus being a point in the boundary of the City of Los Angeles, as same existed on said date; thence along said last-mentioned boundary the following curves and courses:

(C2) northeasterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 23°33'49", an arc distance of 394.81 feet,

(L2) North 50°54'50" East 189.76 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 1040 feet,

(C3) northeasterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 15°42'10", an arc distance of 265.03 feet,

(L3) North 66°37'00" East 147.44 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 980 feet, and

(C4) northeasterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 10°23'43", an arc distance of 174.18 feet to said boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District; thence along said last-mentioned boundary the following courses and curve:

(L4) South 23°37'10" East 174.43 feet,

(L5) South 01°15'55" East 88.07 feet,

(L6) South 69°13'30" West 413.99 feet,

(L7) South 41°53'10" West 357.82 feet,

(L8) South 29°44'30" West 74.96 feet,

(L9) North 33°07'49" West 286.52 feet to the northeasterly terminus of a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 1000 feet, a radial of said last-mentioned curve to said northeasterly terminus bears South 33°07'49" East, and
(C5) southwesterly along said last-mentioned curve through a central angle of 07°22'47", an arc distance of 128.80 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing: 5.03± acres

PARCEL 8

All that certain real property, situated in a portion of Rancho Cienega O'Paso De La Tijera, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, lying within the following described boundaries:

Commencing at the intersection of the centerline of EDGEMAR AVENUE, as said centerline is shown on map of Tract No. 11482, recorded in Book 224, pages 45 and 46, of Maps, in the office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county, and the centerline of SLAUSON AVENUE, as said last-mentioned centerline is shown on said map, said intersection having California State Plane Coordinates, NAD 83, of N 1818523, E 6455556; thence (L1) North 89°33'30" East 150.25 feet and
(L2) North 00°26'30" West 170.00 feet to the southeasterly corner of Lot 8, Block A, of said tract, said corner being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, said corner also being a point in the boundary of the City of Los Angeles, as same existed on January 3, 2012, said corner also being an angle point in the boundary of Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, as same existed on said date; thence along said last-mentioned boundary the following courses:
(L3) North 0°26'30" West 108.14 feet and
(L4) South 54°39'08" East 147.94 feet to the easterly line of that certain parcel of land described in deed to Kellye Richard, recorded on April 26, 2008, as Document No. 08-0910796, of Official Records, in the office of said Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk; thence along said easterly line,
(L5) South 0°26'30" East 21.63 feet to said boundary of the City of Los Angeles; thence along said last-mentioned boundary,
(L8) South 89°33’30" West 120.00 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing: 0.18± acres

Total annexation area for Parcels 1 through 8: 88.13± acres

For assessment purposes only. This description of land is not a legal property description as defined in the Subdivision Map Act and may not be used as the basis for an offer for sale of the land described.

APPROVED AS TO DESCRIPTION

By ____________________________
LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Dated ____________________________
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/SPECIAL REORGANIZATION
(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2012-08

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

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

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

APPLICANT: County of Los Angeles

TITLE: 
CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: 

ADDRESS: 900 S. Fremont Street

CITY: Alhambra STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 91803

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Pat Proano TELEPHONE: (626) 458-3500

E-MAIL ADDRESS: pproano@dpw.lacounty.gov

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
80 S. LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 870 PASADENA, CA 91101
TELEPHONE: (626) 204-6500 FAX: (626) 204-6507
By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]  
DATE: 5/1/12

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The proposed annexation is within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and is broken down into different areas generally located south of Stocker Street, west of Crenshaw Blvd., east of Culver Blvd., and north of Jefferson Blvd and Centinela Avenue.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

88.13 Acres

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

☐ Yes  
☐ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

All the areas included in the proposed annexation generally consist of single residential and commercial communities which are fully developed and built out.

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

As indicated above, the annexation areas are fully developed and built out. They are generally surrounded by the City of Los Angeles, Culver City, and the City of Inglewood which consist of single residential, multi-family, and commercial communities. However, annexation areas located on the northern part of the district is primarily hilly and slopes southward and are adjacent to an oil field and a State park which are both located within the County unincorporated areas.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 239 (estimated)

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

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory. 375

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 227

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

The annexation areas are generally adjacent to and surrounded by residential and commercial development except for the annexation areas on the northern part of the district which are located on Shenandoah Avenue and Gold Leaf Circle that are adjacent to an oil field and a State park, respectively.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The proposed annexation areas are built out. Therefore, no growth is expected in these areas and in adjacent areas.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

The annexation areas include a total of 218 single family dwelling units.

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

This question is not applicable to this proposal since no change in land use or construction of new residences will occur as a result of this boundary change.

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?

Trash collection services are currently being provided to the district without regard to race, culture, or income. The same services will be provided to the proposed annexation areas.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

Total assessed land value is $112,593,822 (LA County Tax Assessor, 2012).

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

Current land use are generally low and medium density residential and major commercial. Existing zoning designations include: R-1 single-family residence; R-3 limited multiple residence; R-4 unlimited residence; A-2 heavy agriculture; C-3 unlimited commercial; M-1 light manufacturing; and RPD-1-4U residential planned development.

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

There is no proposed planned land use for the subject area. The existing land use will remain the same.
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).

There are no changes being proposed in regards to land use and zoning.

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

The land use surrounding the proposed annexation areas are generally residential and commercial while north of the proposed annexations located in the Shenandoah Avenue and Gold Leaf Circle areas are industrial vacant land, occupied by an existing oil field, and government owned property-recreation, respectively.

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 properties affected by the proposed annexation are located within unincorporated area territory and does not involve any city.

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

The existing developed areas within the annexation areas are consistent with the County General Plan and will remain consistent since there are no future developments being proposed.

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

The proposed annexation areas are built out and therefore would not result in any future development.

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

There are no developments being proposed in the annexation areas.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

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

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

There are no existing open space land in the annexation areas. However, existing agricultural lands are located within the annexation areas and are fully developed. The proposal will have no effect on existing agricultural lands.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

It was determined that the County's waste hauler for the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District was unknowingly providing trash collection services to the annexation areas. Since fee for this service is collected from the district landowners' annual tax bill and the annexation areas are currently located outside of the district, the services were being provided to them at the expense of the waste hauler, which recently changed, and now services are paid for by the landowners under the open market system. The proposed annexation is necessary in order for the annexation area residents to continue receiving the same quality of service that the District, through its contract waste hauler, is currently receiving. Otherwise, they will have to arrange their own trash collection service directly with a waste hauler, without oversight from the County, since they will remain in the open market system. In the case of the commercial communities, business owners will also have to arrange their trash collection services directly with waste haulers but will have County oversight under a non-exclusive commercial franchise agreement that commences July 1, 2012.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The annexation proposal would have no direct impact on adjacent areas as services provided to these areas would not change.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

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

The local government structure of the County would not be affected by the proposed annexation.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

No other government services will be impacted since the district is only responsible for trash collection. Initially, trash collection services were unknowingly being provided to the annexation areas at the cost of the waste hauler. This was recently changed and the cost has been transferred to its residents. In the event the annexation is approved, the district will be responsible for providing trash collection services to the annexation areas, through its contract waste hauler. As such, an annual service fee will be assessed on the landowners' tax bill to pay for the cost of the services. The annual service fee is currently $225 or $18.75 per month.

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

The Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District possesses sufficient capacity to provide trash collection services to serve these areas once annexed.

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 cost of services to the district, in the event the annexation is approved, will be higher. However, the services are paid through a service fee that is assessed annually on the landowners' tax bill, which is calculated based on the number of "refuse units" assigned to each property use classification. Therefore, as the refuse unit count increases due to the additional parcels from this annexation, additional funding will be received to pay for the increase in services. Additionally, the existing service contract will expire on June 30, 2013. As such, a new contract will go through a bidding process. The parcels added to the district due to this annexation will be included in the new contract; therefore providing adequate services and controls to the district when the new contract is awarded.
4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

The term of the contract between the district and the waste haulers are typically for 7 years with three 1-year renewal options. At the time of its renewal, a routine evaluation of services is done in order to assure adequacy of services for the following contract term. The current contract expires on June 30, 2013. In the event that the annexation is approved, these areas will be included in the district at the time the services are evaluated for the new contract, thereby ensuring adequacy of services. This increase in service demand will not exceed the existing capacity.

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

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 ___________________________ 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 communities of social or economic interest that would be affected by the sphere of influence amendment.

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

   All the proposed annexation areas are located within the County unincorporated areas and therefore does not require a request for a city sphere of influence update.
5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future.

If the annexation is approved, an annual service fee will be collected from the landowner's annual property tax bill for trash collection and disposal services. This service fee is calculated based on the number of "refuse units" assigned to each property use classification. For example, a parcel containing a single-family residential unit is assigned one refuse unit. The number of refuse units per parcel varies from one-half unit for a vacant parcel to 18 units for a community shopping center. Currently, the annual service fee is $18.75 per refuse unit per month, which translates to $225 per year.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

No, the County and the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District have no existing bonded debt.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Alva</td>
<td>900 S. Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803</td>
<td>(626) 458-3573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Wong</td>
<td>900 S. Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803</td>
<td>(626) 458-2190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

June 2012

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

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- 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 2012

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On April 27, 2004, LACOE received a copy of the CDE’s final feasibility study. On April 29, 2004, LACOE received notice from the CDE that the petition hearing had been delayed indefinitely at the request of the Wisburn SD. Subsequently, the Wisburn 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. Wisburn 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 Wisburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD presented additional information (at the CDE’s request) regarding the legality of Wisburn SD residents maintaining responsibility to pay Centinela Valley UHSD’s tax obligations following any unification of a Wisburn SD.

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen Steentoft, Chief Counsel for the SBE, recommended that certain waivers submitted with the Wisburn 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 Wisburn USD and to set the election area as the area of the Wisburn SD only on the condition that the property owners within the Wisburn SD retain current levels of responsibility for repayment of existing bonded indebtedness of the Centinela Valley UHSD upon successful formation of a Wisburn USD. The SBE voted unanimously to approve the proposal and established that territory within the Wisburn 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 Wisburn 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 Wisburn 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 Wisburn 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, Wisburn SD, and SBE began negotiations to delay the election in order to revisit the issues underlying the petition and subsequent lawsuits. The SBE requested that the County Superintendent delay the election to allow for this negotiation process to run its course. Staff consulted with the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (County Counsel) and was advised that neither the County Superintendent nor the SBE could order a delay of the election.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On February 17, 2012, LACOE received a copy of a February 7, 2012, letter, issued jointly by the Superintendents of the Hawthorne and Lawndale SDs, which was addressed to the boards of the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. The letter stated that neither Hawthorne nor Lawndale SD was in agreement with the proposed legislation and pending joint powers agreement among the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. The letter raised concerns about distribution of potential revenue sharing under the proposed legislation and agreement.

At the March 6, 2012, meeting, Wiseburn SD Superintendent Dr. Tom Johnston addressed the County Committee and explained the status of the district's negotiations on legislation with the Centinela Valley UHSD. Dr. Johnston stated that no agreement was finalized at this point and that he would keep staff informed. Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent of the Lawndale SD, also addressed the County Committee. She stated that her district had not been included in the negotiations and was not supportive of them if critical concerns of the feeder districts could not be addressed. The County Committee reviewed several documents, including recent drafts of the legislation and rationale behind it, as well as the response of the Wiseburn SD to the prior letter circulated by the other feeder districts in opposition of any legislative plan that does not include them and provide for an area-wide approval vote.

The County Committee also discussed the viability of the CEQA study already completed, which has not yet been formally adopted by the SBE. The committee directed staff to draft a letter to the SBE requesting that the CEQA study be adopted before its viability is no longer valid. The County Committee also requested updates from the impacted districts as they continue their negotiations on the legislative solution and on intra-area relations.

At the May 2, 2012, meeting of the County Committee, representatives from the Centinela Valley UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Wiseburn SDs appeared to provide an update on the petition and negotiations among the districts. The County Committee was informed that the Lennox SD Superintendent was unavailable, otherwise he would have appeared. The districts stated that they had pursued further negotiations across several all-hands meetings and had reached two agreements in principal. The agreements would provide for the creation of a Joint Powers Authority entity to collect and distribute tax funds among the districts, and would also provide for the formation of a Wiseburn USD. These agreements would require specific legislation, as proposed earlier this year. District representatives stated that all of their boards had already approved the agreements or were scheduled to do so that week.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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Given the update, the County Committee discussed delaying sending a letter to the SBE to request an adoption of the EIR and to place the Wiseburn USD petition on an upcoming agenda. The County Committee requested that the districts keep them informed of their progress, when all district boards approve their agreements, and how the legislative plan develops.

*Status:* Petition on hold; Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs negotiating legislation and agreements with Centinela Valley UHSD; districts to provide an update at the next County Committee meeting.

**Status Date:** May 18, 2012

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

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

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

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

The petition was presented to the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting. The Secretary communicated that the Pomona USD was currently studying the issue of trustee areas in light of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and may develop a plan to implement them prior to any public hearing on this petition. The Secretary communicated this information to the chief petitioner as well. Staff informed the County Committee of the district’s progress at its January 4, 2012, regular meeting, where a district representative provided details about recent activities and coming plans to conduct demographic studies, hold public hearings, and present alternative trustee area plans in compliance with the CVRA. Staff informed the chief petitioner

* Indicates update from previous summary.
of developments and advised him of the status of the petition review by the County Committee, as well as upcoming agenda items for review by the Pomona USD governing board.

Pomona USD held three public hearings on this matter on February 7, 9, and 15, 2012, at local schools within the district. At the hearings, staff presented overview information about the County Committee and the CVRA as it impacts the current petition. District staff and their attorney presented additional information and answered questions from attendees in the audience. The chief petitioner was present and spoke at all of the hearings.

At the March 7, 2012, meeting, attorney Mr. Kasey Haws addressed the County Committee as a representative of the Pomona USD to provide an update on progress. He stated that the Pomona USD board would review various trustee area proposals at an upcoming meeting and would provide the County Committee with its decision about whether to move forward with a trustee area plan (and which plan), election or other scenario related to these issues. The district would also participate in any public hearing scheduled by the County Committee.

At the May 2, 2012, County Committee meeting, Mr. Haws presented a PowerPoint describing the demographic studies that the district has conducted (utilizing the services of a consultant). The district does not believe that there is racially polarized voting within the Pomona USD, and thus does not believe it is required to move to trustee area voting under the CVRA. Mr. Haws reported that, on May 1, 2012, the Pomona USD governing board voted unanimously to oppose the pending petition. Mr. Haws stated that the district would participate in the public hearing.

The County Committee requested that the public hearing be conducted before the end of the school year, to maximize community participation. In conference with the district regarding the availability of the Village facility (to accommodate a large crowd if necessary), and the availability of County Committee members, a public hearing was set for May 23, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. On May 11, 2012, the chief petitioner, the district, Pomona USD governing board members, and County Committee members were notified of the hearing, and public notices were placed as mandated. Staff requested that the district utilize its community notification channels, and we placed an advertisement in the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin. In addition, the Pomona USD stated that it distributed a media advisory aimed at generating news coverage of the upcoming hearing. After the public hearing, the petition will be heard by the County Committee at the next regular meeting, currently scheduled for June 6, 2012.

*Status: Public hearing scheduled for May 23, 2012, in the Pomona USD.

Status Date: May 18, 2012

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 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient and staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on March 12, 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 Mount San Antonio CCD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019(c) and, based on the number of registered voters in the Mount San Antonio CCD, requires valid signatures from at least 1,000 registered voters within the petition area.

On February 15, 2012, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. Staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification on February 24, 2012.

Staff immediately contacted Dr. Bill Scroggin, President/CEO of the Mount San Antonio CCD, to advise him on the submission of the petition. Dr. Scroggin advised staff that the district was already undergoing the process to move to a trustee area voting system under an expanded board. They have passed district resolutions and hired demographers who have studied the district and the issue of trustee area voting under the CVRA, and have developed multiple alternative plans. Dr. Scroggin advised that a review by the board of these plans, and a selection of one of them to implement for its next regular election, was imminent. He also stated that the board would seek a waiver for an approval election of any trustee area plan adopted, under the California Community College Chancellor’s office. Dr. Scroggin stated that he would keep staff apprised of developments with the district and its trustee area plan process.

On March 12, 2012, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the petitions contained 1,212 valid signatures out of 1,339 signatures submitted. The Registrar-Recorder also reported that the number of registered voters in the Mount San Antonio CCD was 349,833. Under the guidelines of EC §5019(c), the petition contains enough valid signatures to move forward to review at a public hearing and a vote by the County Committee.

Staff contacted the chief petitioner and followed up with a letter explaining the status of the petition on March 12, 2012. Staff also contacted the Mount San Antonio CCD and advised them of the sufficiency of the petition. District staff informed LACOE staff that the Mount San Antonio CCD governing board had hired a demographer and was developing a trustee area plan that included seven trustee areas and seven board members. At its March 28, 2012, meeting, the Mount San Antonio CCD governing board approved the seven member trustee area plan. The board requested that a legal review be conducted so it could implement the trustee area voting and field an expanded board at its next regular election. LACOE legal counsel determined that, given that all of the tenets of the petition have already been adopted by the district, there is no need for the County Committee to take action on the matter and no public hearing is necessary. Thus it is concluded at this time.

**Status:** Petition valid; district to implement trustee areas, trustee area voting and expand its board from five to seven members; matter is concluded.

**Status Date:** May 18, 2012

* Indicates update from previous summary.
FORMATION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

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

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under BC §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 WITHIN THE POMONA USD, RETAINING THE AT-LARGE VOTING METHOD

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, 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

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

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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/November 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.