October 21, 2011

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary, County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee - Wednesday, November 2, 2011

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 2, 2011, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of November 2, 2011.

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 (LACOE)
Board Room
November 2, 2011
9:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action
*  Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Mr. John Nunez

II. FLAG SALUTE—Mr. Nunez

III. RESULTS OF THE ANNUAL COUNTY COMMITTEE ELECTION
    OF MEMBERS CONDUCTED ON OCTOBER 20, 2011—Secretary
    Mr. Matt Spies

    The Secretary will provide the results of the annual election of members to
    the County Committee that was conducted at the fall meeting of the
    Los Angeles County School Trustees Association on October 20, 2011.

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE—Mr. Nunez

    Mr. Nunez will administer the oath of office to the newly elected/re-elected
    County Committee members for the vacancies in the Third and Fifth
    Supervisiorial Districts.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

VI. COMMUNICATIONS—Mr. Spies

    Correspondence

    • A September 21, 2011, letter regarding Centinela Valley Union High
      School District's (UHSD) trustee area boundaries. (Attachment 1)

    News Articles

    • A September 26, 2011, article from SignOnSanDiego.com—"School
      district may look at election change." (Attachment 2)
• An October 1, 2011, article from PE.com—“SAN JACINTO: School board picks favorite map.” (Attachment 3)

• An October 4, 2011, article from The Mercury News—“Judge rejects San Mateo County’s motion to dismiss discrimination lawsuit.” (Attachment 4)

• An October 6, 2011, article from The North County Times—“VISTA: School trustees vote to proceed with voting changes.” (Attachment 5)

• An October 15, 2011, article from the Oakland Tribune—“Ohlone changing election system.” (Attachment 6)

• An October 18, 2011, article from The Herald—“SVMH vulnerable to suit, says consultant.” (Attachment 7)

• An October 19, 2011, article from The North County Times—“ESCONDIDO: High school district trustees agree to election change.” (Attachment 8)

**Informational Correspondence**

• An October 11, 2011, e-mail message from the Wiseburn SD concerning the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD. (Attachment 9)

• An October 18, 2011, e-mail message from the Lemon SD concerning the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and trustee area voting. (Attachment 10)

• Garvey SD Resolution No. 11-12-06 initiating a study of its election system. (Attachment 11)

• An October 12, 2011, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning the City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-23 (Norland-Robinson Road). (Attachment 12)

• An October 18, 2011, LAFCO Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies concerning the City of Palmdale Annexation No. 2011-09 (Granite Expansion). (Attachment 13)

**VII. 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.)
VIII. PRESENTATION OF A PETITION PROPOSING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

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

On August 15, 2011, the chief petitioner submitted the signed petition for review. Staff forwarded the petition to the Los Angeles County Registrar Recorder/County Clerk’s office for signature verification and on August 29, 2011, LACOE received notice that the number of valid signatures were sufficient. At the direction of the County Committee, staff will consult with all impacted parties to schedule one or more public hearings within the Pomona USD.

IX. DISCUSSION OF THE CVRA, TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES, AND A MEETING OF THE SECRETARIES TO COUNTY COMMITTEES GROUP

The Secretary will discuss recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee area issues in Los Angeles County, and report on a recent meeting of the statewide Secretaries to County Committees group.

X. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR NEW OFFICERS

Mr. Nunez will appoint a Nominating Committee to recommend candidates to fill the positions of chairperson and vice chairperson for the 2012 year. The Nominating Committee will present its report at the January 2012 regular meeting, at which time the County Committee will vote on the recommendations provided.

XI. EVALUATION OF THE SECRETARY AND STAFF TO THE COUNTY COMMITTEE

Each member of the County Committee will be requested to complete a performance evaluation form concerning the secretary and staff to the County Committee. Mr. Nunez will appoint a three-person Evaluation Committee who will receive the completed evaluation forms from the members, and consolidate the information into an evaluation report. The report will be presented to the County Committee for discussion/approval at a regular meeting designated by the chairperson.
XII. UPDATE ON ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED FORMATION OF A WISEBURN USD

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

XIII. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

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

XIV. 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”)

XV. 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]”)

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

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

Regular Meeting
July 6, 2011

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

**Members Present**
Frank Bostrom
Lloyd de Llamas
Owen Griffith
Joan Jakubowski
Maurice Kunkel
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz
Suzan Solomon
AJ Willmer

**Members Absent**
Maria Calix

**Staff Present**
Matt Spies, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Mary Bracamontes, Recording Secretary

Mr. Nunez suggested that after approval of the minutes (Agenda Item III), that Agenda Item VII be moved ahead of other agenda items for discussion and to allow for presentations from the audience concerning the item.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Mr. Griffith that the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 6, 2011, be approved. The motion **CARRIED** with two abstentions from Ms. Solomon and Mr. Ogaz.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Ms. Jakubowski that there be a change in the order of the agenda, and that Agenda Item VII be moved to the front of the agenda. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.
Mr. Spies provided an overview of recent activities and issues related to the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD, and the meetings held with the impacted districts within the Centinela Valley UHSD region concerning a local solution to provide a better educational environment to students. He stated that LACOE staff had attended three of these meetings to listen to discussions and to be present as a resource on school district organization. Mr. Spies stated that the last meeting LACOE was asked to attend was scheduled to be held in May but the meeting was cancelled. He stated that Ms. Sharon Harvey, LACOE staff, tried to reschedule a meeting before June 30 but she was unsuccessful, and she has now been reassigned so will no longer be involved. Mr. Spies referred members to a letter in the folders that the County Committee requested regarding actions taken by the County Committee in 2002 on the proposal, committees awareness of the recent district meetings, and a request of updates from the impacted districts.

Mr. Nunez asked members for any questions or comments regarding Mr. Spies overview and there were none. He commented that the County Committee had met on the subject twice concerning the letter and that the information had been shared with the Wiseburn SD. He went on to say that the committee felt that there was a stagnation in resolving the issue, and that the impacted districts needed to move forward and make a decision. Mr. Nunez stated that the County Committee also has an obligation as a committee to look into the possibilities of what could happen if the involved districts can not make a decision; and this is why the letter was sent. He asked the members for further comments and there were none. Mr. Nunez called on members of the audience concerning this agenda item.

Dr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn SD, addressed the County Committee stating that the district appreciated the letter sent by the County Committee and that the district shared the committees sentiment in that it seemed the process was stagnant. He stated that the proposal had been sent to the State Board of Education (SBE) in 2004 and the Wiseburn unification was approved by a vote of 10-0, but the process was stopped by litigation involved around an environmental review. He continued stating that the proposal came back up to the SBE in 2009 with the completion of the environmental impact report (EIR) but he was not going to go into what the report said. Dr. Johnstone stated that the SBE approved the Wiseburn unification proposal with an area wide vote but because of the language of the ballot measure, it was not going to be favorable to Wiseburn because the district is only 13 percent of the voting population in the Centinela Valley UHSD. He went on to say that the sentiment of the community was that it would have been a big loser for the district, so a decision was made to work with the impacted districts to come up with a solution. Dr. Johnstone went on to say that three meetings have been held and they are working ahead, and the language of the County Committee’s letter is very accurate in that there is not a unanimous opinion on how to resolve the situation. He referred to a portion of the County Committee’s letter regarding the committee’s concern “that any resolution of the original petition request focus on the...
interest of the local community members who moved for the petition and most importantly on the interests of the thousands of students who could be impacted.” Dr. Johnstone continued that the district shared the committee’s concerns especially since in September this year it will be ten years that this proposal started, and most importantly because of the 292 students that graduated from Dana Middle School in 2010, only 17 of the Wiseburn SD students chose to attend the Centinela Valley UHSD. He went on to say that the Wiseburn SD community passed a bond of $87 million to build their own high school. Dr. Johnstone stated that the district was going to push ahead for unification, and that he and Mr. Fernandez were working with their attorneys to draft language to come up with a resolution that would leave the Centinela Valley UHSD whole for their future bonding capacity. He commented that one of the sticking points was the wide area vote and the issue is being worked on, but he believes the Wiseburn community would support the wide area vote and they would like to bring the proposal to an end within the next 18 months. Dr. Johnstone then asked for questions from the County Committee.

Mr. Willner inquired about the district’s opinion on requesting approval of the EIR that is in place?

Dr. Johnstone responded that since the EIR has a shelf life of five years, the district would like to see it approved since the State has spent a lot of money on it.

Ms. Jakubowski inquired about the bonding capacity of the district and whether the district has addressed the issue, and does the district feel that it would still be financially sound?

Dr. Johnstone responded that as far as their future bonding capacity, the district would maintain all of its elementary K-8 capacity; and as far as the high school capacity, that would include the commercial area of eastern El Segundo which represents 36 percent of Centinela Valley UHSD’s bonding capacity. He continued that if this were taken out the Wiseburn SD would be in better shape but it would also leave Centinela Valley UHSD in a very precarious situation which the district knows would end up in litigation, and the Wiseburn SD just wants to resolve this. Dr. Johnstone stated that the Wiseburn community just passed an $87 million bond without this and would maintain the residential portions of the Holly Glen and Wiseburn communities which is nine percent of the Centinela Valley UHSD bonding capacity so the K-8 bonding capacity would go up slightly or stay the same, and 20 percent of the high school bonding capacity would be kept so Wiseburn SD would lose 80 percent to Centinela Valley UHSD so in terms of operation, the district would not be impacted in its future bonding capacity.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Johnstone and called on Dr. Fred Navarro, Superintendent of the Lennox SD, to address the County Committee.
Dr. Navarro stated that he was happy to hear that the Wiseburn SD was in favor of an area wide vote because the Lennox SD's constituents would only agree to the proposal if there were an area wide vote. He went on to say that the Lennox SD was an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County and one of the densest in population because they are a district of 6,000 in population in a 1.3 square mile area. Dr. Navarro stated that he realizes there is an agreement being made by Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD for the bonding capacity, but when Dr. Johnstone and Mr. Fernandez are long gone years from now who is to say that won't change through some other legislation, and if that is going to be part of this deal then the Lennox SD would like their constituents to have a say on what is going to happen in the future of their students because no one knows what is going to happen.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Bostrom inquired that if the district is in favor of an area wide vote, how soon will your district be able to take a position on it as a board?

Dr. Navarro responded that it would just be a matter of going back to the board and adopting a resolution at a board meeting stating its position.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Navarro and called on Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent of the Lawndale SD.

Dr. Dougherty addressed the fact that she disagreed with what was said in the letter and there were many inaccuracies in the letter as well as the County Committee's minutes of April 6, 2011. She stated that the main thing that needed to be said is that there are two different issues—there is a regional solution that all superintendents met 20 years ago to try and work on and there is Wiseburn unification; this is about Wiseburn unification not a regional solution. Dr. Dougherty continued that it is not a regional solution for our students and there are 19,500 students between Lennox, Lawndale, and Hawthorne that have not gotten a voice in this, and have not gotten a chance to clarify the letter or to clarify the minutes. She also stated that the minutes contained an e-mail that she did and she did not know how it got there and it was not addressed in the minutes correctly. Dr. Dougherty went on to say that her board was directing her to listen to all sides of the issue and it is not just a Centinela Valley/Wiseburn issue, there are three other school districts and a lot of other students that will be affected by this decision.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Bostrom inquired about what the inaccuracies were so that it could be a matter of record for the committee?

Dr. Dougherty responded that there were inaccuracies in the letter and parts of the minutes from the last meeting as far as the whole idea of why the districts met, how they met, and the purpose of the meetings—they were inaccurately addressed.
Mr. Nunez asked Dr. Dougherty to clarify the letter and minutes she spoke about.

Dr. Dougherty clarified that it was the letter Mr. Nunez had recently sent to all affected districts and the County Committee’s April meeting minutes. She stated that the County Committee should meet with the other three elementary districts that are being affected by this, and that it would be an important step before such an important decision is made.

Ms. Jakubowski asked for page or reference clarification regarding the inaccuracies of the April meeting minutes.

Dr. Dougherty responded that from Page 6 on of the minutes, there are statements like “superintendents don’t pass the information on to their boards.” She went on to say that their boards are part of those meetings and at the direction of their boards they were at this meeting, so they do understand the issue deeply. She explained that the “Wiseburn deal” subject came up at one of the district regional solution meetings because none of the districts in attendance knew anything about this so they started asking questions about it and the legislation.

Ms. Decgan asked Dr. Dougherty to submit a letter outlining the inaccuracies of the letter and minutes in greater detail.

Dr. Dougherty agreed to submit the letter.

Mr. Willmer commented that the County Committee’s concern was that a local solution was not going to happen and they preferred that this be resolved by the impacted constituents. He went on to say that the purpose of the notice was to let the districts know that if this was not resolved by the impacted constituents and they did not come up with a solution, then the County Committee would take their prerogative to reinstitute the process by open meetings, noticed meetings, in a very public manner. Mr. Willmer stated that the County Committee was looking for a local solution but if this does not happen, then the committee will discuss what prerogatives they have to open the process again.

Dr. Dougherty asked Mr. Willmer what he meant by a local solution?

Mr. Nunez spoke on behalf of the County Committee stating that they want the impacted districts to solve the problems in the area as far as the Wiseburn SD unification issue-size of voting area, who gets to vote, and the revenue still needs to be figured out. He continued that the districts need to solve this because if the County Committee has to figure out a solution, they may not see the issue like the districts do so it’s very important that this come to an end and get solved.

Mr. de Llamas asked Dr. Dougherty for clarification regarding the districts meeting 20 years ago.
Dr. Dougherty responded that the previous superintendents of the districts met 20 years ago to come up with a regional solution and they discussed how the different high schools would be part of their own area. Lawndale High School would stay with Lawndale; Hawthorne High School would stay with Hawthorne—while this was going on, that is when Wiseburn SD went off on their own to try to unify and the regional solution was halted. She stated that they are not sure if their solution is to stay K-8 districts and feed into Centinela Valley UHSD, but if that is their solution then a regional vote needs to happen so that the taxpayers can weigh in on the decision.

Mr. de Llanas commented that 20 years is two generations of students going through the system, and 20 years is a solution of doing nothing.

Dr. Dougherty responded that if the solution is to stay K-8 schools and to feed into Centinela Valley UHSD then that may be their solution, and there may be one district that does not want to do that but for the rest of us that may be our solution.

Mr. Bostrom stated that there seemed to be a problem in the definition of terms—what is a regional solution and what is germane to the Wiseburn application? He went on to say that an argument could be made that the Wiseburn situation should be incorporated into a regional solution but by definition those are two different issues and the County Committee needs to follow the procedures of the Wiseburn application as it was submitted, so clarification needs to be done because the two issues are being used interchangeably and it’s causing some confusion.

Mr. Ogaz commented that it has been ten years since the issue started in 2001 and the County Committee held several public hearings where the constituents of the communities at that time—Wiseburn and Centinela Valley UHSD—were the primary stakeholders and this is where it started. He continued that now other districts have joined in and ten years have passed and nothing has still happened, and trying to resolve this with a regional solution has not happened and the issue is still at square one. Mr. Ogaz stated that the district regional meetings being held should be better communicated to the County Committee and there should be no attempt by Wiseburn SD or any other district to circumvent the County Committee’s decision on the proposal and that has been sent to the SBE. He went on to say that there has been at least one SBE meeting on the proposal that was cancelled because Wiseburn SD could not make the meeting and because of reasons like this, the proposal is not moving forward and its time that the affected districts focus on the matter for the students because ten years is just too long without a solution. Mr. Ogaz suggested that the County Committee bring back the issue to the committee level and make a decision that would be beneficial to all, especially because the other districts who were not involved from the beginning are now coming forward due to the regional meetings being held in the area and it is now a larger issue than before.
Mr. Nunez commented that what is being heard is the tone of the County Committee’s meetings of the last two years, and what we are hearing is that there is a problem in the area and at one time there was regional planning going on but then one district (and they had the right to) decided that they wanted to do something else. He stated that discussions were held concerning what should be done ten years ago, and the County Committee as well as the SBE agreed that the one district should do what they wanted, and the fact of the matter is that the process can not be stopped because of the guidelines that need to be followed. Mr. Nunez stated that another 20 years without a solution can not go on because the demographics as well as other changes can take place in the area.

Dr. Dougherty responded that maybe the district boards now just want to stay K-8 districts without a regional solution and maybe 20 years ago they did want a regional solution, but now with one district trying to pull out, it could mean large ramifications for the other districts.

Mr. Nunez called on Mr. Jose Fernandez, Superintendent of the Centinela Valley UHSD, to address the County Committee.

Mr. Fernandez stated that the discussions being held were very informative and laid out some of the problems the district is facing. He went on to say that the process did work and it went up to the SBE and it was placed on the agenda, and 72 hours prior to the meeting the Wiseburn SD asked that the agenda item be pulled and if this had not happened an election would have been held and the issue would have been resolved. Mr. Fernandez continued that it was not Centinela Valley UHSD or any of the other three feeder districts that requested that the agenda item be withheld it was Wiseburn SD, and he wanted to make sure the County Committee understood this. He stated that his understanding of why the item was withheld is because Wiseburn SD was not happy that all stakeholders would have a say in the outcome, and Centinela Valley UHSD’s position has always been that every resident of the district and everyone impacted by this decision should have a say in the outcome. Mr. Fernandez stated that he concurred with the statements from the Lawndale and Lennox SDs that education needs to occur and that there are inaccuracies in the minutes-lack of information-and that they also have issues with the letter from Mr. Nunez, and would provide those discrepancies and misconceptions in writing to the County Committee. He suggested that the County Committee meet with all the impacted districts to get input and points of view, and that a regional solution would be the best thing but there is a difference between a regional solution and a Wiseburn SD unification and there is a lot of misinformation.

Mr. Nunez asked County Committee members for questions.

Ms. Jakubowski asked Mr. Fernandez if his district has submitted current information to LACOE as far as how many students the district actually receives from each of the feeder districts?
Mr. Fernandez responded that he was not aware that the County Committee was dealing with this issue for the past two years, and the only reason he was at this meeting today was because Dr. Dougherty (Lawndale SD) informed him that his district was on the agenda and the Wiseburn SD issue was going to be discussed. He continued that most of the other districts did not know that this issue was being discussed at this level for the past two years, they all thought it was at the State level and their focus was to work with the State.

Ms. Jakubowski asked that her question be answered concerning number of students from the feeder districts.

Mr. Fernandez responded that he was not sure if LACOE had current information but the number of students from Wiseburn SD was very small.

Ms. Jakubowski asked staff if it were possible to get the information.

Ms. Deegan responded that the information currently available is total enrollment in eighth grade in all the feeder districts and the information is from the State data, also the ninth grade enrollment in the Centinela Valley UHSD. She continued that the only information not available was the home district of the enrolled ninth graders and each feeder district would have to provide that information, and a request for the information would be made.

Mr. Ogaz commented that the County Committee is well aware about the district regional meetings but for the past two years have wondered what has happened, what successes have you had, and what advances have you had, in the planning and getting together to come up with a consensus and a decision to finally get this issue resolved and it hasn’t happened. He went on to say that they have asked staff to keep them updated on the status of this issue, and that is why this item was agendized because the County Committee would like to know where it stands. Mr. Ogaz stated that this issue started ten years ago and at that time the County Committee made its decision regarding the vote between Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD, and the decision was that the vote would be between all the feeder districts which included Wiseburn SD, but Wiseburn SD was not in favor of the decision. He continued that although the County Committee’s decision was based on a total review, input from the community at the meetings held, and the information available concerning ethnicity, demographics, and student enrollment, it was determined that the proposal move forward to the SBE, and it is now on hold either for political or other reasons and its time that it be finalized. Mr. Ogaz stated that if the County Committee is going to request additional information from the other impacted districts, when it was just Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD before, does this mean the request for additional information starts the process over again from the beginning or do you add on to the current information due to the fact that
the districts have had the regional meetings and the County Committee is not aware of what has been discussed or planned or how often the districts have been meeting?

Mr. Fernandez responded that since he has been superintendent, the main issue has been whether everyone has a say in the outcome or whether Wiseburn SD determines its own fate on its own, that has always been the argument. He went on to say that their position has always been that all stakeholders should have a say in the outcome since they will be impacted by the decision. Mr. Fernandez stated that his district did not oppose the decision of the SBE which called for everyone to have a say in the outcome and his district would have accepted the outcome, but it was Wiseburn SD that delayed the process not his district.

Mr. Ogaz reiterated his comments that from the beginning it was Wiseburn SD's petition to break away from the Centinela Valley UHSD and that was the original issue. He went on to say that the County Committee's decision was based only on whether Wiseburn SD would be allowed to break away and who would decide the matter-voters residing in the Wiseburn SD or the total Centinela Valley UHSD area, and it was the County Committee's decision to allow the total Centinela Valley UHSD area to vote, and as far as the County Committee there has been no change in that decision. Mr. Ogaz stated that now with the regional meetings the districts have held this could change the complexity of the issue because now there are other voices, concerns, and issues that are coming forward so does the County Committee start over again and that is the current issue.

Mr. Nunez asked Mr. Fernandez that since his district was not at the first regional meeting, whether the district had representatives at the other regional meetings held?

Mr. Fernandez responded that he as well as the district board president, board vice president, and other board members have been present at those meetings.

Mr. Willmer asked that a correction be made on the history of this issue. He stated that at the County Committee's hearing the recommendation was for a full Centinela Valley UHSD vote and it then got appealed at the SBE, and at that time the SBE crafted some environmental impact issues that dealt with some of the bonding capacity and then the SBE recommended a vote only in the Wiseburn SD area. Mr. Willmer continued that at that point the Centinela Valley UHSD legally filed to stop the process, so the initial SBE recommendation was for the Wiseburn SD voting area only and based on actions by the Centinela Valley UHSD, a larger EIR was filed and a subsequent recommendation was made for a larger vote. He went on to say that he agreed with Mr. Ogaz in that the County Committee stands on their decision made at the time the proposal was presented and felt that if the County Committee has to review the proposal again, their recommendations could change.
Mr. Bostrom commented that its important to stay focused because there is a regional issue, which is yet to be defined, and the Wiseburn SD issue. He stated that he felt that the County Committee can not go back to revisit an issue that has already been voted on based on a new definition, unless the whole process is revisited.

Mr. Nunez stated that the County Committee needs to look at the Wiseburn SD unification issue only, and he understands that there is a regional issue in the area that could possibly come before the County Committee in many different ways, but right now the Wiseburn SD unification issue needs to be resolved either by a vote to unify or not to unify, it needs to be completed and finished.

Mr. Fernandez reiterated that it was not his district who stopped the process and they would like this issue to also come to a close.

Mr. Bostrom asked Mr. Fernandez if his board would be willing to go on record supporting an area wide election and ask that it be held ASAP?

Mr. Fernandez responded that his board is prepared for a county wide election but has not asked about election dates and there has not been any opposition to that, and he stated that the board president was present to address that issue.

Mr. Nunez called on Mr. Hugo Rojas II, Centinela Valley UHSD Board President, to address the County Committee.

Mr. Rojas stated that because Mr. Fernandez had already spoke on some of the issues, he was just going to stress some items on behalf of the district board, such as (1) all districts need to be involved in this process; (2) all stakeholders should be involved since there are 163,000 residents in the area. He went on to say that this issue is fairly new to him as a board member of the district because he has been there for a little over a year, but is becoming very educated on how the process works and he commended the County Committee. Mr. Rojas stated that he was also present at the feeder district meetings.

Mr. Bostrom asked Mr. Rojas that the term “the vote should be conducted in Centinela Valley UHSD” and another one is “all affected school districts in the area,” which would be regional, so which is it, and would your board be willing to support the original recommendation that it be Centinela Valley UHSD only, or is the board looking to change the recommendation to an area wide vote?

Mr. Rojas responded that they are looking at an area wide vote, that all districts and voters have a say in the process, and because this has gone back and forth he is trying to get all the facts from the County Committee as well as the district because there can sometimes be some misconception of the information.
Mr. Nunez thanked Mr. Rojas and called on Ms. Janet Mueller, Dannis Wolver Kelley Law Firm and Legal Counsel for the Centinela Valley UHSD.

Ms. Mueller stated that she was not going to repeat what had already been discussed but was going to focus on key legal issues. She reiterated that the district would be happy to meet the timeline specified in the letter and they would also use the time to correct and/or raise some legal issues that exist and that need to be clarified. Ms. Mueller stated that the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) process issue that has been discussed at great length could be significant and needs to be resolved, and the basis of the idea that an EIR has a five year life is something she has never heard and does not know where the idea comes from. She continued that she encourages the County Committee to be aware of the fact that anytime an EIR becomes outdated either because of the conclusions it draws or the setting or project have changed, something has to happen under CEQA-additional information has to supplement the EIR and at this point it is not an adopted document so there is nothing official to supplement—there may need to be some additional information at this point because of the passage of time, and it should be a State issue since its their document. Ms. Mueller went on to say that as far as delays, it took the State four out of the ten years to come up with the EIR so there was nothing that could happen because the CEQA process took so long to complete. She continued that as far as the regional meetings, there have been two held that she knows have involved Centinela Valley UHSD so it is a false impression that the meetings have been going on for two years because they have not, Centinela Valley UHSD started being involved in these meetings in October 2010. Ms. Mueller commented that the district had received a proposal from the Wiseburn SD that had foundational issues and they were trying to understand how the proposal would fit within the larger reorganization scheme required by law—questions of the issues regarding the vote and different stakeholder groups, whether the proposal was written to take away the authority or further process of the SBE, the County Committee or any other entity that would normally be involved in the decision making. She continued that there was very broad language in the proposal that would take away the process or the rights of all organizations normally involved and because they wanted clarification on the proposal and felt it was not correct or legal, they did not look closely or in detail at the bonding capacity and assessed valuation proposals made by Wiseburn SD to address the key taxation issues. Ms. Mueller stated that they felt if the foundational issues could not be addressed then they should not spend the time to look at what the impact would be on the future bonding capacity or outstanding debt of the district.

Mr. Willmer inquired if Ms. Mueller was speaking about Wiseburn SD’s draft legislation?

Ms. Mueller responded that she was speaking about the proposal received in March 2011 from Wiseburn SD concerning the addition of five statutes to the Education Code that pertained specifically to this issue.
Ms. Mueller commented that the question concerning whether the district would support calling an immediate election, the district would want clarification on what basis, what plan, and what expectations for the division of bonding capacity, repayment of the outstanding debt, etc. since there is a proposal on the table from Wiseburn SD. She continued that they had responded to the proposal but had not heard from Wiseburn SD and did not know where Wiseburn SD stood until receiving the letter from the County Committee so they are still waiting for a response from Wiseburn SD regarding the proposal.

Mr. Nunez clarified that the four year delay of the CEQA process was partially due to Centinela Valley UHSD's challenge in addition to the other districts putting road blocks of the vote.

Ms. Mueller responded that the SBE has now changed their practice because they agreed and believed that in fact they had not been complying with CEQA on reorganization proposals so from the districts point, they created some good law and practice for reorganization.

Mr. Nunez responded that he was not disputing that something good came out of this but delays were caused by all stakeholders of the proposal not only the SBE. He went on to say that like all things, the main issue was the money and richness of the Wiseburn community because the number of students affected would not have been an issue for Centinela Valley UHSD if it was not for the revenue base. Mr. Nunez thanked Ms. Mueller and called on Dr. Helen Morgan, Superintendent of the Hawthorne SD.

Dr. Morgan addressed the County Committee stating that the meetings held by the districts were not Wiseburn SD unification meetings but were regional solution meetings because there are concerns about Centinela Valley UHSD's student achievement and we all recognize the issue, and changes are being made. She went on to say that they have had positive outcome from the meetings, and the feeder districts are having dialogue with the high school district to have a cohesive program of students going from the feeder districts to the high school district. Dr. Morgan continued that the regional solution meetings were not about the Wiseburn SD unification but they discussed school uniforms, safety issues, how to improve student achievement, and occasionally the issue of unification would come up in the since of most feeder districts want to remain elementary districts, and the bottom line is how to improve the needs of the students. She went on to say that there are many other issues but the monetary outcome will impact all the districts but it is a separate issue from what the feeder districts discussed at the regional solution meetings. Dr. Morgan stated that Centinela Valley UHSD was not invited to attend the first regional solution meeting, but districts discussed that if these meetings were going to continue, Centinela Valley UHSD needed to be included in the discussions otherwise, the meetings were not going to continue, and at that point Centinela Valley UHSD joined in the discussions with a positive outcome. She felt that these meetings were
not about the Wiseburn SD unification but about better serving the needs of the students and the community.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Ogaz asked Dr. Morgan if Centinela Valley UHSD did not attend the first meeting because they were not invited or because they did not want to attend?

Dr. Morgan responded that her understanding was that they were not invited to attend.

Mr. Ogaz inquired that the definition of “regional” does not exist when that happens?

Dr. Morgan responded that at that point the districts decided that Centinela Valley UHSD needed to be at the meetings.

Mr. Ogaz commented on student accomplishments and how they are developing and the student grades. He stated that it is difficult to point fingers at a particular district when districts have to deal with what they have, and depending on demographics and social economic issues of the districts, especially if there is a lack of parent support for many reasons, this will determine how much support you have or do not have to help or assist students. Mr. Ogaz continued that it then becomes difficult for districts in general to make gains in student achievement, and this needs to be kept in mind and districts need to stop blaming a particular district.

Dr. Morgan responded saying that she respectfully disagreed with Mr. Ogaz’s comments because her district is serving the same students as the other feeder districts and their student achievement is doing quite well and they are moving forward, and that is the conversation they want to continue having with Centinela Valley UHSD so that the students can have the same results.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Morgan and called on Dr. Ben Wolf, Assistant Superintendent of Education of the Centinela Valley UHSD, to address the County Committee.

Dr. Wolf spoke regarding student achievement in the Centinela Valley UHSD and stated that instruction and social economics determines achievement. He went on to say that there is no control of the social economics of the students that come to the district but there is control of the quality of instruction and whether they are using resource based strategies to teach the students to hopefully get improvement. Dr. Wolf stated that because there are misconceptions about how well the students are doing at Centinela Valley UHSD, he wanted to provide a summary of the test scores of the past few years. He continued that because they are working with the feeder districts, which was not the case before, in the last three years Centinela Valley UHSD’s API scores have gone up
45 points and the major subject groups have also gone up. Dr. Wolf stated that Hispanic students have gone up 44 points, English I students have gone up 38 points, African-American students have gone up 47 points; and the districts lowest achieving high school, Leuzinger, has gone up 58 points, 62 points for Hispanic students, 39 points for English I learners, 56 points for African-American students, and the Federal proficiency data (AYP) which high schools are graded on differently than the feeder districts because of the California high school exit exam, the district has had large increases in proficiency in all the schools in the district and all sub groups, and Leuzinger has gone up 17 percent this year in proficiency as well as English learners, Hispanics, and African-Americans have also gone up. Dr. Wolf continued that when a comparison is made between AYP and API scores from a high school to a middle and elementary school, the State will tell you that elementary API scores in a unified school district are always higher and drop in middle and high school levels because of the different subjects and the mix of creating the scores.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had questions.

Ms. Jakubowski asked for clarification concerning the increase of the scores within the last three years and whether they were the scores of each year.

Dr. Wolf responded that it was a close average but the largest increase was in the last year when all the reform efforts came into play. He stated that he became involved in the middle of the school year two years ago so the new reforms have been in place at least a year and very large results have taken place.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Wolf for his presentation and stated that there were no other speakers to address the County Committee.

Mr. de Llamas and Mr. Bostrom agreed that the County Committee should discuss their options.

Mr. Spies stated that staff could initiate the process and get the information from several sources for the next meeting.

Mr. Willmer stated that although the district representatives felt inaccurate information was included in the letter and meeting minutes, he felt very comfortable with the letter sent and particularly because it requested responses by August 1st, and that deadline should be respected knowing that further information will be submitted by the districts. He went on to say that the regional solution meetings and articulation sounds very positive among the elementary and high school districts which is one issue, but what is in front of the County Committee is the prerogative for
a unification process that was instigated by the Wiseburn SD and we need to separate those two issues and decide how we move forward on the Wiseburn SD unification.

Ms. Solomon asked for clarification concerning the County Committee’s request of the districts to provide an update of the status of where the discussions are and what actions are taking place, but nothing has been asked of the County Committee, so is the County Committee asking themselves to review the original decision made concerning the petition at that time?

Mr. Nunez responded that he did not believe the County Committee wanted to review their original decision of the proposal and start from the beginning again. He felt the County Committee’s decision should stand as is unless the community comes forward with a request, then that is something different. Mr. Nunez continued that the work that was started over ten years ago by the committee has not been completed and it needs to come to a conclusion one way or the other.

Ms. Jakubowski commented that the committee’s concern is that as a County Committee we have timelines but the SBE does not have any timelines, and for one reason or another this process has been going on at the State level for too many years. She continued that because it has been going on for so long, the County Committee would like to see it come to a conclusion and this does not mean it has to start from the beginning again. Ms. Jakubowski stated that the process has to be looked into as far as what has been done, where is the State, where are the districts, and what can be done to move this proposal forward. She went on to say that the issue of a regional solution, although it plays into this, is a separate issue, and the County Committee was charged with the Wiseburn SD unification and that is what needs to be dealt with. Ms. Jakubowski continued that if after this issue is concluded the County Committee wants to look at the region, then that is a separate issue.

Ms. Solomon commented that what she is hearing is that the County Committee originally supported the idea of a wide regional vote to make the determination of the unification process and they still stand by that decision today. She is then hearing we need to look at new information because there is new data and new facts that could have a different impact.

Mr. Nunez responded that the original findings of the proposal need to be looked at because that is what needs to be dealt with now, but if several changes of the findings have taken place, then it is up to the community to submit a new proposal in order for the County Committee to review new data, otherwise the County Committee’s decision on the original proposal stands.

Ms. Solomon asked Wiseburn SD why the proposal had been pulled from the SBE’s agenda and what was the rational?
Dr. Johnstone responded that Mr. Fernandez made the remark that the process would have been resolved if there had been an election, but it would have been resolved only if the vote had resulted in how Centinela Valley UHSD wanted it to end up, and if it did not end up in their favor then it would have ended up in litigation because it would then create winners and losers. He continued that on the other hand if Wiseburn SD had ended up on the losing end then the chief petitioners would have started the process over again because the situation at hand is not acceptable to the Wiseburn community. Dr. Johnstone continued saying that the Wiseburn SD felt that they needed to come up with a “win win” situation and started looking at a legislative solution and they are going to continue to work with the Centinela Valley UHSD attorney, and progress is being made so that all Centinela Valley UHSD districts come out on the winning side.

Mr. Nunez stated that the County Committee was having a difficult time understanding how Dr. Johnstone was answering Ms. Solomon’s question regarding why his district had pulled the item from the SBE’s agenda.

Dr. Johnstone responded that the rational was that given the language of the proposal, there was no way Wiseburn SD with 13 percent of the voting population was going to win and they were going to end up causing a major loss to the community.

Mr. Willner commented on Ms. Solomon’s comments stating that the County Committee has had several discussions with staff and others concerning the situation, and one process this committee gets involved with reorganization is when petitions come before them but the committee has always been forthright that if the situation looked appropriate then the County Committee themselves could initiate a process. He inquired about the suggestions given to the committee by staff and in particular bullet eight concerning engaging LACOE staff to study the voting area issue, assessed valuation issue, retention of bonded indebtedness obligations for Wiseburn residents if and when they leave Centinela Valley UHSD, and other issues challenging a local solution. Mr. Willner stated that he would like the committee to revisit the original decision because he recalls that the committee had some concerns about some economic uncertainties or bonding problems with this type of reorganization and that situation may be worse, or there may be proposals that remove that as a dilemma and the committee may now not see an economic impact for a local vote within Wiseburn SD.

Mr. Nunez responded concerning whether the County Committee could revisit the original decision, and felt that the Wiseburn SD proposal had to come to a conclusion as it currently stood, but once concluded the County Committee could revisit the proposal. He stated that he felt the appropriate way to do this was to have the community come forward with a request to revisit the proposed area, and then if the County Committee strongly felt they should get involved then this could happen, but for now the current proposal needed to be concluded.
Mr. de Llamas inquired about a statement made by Dr. Johnstone regarding that they were approaching a solution that would satisfy all involved and that was why they were asking for more time so that they could come up with something that would satisfy everyone, was this what was said?

Dr. Johnstone responded that his statement was accurate and time was of the essence as far as they were concerned.

Mr. de Llamas asked if he could make a motion concerning this and Mr. Nunez asked that he hold off until he made a comment.

Mr. Nunez commented that he was reviewing the agreements Wiseburn SD was making to allow the Centinela Valley UHSD to continue having the revenue from the area and felt that as a resident of the area, he would question why he should pay taxes on something his schools will not benefit from and he did not understand how this could happen without a vote from the residents of the area.

Mr. Willmer stated that this was the point and the solution should probably be that the Wiseburn area have a say on the proposal.

Mr. Nunez stated that when the original petition was submitted, there was no reference in the petition of Wiseburn SD allowing Centinela Valley UHSD to keep the revenue of the area, and the County Committee's decision and actions were based on information of the original petition, and because new solutions are now being submitted, the County Committee can not be expected to start over again.

It was MOVED by Mr. de Llamas that the County Committee correspond with the SBE to request a formal adoption of the current EIR and that the proposal be calendared and reviewed in its current form. Mr. de Llamas continued that by requesting the proposal be calendared, it would give emphasis to the SBE to resolve the issue one way or the other, and if the Wiseburn SD loses it would give them the opportunity to come back with a new petition to start over again. He stated that ten years of this bouncing around for position has sentenced a whole new set of students to a bleak future and sent them through the process. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Bostrom.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested that the County Committee wait on the motion because of the letter sent to the districts and the August 1 deadline date to receive responses from the districts.

Mr. de Llamas disagreed because he felt that the districts had been giving the same responses over the last ten years.
Mr. Nunez requested that Mr. de Llamas amend his motion to include the August 1 deadline date.

Mr. de Llamas asked if the County Committee wanted to hold the motion until the next meeting in order to wait to receive the district responses?

Mr. Bostrom stated that as the second of the motion, there was a valid reason to hold the motion because the preoccupation has been failure of all the parties to get this to a vote and not for lack of the County Committee doing anything. He went on to say that the County Committee has been trying to push the process and if the process means the parties can not get along, then we have to facilitate that or be preemptive and move forward. Mr. Bostrom agreed with Ms. Solomon concerning her comments that if the parties are talking and the issue is pushed from August to September, then he does not see any harm in that.

Ms. Solomon responded that now her question becomes, what is to prevent the school district from requesting that again the item be taken off the SBE agenda if there is no movement to create a "win win" situation?

Mr. Nunez responded that the County Committee has no control over that situation because they are independent school districts that will do whatever they have to do for the best of their district, and the County Committee needs to do whatever they have to do to move forward. He asked Mr. Spies what the date of the next meeting would be in order to wait for the district responses which are due by August 1.

Mr. Spies responded that the next meeting would be August 3 which would be a little tight to gather the district responses and to summarize, but staff could bring the district response information to the September 7 meeting in order for the County Committee to discuss.

Mr. de Llamas stated that he did not want to amend his motion and the motion would stand as is.

The motion CARRIED with one 'no' vote from Mr. Nunez, and two abstentions from Ms. Solomon and Mr. Kunkel.

Ms. Deegan inquired if the County Committee wanted the most current CDE EIR report which includes the full findings of the EIR and the advent of charter schools which was not an issue when the County Committee first reviewed the original petition.

Several County Committee members responded that they would like a copy of the most current CDE EIR report.

Mr. Nunez asked for a recess at 11:05 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:18 a.m.
Mr. Nunez asked about the minutes and statements made concerning incorrect information from some of the district representatives present at the meeting.

Ms. Deegan responded that hopefully those districts could include that information in the responses due by August 1, but her guess would be that when someone says something that is in the minutes it is not the same as issuing a report attesting to something factual because the County Committee members all have an opinion and that is what is captured in the minutes and not an actual recounting. She continued that hopefully the districts would be more specific as to what the inconsistencies are.

Mr. Bostrom stated that what is going to happen is the districts are going to respond with their interpretation against our interpretation of what constitutes due process, and since the County Committee has publicly raised the discussion of whether or not the report needs to be redone, and if their legal argument is that the report needs to be redone because ten years have past and the information has changed, then that is something we need our County Counsel to tell us because we have never dealt with this as far as if a petition has gone beyond its liability in terms of its content.

Mr. Spies responded that in working with the CDE staff, LACOE staff have provided them with new financial information so the SBE has the most current information.

Mr. Bostrom responded that he felt that County Counsel could at least look at precedence and confirm that there was no violation of due process.

Mr. Nunez asked that the meeting continue at the next agenda item.

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

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

Mr. Spies stated that on April 19, 2011, he had a LACOE Board presentation concerning the CVRA, activities around the State, and options available to districts to avoid being challenged. He continued that the presentation went well but the question and answer period did not go as well because of concerns expressed by one of the LACOE Board members about the law and how school elections had been occurring in the last 150 years without problems and why change needs to occur now. Mr. Spies went on to say that at the presentation the Board had several questions concerning the role of the LACOE Board, County Committee, and the Los Angeles County Trustees Association (LACSTA), and their...
play in the County Committee election and the interaction between the agencies. He went on to say that as a result of the Board’s request, he was asked to give another presentation on June 23 along with other LACOE staff-LACOE’s in-house Legal Counsel, and Mr. Frank Kwan, Director of Communications and Administrator of LACSTA. Mr. Spies went into the next agenda item as he continued his presentation.

Mr. Spies continued that he sent the County Committee members an invitation to attend the LACOE Board meeting on June 23 and those present were Mr. Nunez, Mr. Willner, and Ms. Calix. He thanked the members for attending and went on to say that Mr. Kwan was first to give his presentation and that he covered the history of LACSTA and how it is a venue for the County Committee’s elections. Mr. Spies stated that his presentation was next and he spoke about the history of the County Committee, how the voting occurs, and how each district selects their voting representative. He continued that at the conclusion of his presentation, the Board asked several questions regarding procedural issues related to the election and the open ended nature of petitions that are brought before the County Committee. Mr. Spies then asked the County Committee members present at the Board meeting if they had anything to add.

Mr. Nunez added that he felt one in particular Board member was adamant about the timeline of gathering signatures, and he was shaking his head in the back of the room and felt that the Board member noticed this and hopefully realized that the County Committee is asking the same questions. He went on to say that after the meeting he spoke to this particular Board member and the member stated that she would support any legislation concerning this issue.

Mr. Spies stated that a copy of the bulletin concerning the CVRA was also enclosed in their folders as well as a draft letter requested by the County Committee to be addressed to the presidents of the governing boards of the school and community college districts for review. He went on to say that the role of the County Committee is to approve plans submitted by districts; districts will provide evidence and attest that the plan submitted meets the requirements of the CVRA; County Committee accepts and approves the plans and the approval is perfunctory in nature; districts may also want to seek a waiver of the Education Code that requires an election of the community to approve these trustee area plans. Mr. Spies stated that staff had surveyed the County Committee members and it does not appear that there will be a quorum for an August meeting, and it is possible that districts could submit plans in the summer but there is no timeline for the County Committee to act on the plans, so they could be held until the September meeting and at that time agendaize it so that the County Committee could act upon them.
Mr. Bostrom asked to discuss the draft letter concerning the CVRA and suggested that a one page attachment be included regarding a timeline concerning what the process is and what needs to be done to have a trustee area change.

Mr. Spies responded that the information was included in the bulletin and the bulletin would be attached to the letter, and staff has planned a follow-up bulletin that will also include the information.

Mr. Bostrom stated that there are those who will not read the bulletin but if there is some type of matrix showing the process, they will more likely review that instead of reading.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested using the last attachment of the bulletin and just add estimated times/dates to the document.

Ms. Solomon suggested that the word “I” be replaced with “the County Committee” or “we” so that it is not so personal because it is suppose to be a business letter and information for the districts.

Mr. Spies provided an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization.

Mr. Bostrom inquired why staff had checked the “Watch” box regarding monitoring the bill and not taking action for Assembly Bill (AB) 1252/Davis?

Ms. Deegan responded that the prior bill included that type requirement for all community college districts and has since been amended to more of a choice then this bill came up requiring this so that their study is paid for.

Mr. Bostrom suggested that the County Committee support the bill instead of just monitoring it.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that what she was hearing is that a motion should be made to send a letter in support of the bill and she proceeded to make the motion.

It was MOVED by Ms. Jakubowski and SECONDED by Mr. Bostrom that the County Committee send a letter in support of AB 1252/Davis.

Ms. Solomon inquired as to who is actively supporting or opposing the bill because this would be a factor in her support of the bill?

Mr. Spies responded that staff was not sure but would get the information to her.

Ms. Deegan added that she would research who is actively supporting or opposing the bill and why.
Ms. Jakubowski stated that she would amend her motion that after review of where the legislation stands, that the County Committee will support the bill based upon review of the current legislation and at the discretion of the Chairperson.

The motion FAILED with four 'yes' votes, four 'no' votes, and one abstention by Mr. de Llamas.

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

Mr. Spies provided an update on school district reorganization proposals excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD. He stated that he had received a telephone call from Mr. Mendoza indicating that he was still collecting signatures and hoped to submit the petition on the Pomona USD trustee area proposal within a month. Mr. Spies went on to provide an update on the Compton CCD lawsuit regarding their governing board election in November.

Mr. Bostrom suggested that a thank you letter be sent to the district representatives of the Wiseburn SD unification proposal who were in attendance at the meeting to keep the dialogue going. He commented that the letter received from the law firm seemed that it was going to delay the process and could stop the County Committee from trying to move the process forward.

Mr. Spies responded that it could stop the process but after speaking to the CDE representative he did not think it would.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
September 21, 2011

Matthew F. Spies
Interim Assistant Director
Regionalized Business Services
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Re: Centinela Valley Union High School District
Trustee Area Boundaries
Our file 1995.1107

Dear Mr. Spies:

I write in response to your letter to Mr. Fernandez regarding the Centinela Valley Union High School District's ("District") request for approval of rearrangement of its trustee area boundaries. As stated in my previous letter, while the District is disappointed that the County Committee on School District Organization ("County Committee") was unable to implement the District's proposal for the November 2011 election, it now wishes to formally submit its proposal to take effect for the November 2013 election. The District looks forward to providing any information necessary for the County Committee to review and approve this proposal in a timely manner.

On July 1, 2011, the District submitted its proposal to rearrange the trustee area boundaries employed in District elections. The proposal included a resolution adopted by the District's governing board explaining the need for the adjustments and the grounds on which the adjustments were made as well as a detailed map of the new trustee area boundaries. The boundaries themselves were drafted by an experienced and well-respected demographic consultant and were adopted after an opportunity for public input. Additionally, the District indicated it would cooperate with any requests for additional information from the County Committee.

Given the large population disparities between the trustee areas revealed by the demographics study, the District believed it was in its residents' best interests for the proposal to take effect before the November 2011 election. The District's prior correspondence explains that the Education Code allowed for...
the action necessary to approve this proposal before the November 2011 election. Nonetheless, we understand that it is the County Committee’s position that it was unable to take the steps necessary to put the proposal in place for the upcoming election. In any event, as noted in my July 29, 2011 letter, the District now wishes to proceed with implementing its proposal for the November 2013 election. Accordingly, the District again formally submits the attached proposal to rearrange the trustee area boundaries for agendizing and consideration by the County Committee. (A copy of the proposal originally submitted on July 1, 2011 is attached.)

Your letter indicates that if the District wishes to formally submit its proposal – which it does – the County Committee will provide a questionnaire seeking additional information about the District’s proposal to allow the County Committee to review “the multiple requirements of all relevant regulations.” The District is aware of the minimal requirements for approval of its proposal found in Education Code section 5019, but would appreciate if you could provide us with the source of any additional regulations or requirements which apply to the District’s request to rearrange the boundaries of its trustee areas. As I am sure you are aware, the drawing of boundaries used in from-trustee area elections is not subject to the same strict criteria applied to the drawing of boundaries employed in by-trustee area elections. (See, Mead v. Washington Cty. Commissioners (S.D. Ind. 2004) 2004 WL 1785346 [where commissioners are elected by entire county, equal protection requirements do not apply to boundaries of residence districts].)

The District remains committed to working with the County Committee to ensure the timely review and approval of its proposal to rearrange its trustee area boundaries. It is happy to provide any necessary information upon the County Committee’s request and will appreciate receiving the questionnaire from the County Committee as well as any additional regulations or requirements applicable to the District’s request by September 30, 2011. Please direct your response and the requested information to the undersigned.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Very truly yours,

DANNIS WOLIVER KELLEY

[Signature]

William B. Tunick

WBT:ab

Enclosure

cc:  Mr. Jose Fernandez, Centinela Valley UHSD
     Ms. Smith, LACOE
     Mr. Iizuka, LACOE
     Mr. Deegan, LACOE
     Ms. Patricia Smith, LACOE
     Sue Ann Salmon Evans
RESOLUTION OF THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD REQUESTING THE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL
DISTRICT ORGANIZATION TO REARRANGE THE BOUNDARIES OF DISTRICT'S
TRUSTEE AREAS PURSUANT TO EDUCATION CODE SECTION 5019

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Centinela Valley Union High School District utilizes
trustee areas in its election of Governing Board members;

WHEREAS, under its current election system, candidates for each seat on the Governing Board
must reside within a “trustee area” established for that seat;

WHEREAS, the trustee area boundaries currently in use have not been adjusted in at least 10
years;

WHEREAS, the trustee areas currently in use are numerically unbalanced, with more than a 67% deviation in the populations of the trustee areas; the difference in population between the largest and smallest trustee areas is almost 22,000;

WHEREAS, Education Code section 5019.5 encourages districts to examine and adjust their trustee area boundaries following the release of the results of the decennial census to ensure that the population of each trustee area is, as nearly as may be, the same proportion of the total population of the district as each of the other areas;

WHEREAS, the results of the 2010 census were released in the spring of 2011;

WHEREAS, Education Code section 5019(e)(1) provides that a proposal to rearrange trustee area boundaries may be initiated by resolution of the governing board of a district;

WHEREAS, Education Code section 5019(a) provides that upon request a county committee on school district organization may establish, rearrange the boundaries of, and/or abolish trustee areas;

WHEREAS, Education Code section 5019(c)(2) requires that when a proposal to rearrange the trustee area boundaries is initiated by resolution of the governing board of a district the county committee on school district organization shall call and conduct a hearing, at the conclusion of which, the county committee on school district organization shall approve or disapprove the proposal;

WHEREAS, Education Code section 5019(d) provides that upon approval of the rearrangement of the trustee area boundaries by the county committee on school district organization, the rearrangement of the trustee areas shall be effectuated for the next district election occurring at least 120 days after its approval;

WHEREAS, the next election for Governing Board members is scheduled for November 8, 2011;
WHEREAS, the Governing Board believes it is in the public’s interest that the trustee areas be rearranged as expeditiously as possible in order to insure that the outdated and unbalanced trustee areas boundaries are not employed in the upcoming election;

WHEREAS, at its special meeting on June 29, 2011, the Governing Board received a presentation from the District’s demographic consultant, National Demographics Corporation, which included the proposal for rearrangement of the trustee area boundaries based on the 2010 decennial census results;

WHEREAS, the proposal for rearrangement of the trustee area boundaries attached hereto as Exhibit A reduces the deviation in the population of the trustee areas to less than 4%; the difference in population between the largest and smallest trustee areas would be less than 1,300 under the proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, the District’s Governing Board hereby finds, determines, declares, orders and resolves as follows:

1. The Superintendent is directed to provide a copy of this Resolution to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization for action in accordance with Education Code section 5019;

2. The Governing Board respectfully requests that the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization hold a hearing pursuant to Education Code section 5019(e)(2) and approve the rearrangement of the trustee areas within the Centinela Valley Union High School District as set forth in Exhibit A;

3. The Governing Board respectfully requests the Los Angeles Committee on School District Organization take such action as necessary to approve the rearrangement of trustee areas at least 120 days before the November 8, 2011 election in order that the rearranged boundaries may be effectuated for that election; and,

4. The Superintendent is further directed to work with the District’s demographic consultant and legal counsel and to take any action as the Superintendent may deem warranted to give effect to this Resolution.

APPROVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED by the District’s Governing Board on the 29th day of June, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES: __4__
NOES: __1__
ABSTENSIONS: __0__
ABSENT: __0__

[Signature]
President of the Board of Trustees of the Centinela Valley Union High School District

Attested to:

[Signature]
G Clerk of the Board of Trustees of the Centinela Valley Union High School District
School district may look at election change
Escondido Union voter demographic study nears final step

BY MICHELLE BREIER REPORTER - NORTH COUNTY
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2011 AT 2:10 P.M.

ESCONDIDO — A demographer hired to study voting patterns in the Escondido Union School District has determined that it would be reasonable for the district to consider changing the way it elects school board members, an assistant superintendent said Thursday night.

In April, trustees approved an agreement with National Demographics Corp. to study whether racially polarized voting exists in Escondido Union school board elections.

School board seats in Escondido do not represent specific geographic areas. Trustees are elected in at-large elections, meaning all voters within the district's boundaries can vote for any candidate.

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

The study on voting patterns in Escondido Union school board elections is a response to the lawsuits. The Escondido high school district is conducting a similar study.

The fourth level of the five-part study has been completed, Assistant Superintendent Gina Manusov said. The trustees will receive a confidential summary report before the results are made public. An attorney is reviewing the study's findings, Manusov said.

The board has an Oct. 31 deadline to approve a resolution to change the election process. The district would have to seek a state election waiver to change the voting without getting public approval.

The district then must gather public comment on trustee area boundaries.

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

michelle.breier@unintrib.com • (760) 752-6262 • @SDUTBreier

Find this article at:

☐ Check the box to include the list of links referenced in the article.

© Copyright 2011 The San Diego Union-Tribune LLC
SAN JACINTO: School board picks favorite n

BY GAIL WESSON
STAFF WRITER
gwesson@pe.com

Published: 01 October 2011 12:06 AM

In less than an hour Friday, San Jacinto Unified trustees whittled down six boundary areas to one preferred option.

Board President Debbi Rex asked that the final vote on the plan be set for the public more time for input.

The change to electing trustees by geographic area, instead of at large, will go in 2012 election.

San Jacinto Unified is among those districts with a significant percentage of minor change. Of the 46,020 residents in the district in the 2010 census, 51 percent are of voting age.

The concern is over possible lawsuits. Elsewhere, a San Francisco-based law firm says that at-large voting dilutes the influence of minorities, a possible violation of

Trustees favored the option dubbed Plan A-2, with a few changes: moving the area from Area 1 into Area 3; moving a similar area north of East Main Street from...
Peter Morrison must determine whether the change keeps about the same percent revised boundaries will be shared at the board’s Oct. 18 meeting.

Rex suggested the boundary change to keep the number of school sites in each member’s district equal. Attorney David A. Soldani pointed out, “As board members, even though you represent the entire district.” Soldani is with the district’s law firm, Atkinson, An and helps districts address boundary issues.

The board has no Hispanic member but is diverse. Trustee Willie Hamilton is Japanese and Rose Salgado is a member of the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. The way boundaries are drawn in Plan A-2, Rex, who just moved, and trustee trustee area, and the other three trustees are in separate areas.

Information about election by trustee area is available on the district’s website:
Judge rejects San Mateo County's motion to dismiss discrimination lawsuit

By Bonnie Eslinger
Daily News Staff Writer

Posted: 10/04/2011 03:00:00 AM PDT

A judge Monday rejected San Mateo County's request to dismiss a lawsuit that alleges it discriminates against minorities by allowing supervisors to be elected countywide instead of by districts.

San Mateo is the only county in California that elects members of the Board of Supervisors at large, even though each represents one of five districts. While supporters of the system say it makes the supervisors accountable to everyone in the county, critics say it stacks the decks against relatively unknown candidates because in most cases they need to mount expensive countywide campaigns to beat well-known politicians.

The lawsuit, filed in April on behalf of a group of six Asian Americans and Latinas, alleges that San Mateo County's election system violates the California Voting Rights Act, which seeks to ensure that minority votes are not systemically diluted.

In rejecting the county's motion to dismiss the suit, Superior Court Judge Joseph Bergeron wrote in his brief ruling that he is not weighing in on the merits of the case.

Whether a violation occurred must be determined before any remedy is chosen, Bergeron said.

"The complaint does not allege that district-based elections must be implemented or that any other remedy that abolishes at-large elections is required," he wrote. "The complaint cites district-based elections as one kind of remedy, not to the exclusion of all others."

Robert Rubin, director of litigation for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, said one alternative way to avoid discriminating against minorities is to have rank-choice voting, as San Francisco and Oakland do. Under that system, residents can vote for more than one candidate, in order of preference. That way, a candidate who does not win a majority of the votes outright can still be elected if he or she picks up enough second- or third-place votes to get over the 50 percent mark.

In its motion to dismiss the lawsuit, the county argued that its at-large system is allowed under the state's constitution.

County Counsel John Belers said the rights guaranteed in that constitution outweigh those of the Voters Rights Act.

"We've chosen at-large elections," he said. "Some legislation can't come along to trump our constitutional right."

Rubin countered that the county is incorrectly "picking and choosing" which parts of the state constitution to comply with. Choosing between district or at-large elections is just one right.

"There's also an equal protection clause," he said. "You must read those two together. ... You can conduct at-large or district elections so long as they do not dilute the votes of minority communities."

In San Mateo County, Asian and Latinx residents make up nearly half of the population, according to 2010 census data, but neither minority group is...
represented on the five-member Board of Supervisors.

Only one Latino and no Asian candidates have been elected to the board in the past 16 years, according to the lawsuit.

Last year, the board discussed the pros and cons of electing supervisors by district or countywide and ultimately decided against putting a measure on the ballot to allow voters to decide which system they prefer. A few months before that July vote, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights wrote the board a letter recommending it change to a district system or risk legal action.

A trial date to hear the lawsuit has not yet been set.

Email Bonnie Eslinger at beslinger@dailynewsgroup.com.
VISTA: School trustees vote to proceed with voting changes

By STACY BRANDT sbrandt@nctimes.com | Posted: Thursday, October 6, 2011 10:00 pm

Vista Unified trustees begrudgingly voted Thursday to proceed with a plan to split the school district into five separate voting areas without placing the issue on a ballot.

The school board voted 4-1 to approve a final map for the voting change and to seek a waiver from the state to allow the move without a public vote.

Trustee Jim Gibson voted against the move, saying he didn’t support the change and thought it should be up to the voters how the school district proceeded.

"I want to send this to the taxpayers," he said. "The collective wisdom of the voters is a lot better than the collective wisdom of our board."

Board President Steve Lilly was the only trustee who said he thought the change might be beneficial to voters. The other three said they didn’t like the move, but felt compelled to do it because of legal challenges elsewhere.

"I just think it’s a terrible idea overall, because we are dividing the district," Trustee Elizabeth Jaka said. "But I don’t have the $1 million or $2 million or $3 million dollars in my pocket to fight this."

The decision will change the way trustees are elected.

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

From now on, only people within each of the voting zones can run to represent that zone and the residents there will only be able to vote for one candidate to represent them.

The map the board approved ---- a slightly revised version of one recommended in July ---- will create five similarly sized zones within the district that were designed with school boundaries and population in mind. No two current trustees are in the same voting area.

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

Vista Unified hasn’t been targeted specifically by the group, nor has any other district in the county. However, the San Diego County Office of Education has recommended that they consider making the change to avoid problems in the future.

If Vista Unified doesn’t make this change now, it could be sued and forced to pay the plaintiff’s legal fees and to change to zoned elections if it settles out of court, said Peter Fagan, a lawyer hired by the district. If the district asked voters to decide and they turned the proposal down, the district could still be sued, he said.

"I know it’s a wacky system," he said.

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

Only Lilly said he thought the voting change would help Latinos elect leaders. The other four members said they thought it might actually make it more difficult.

"It’s almost taking away Hispanics right to their choice," Trustee Angela Chunka said, because it could dilute votes of Latinos who are in largely white areas of the school district.

Only a handful of regulars attended the meeting Thursday. Before the vote, three teachers union critics blasted the district for the plan, saying it would help the Vista Teachers Association and not the district’s Latinos.

"It’s pretty apparent Hispanics never will be elected in this school district," said Sylvia Peters, a community activist who frequents Vista Unified meetings.
They also complained that the district hasn't done enough to let Spanish speakers know about the changes.

The district held two sparsely attended community meetings in July and August to get input on the plans.

"We reached out to as many community members and organizations as we could," said Donna Caperton, assistant superintendent in charge of business services for the district.
Ohlone changing election system

By Matthew Artz
Oakland Tribune

Posted: 10/15/2011 04:38:02 PM PDT
Updated: 10/15/2011 08:00:45 PM PDT

Ohlone College once again is planning to change the way it elects trustees, this time out of fear that its current system violates federal law.

A recent district-commissioned study documented what has long been known about Ohlone's unusual system for electing trustees -- it guarantees that Newark is far overrepresented on the board at the expense of Fremont and Union City.

Trustees last week made it clear that they are intent on ending the long-standing system by which two members of the seven-member board must hail from Newark, even though the city constitutes only about 16 percent of district residents.

Later this year, trustees will consider whether to divide the district into seven wards -- each represented by a trustee who would have to reside in the ward -- or whether to continue with a modified version of the current system, only with portions of Fremont and Union City added to the Newark section, which still would be guaranteed two trustees.

Ohlone is one of dozens of districts considering changing its election system after the release of 2010 census figures. Like many districts in the state, Ohlone feared it was vulnerable to a challenge under the California Voting Rights Act, which was written to provide protection for minority groups.

The state law, which went into effect in 2002, targets governmental entities such as Ohlone that elect trustees by a districtwide vote rather than having trustees run in separate electoral wards.

Under the law, a minority group can sue to force governmental entities to form wards drawn to help minorities win election if the minority group can show that the dominant ethnic group is consistently voting against it and hurting its chances to win representation.

To help districts avoid litigation, Gov. Jerry Brown this year signed legislation that lets community college boards switch to ward elections without seeking voter approval.

As the East Bay's only community college district whose trustees are elected by a districtwide vote, Ohlone contracted with the consulting firm Redistricting Partners to determine if it was vulnerable to being sued.

The firm found no evidence that Ohlone's election system hindered minority candidates from winning seats. African-Americans and Latinos weren't numerous enough to be statistically significant, and Asians generally voted similar to whites, the study found. But it discovered the district was violating a federal law.

Ohlone last year changed its voting system, under pressure from the League of Women Voters, ending its practice of having challengers choose the incumbent they wished to run against.

Ohlone's current election system requires that two trustees hail from Newark and that the other five trustees reside in the remainder of the district, which includes Fremont and a small portion of Union City. However all candidates still must run across the entire district.

The system, which was designed to make sure
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Newark got fair representation, guarantees the city one trustee for every 9,000 registered voters. Meanwhile the rest of the district gets one trustee for every 20,000 registered voters -- a clear violation of federal election law, said Paul Mitchell, of Redistricting Partners.

The board is scheduled to vote on a new system in December after holding a public hearing. One option would divide the district along Interstate 880 with everything to the west, including all of Newark being guaranteed two trustees and everything to the east being guaranteed five trustees. Another option establishes seven separate electoral districts with all of Newark being in a single district.

Although trustees said they wanted to hear from the public, most of them during Wednesday's board meeting seemed opposed to creating seven electoral districts. Ohlone trustee Garrett Yee said the system would likely confuse voters, and trustee Nick Nardolillo feared that "you're not going to guarantee that you'll get a candidate in all of these areas."

Board President Rich Walters expressed openness to the switch, saying that the lower cost of running for office in a smaller district could persuade more people to run.

Contact Matthew Artz at 510-353-7002.
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SVMH vulnerable to suit, says consultant

By JIM JOHNSON
Herald Staff Writer

Salinas Valley Memorial Healthcare System is vulnerable to a voting rights lawsuit because of racially polarized voting patterns — but a change to area or zone elections would likely cure it, said an electoral demographer.

In a presentation to the Salinas Valley Memorial electoral advisory committee on Monday, demographer Matt Rexroad of Redistricting Associates said the public district hospital system's half-century-old method of electing its board members would likely be found in violation of the state's Voting Rights Act if it's challenged in court.

Rexroad told the committee, which has been meeting for months to determine if the district should switch from the current at-large electoral method, that he had found evidence of racially polarized voting in the district boundaries.

California's Voting Rights Act prohibits racially polarized voting, which results in voters of a protected class such as an ethnic minority being denied an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice because the majority tends to elect candidates of like ethnicity. The report said white voters in the district habitually choose candidates with non-Latino last names, while Latino voters usually choose candidates with Latino last names.

Rexroad said the voting record in the district on a range of issues indicated a relatively high rate of racially polarized voting, although he said he couldn't say if that included elections for Salinas Valley Memorial board members because he was unable to acquire those records from the county Registrar of Voters.

Although the committee asked for Rexroad to return with additional analysis that includes voting patterns in local elections, he said that's not likely to change his conclusion.
district board decides to go ahead with changing or considering a change to area or zone elections.

Committee members also discussed possibly increasing the number of board members from five to seven, but legal counsel Matt Ottone said that would require a public vote.

The committee has held a series of public meetings at various locations in the district over the past month or so, most of them poorly attended and with little input.

On Thursday, the district board is scheduled to consider hiring a national health care investment firm, Cain Brothers, to help the board look at a potential affiliation or merger. The board will not consider Egan's request to look at rehashing all or part of a still-confidential report from McKinsey & Co. that recommended merger or affiliation.

Jim Johnson can be reached at 753-6753 or jjohnson@montreyherald.com.
ESCONDIDO: High school district trustees agree to election change

By GARY WARTH gwarth@nctimes.com | Posted: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 7:00 am

Trustees in the Escondido Union High School District adopted a resolution Tuesday to draw boundaries for new voting areas and change from at-large to by-trustee elections.

The Escondido Union School District, which has related voting areas and the same demographics as the high school district, adopted a similar resolution last month.

Districts throughout the county this year have been considering the change at the recommendation of the county Office of Education. Discussions to change the voting method began after a group of attorneys began suing school districts in the state for not complying with the California Voting Rights Act, which has been in effect since 2002 and attempts to ensure that minority groups are fairly represented in elections.

The proposed change means people would vote for one candidate to represent their voting area rather than voting for any number of candidates vying to fill open seats representing the entire district.

County officials had told area school districts that they had until Oct. 31 to adopt resolutions to change the voting method to be in time for the November 2012 elections.

Additional steps at the county and state level still must be taken before the change is official.

In adopting the resolution, trustees noted that the action was not an acknowledgement that the district is in violation of the California Voting Rights Act, but rather was a preventive measure in case it is challenged in the future.

In considering whether districts should change their election methods, demographers study voting trends and demographics to determine if minority groups have been under-represented in elections.

A change to by-trustee elections is expected to create a greater opportunity for minorities to serve.

"I hope it will give many people an opportunity to run for office who may have been hesitant before," said Trustee Randy Garcia.

"Times have changed," Trustee Kurt Marler said. "The community has changed. It's a different community from the time when I went to Orange Glen High School."

Also Tuesday, trustees said goodbye to Assistant Superintendent of Business Services Barry Dragon, who is retiring at the end of the month from the job he's held for six years. His replacement, Michael Simonson, attended his first board meeting Tuesday.

Board President George McClure said he appreciates Dragon's intellect and honesty.

"We've always been able to trust you," McClure said.

Trustee Jon Petersen said that as a board member he was able to sleep easier knowing someone as competent as Dragon was handling the district finances, and Superintendent Ed Nelson credited Dragon with helping the district navigate severe fiscal challenges in recent years.

Dragon said he had been fortunate to work with some "marvelous" people in the district.

"The conductor is the only one in the orchestra who doesn't play an instrument," he said. "I've been fortunate to be around some great musicians."
From: Deegan_Allison
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 2:38 PM
To: Bracamontes_Mary
Cc: Spies_Matt
Subject: FW: Attached Image

Mary, please print docs and email for the Wiseburn file. Thanks.

Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
Business Advisory Services Manager
Los Angeles County Office of Education
(562) 922-6270
deegan_allison@lacoe.edu

From: Tom Johnstone [mailto:tjohnstone@wiseburn.k12.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 1:47 PM
To: Spies_Matt; Deegan_Allison
Cc: Cox_Tom
Subject: FW: Attached Image

Hi Matt and Allison! Please find attached the graphic that our attorney put together and the grid that was put together by the feeder Districts. We will be meeting directly with CV and their attorneys on October 28. We will keep you in the loop! Thanks!

From: do canon
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 10:43 AM
To: Tom Johnstone
Subject: Attached Image
PROPOSED UNIFICATION OF WISEBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT
BONDED DEBT LIMITS AS PERCENT OF PROPERTY VALUE
( Elementary limit = 1.25% of AV; high school limit = 1.25%; unified limit = 2.5%)

**Existing Limits**

**Elementary Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Property Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiseburn</td>
<td>$6.44 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenox</td>
<td>$4.04 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>$3.77 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale</td>
<td>$3.02 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16.27 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect of Unification**

**Under Existing Law**

**Under Proposed Law**

---

**Centinela Valley Union High School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$16.87 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Based on 7/50/89 valuation.
2. Elementary district AV as percent of high school district AV.
3. WUSD residential property represents 9% of CVUSD property value.
4. CVUSD existing bonds would be paid from all future WUSD property, including residential.
5. WUSD residential property would not pay for future CVUSD bond measures.
6. Percent of CVUSD property value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawndale</th>
<th>Lennox</th>
<th>Hawthorne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are not guarantees that the agreements as presented are &quot;set in stone.&quot;</td>
<td>There is always a fear that any legislation can be altered in the future.</td>
<td>There must be an area-wide vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The legislation can be changed on the floor as the bill is moving through the process.</td>
<td>Lennox high school students would be the big losers in the future if access to the tax base in Wiseburn was no longer accessible.</td>
<td>Concern about the possibility of the burden of bond repayment on our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no guarantee that the legislation won't be challenged by a Wiseburn resident.</td>
<td>The county mentioned that it may not be legal for Wiseburn to legislate away the rights of future Wiseburn area residents.</td>
<td>Concern of a &quot;grass roots&quot; movement for our District to unify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no guarantee of an area-wide vote.</td>
<td>The Lennox Board insists on an area-wide vote be a part of any legislation of unification action.</td>
<td>Concern that the students of CVUHSD are our students and this will eventually impact the facilities and opportunities they receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Unification would greatly impact our potential to try for another bond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
Bracamontes_Mary

From: Spies_Matt
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 3:19 PM
To: Deegan_Allison; Bracamontes_Mary
Subject: FW: CVRA/ Trustee Voting Area

Mary, please print this message
Thanks, Matt

----Original Message----
From: Brian Johnson [mailto:brian.johnson@leannox.k12.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 2:52 PM
To: Spies_Matt
Subject: CVRA/ Trustee Voting Area

Matt,
I just wanted you to be aware that we had talked about this issue in our district. It turns out that our district has looked into this before and, due to our very homogeneous population (93% Latino) and 1.2 square mile area, it appears that this is not an issue in the Lennox School District.
Thank you,
Brian Johnson
Asst. Supt, Admin Services
Lennox School District
RESOLUTION INSTITUTING VOTING BY TRUSTEE AREA STUDY

BEFORE THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
GARVEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of initiating a study of the
district election system to address
alternatives to comply with the California
and federal Voting Rights Acts.

RESOLUTION NO. 11-12-06

A Resolution by the Governing Board of
the Garvey School District to Initiate a
Study of its Election System to address
alternatives to comply with the California
Voting Rights Act.

RECITALS

1. The Governing Board of the Garvey School District ("District" or "School District")
finds that it is necessary to review its current trustee election system in light of
the California Voting Rights Act (hereinafter "Act"), and desires to determine if
any changes are required in the current system so as to comply with the Act; and

2. The Governing Board desires to direct the District Superintendent to lead a study
to be presented to the Governing Board regarding the Act, of any changes
required to bring the District into compliance with the Act, including but not limited
to adopting a by-trustee area election system, and the process and procedure for
modifying its current election system; and

3. The federal 2010 Census is now complete; and

4. The Governing Board desires that the study and the recommendations be
completed in a timely manner to allow, if necessary, a change in election
systems for the November 2012 elections, which also allows for trustee area
boundaries to be accurate and current based upon the 2010 Census data if the
District ultimately determines that adoption of a trustee area electoral system is
appropriate, and

5. Data from the 2010 Census is now available, which may permit trustee areas to
be drawn and implemented, if required, using the most up-to-date demographic
data available, for the Board's 2012 Board elections,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. The board determines that it is in the best interest of the district to conduct a study to ensure compliance with the California and federal Voting Rights Acts.

3. The District Superintendent, or designee, is directed to notify the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization of its intent and hereby requests that the County Committee receive this Resolution and at its earliest opportunity provide to the District information regarding the County Committee's process for changes in trustee areas or election systems;

4. District Superintendent is vested with the power to (a) prepare a study of changes needed, if any, for the District to be in compliance with the Act, including but not limited to adopting a by-trustee area election system, (b) assess its risk by consulting with professional experts, (c) expend funds for that purpose, (d) identify what process may be necessary for such change.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was adopted upon motion by Trustee John Yuen, seconded by Trustee Bob Bruesch at a regular/special meeting held on September 29, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES: 5
NOES: 0
ABSENT: 0

DATED: September 29, 2011

President, Board of Trustees

CERTIFICATION

I, Bob Bruesch, Clerk to the Board of Trustees of the Garvey School District, certify that the foregoing Resolution was regularly introduced, passed, and adopted by the Board of Trustees at its meeting held on 9/29/2011.

DATED: September 29, 2011

Clerk, Board of Trustees
Garvey School District
NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

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

Subject: City of Santa Clarita Annexation No. 2011-23
(Norland-Robinson Road)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles. The application involves approximately 187 acres of uninhabited unincorporated county territory. The proposal area is generally located south of State Route 14 and the City of Santa Clarita limits, east of Oak Spring Canyon Road, and west of Sand Canyon Road. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

City or District
City of Santa Clarita

Organizational Changes
Annexation to the City of Santa Clarita

The proposed application, map and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit comments to the LAFCO office by November 14, 2011. If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (818) 254-2454.

Date: October 12, 2011

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2011-23 (Norland - Robinson Road Annexation)

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Santa Clarita
2. County of Los Angeles
3. 
4. 

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

1. Annexation
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

APPLICANT: City of Santa Clarita

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

ADDRESS: 23920 Valencia Blvd.

CITY: Santa Clarita     STATE: CA     ZIP CODE: 91355

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

E-MAIL ADDRESS: pleclair@santa-clarita.com

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
700 N. CENTRAL AVENUE, SUITE 445 GLENDALE, CA 91203
TELEPHONE: (818) 254-2454    FAX: (818) 254-2452
By submitting this Application to initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

DATE: [Date]

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The 204.32-acre project area is located south of State Route 14 (SR14), north and west of the existing Sand Canyon Community of the City of Santa Clarita. Approximately 57 acres of the annexation area are located at the eastern terminus of Lost Canyon Road, north of the existing railroad right-of-way, and south of SR14. Norland Road, a dirt road, runs through the northern portion of the 57 acres. Approximately 130 acres of the annexation area includes a portion of railroad right-of-way along the northern boundary of the annexation area, and vacant residential land south of the railroad right-of-way, between the existing City of Santa Clarita City limits on the west and the Angeles National Forrest boundary to the east of the property. Oak Spring Canyon Road runs along the southern boundary of the annexation area.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

204.32 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 northern 57 acres of the annexation area consists of vacant land owned by the City of Santa Clarita within the river bottom of the Santa Clara River. The remaining 130 acres consists of vacant residential land with a Los Angeles City Metropolitan Transportation Authority rail line that connects the City of Los Angeles with the Antelope Valley. In addition, a natural gas pipeline runs through the annexation area in an east-west direction, just south of the railroad right-of-way. An incomplete, inactive development application was submitted to the City of Santa Clarita for the future development of 40 residential lots on 86 of the 130 acres. Two small parcels are owned by a privately owned and operated water company in the City, the Newhall County Water District.

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

The northern 57 acres of the annexation area consists of vacant land owned by the City of Santa Clarita within the river bottom of the Santa Clara River. The remaining 130 acres consists of relatively flat land along the western portion of the property changing to the base of the undisturbed hillsides to the east of the property to the Angeles National Forrest.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 3 residents

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area? Approximately 126 residents upon buildout

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 6 landowners.

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

The subject territory is located immediately north and east of the existing rural community of Sand Canyon in the City of Santa Clarita. In addition, to the north across SR14, is a more urban land development pattern within the City of Santa Clarita. To the east of the subject property is the Angeles National Forrest.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

Immediately west of the southern portion of the annexation area is a development application in process with the City for the subdivision of 99 single-family residences on approximately 180 acres, consistent with the surrounding Sand Canyon Community. In addition, a 40-lot residential subdivision is proposed on 88 acres of the southern portion of the annexation area. It is likely that these development applications would be considered by their respective jurisdictions regardless of the annexation proposal at this time. Property to the east of the annexation area is owned by the Federal Government as a part of the Angeles National Forest and is not anticipated for any future development.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

One (1) 1,800 square-foot, single-family residence.

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

The annexation area, in and of itself, will neither improve nor have a negative impact on the regional housing needs as determined by SCAG. However, the development of the residential subdivision in process with the City will have the potential to contribute up to 40 residential units to the City’s regional housing obligation.

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?

Public facilities and services are currently being provided to area businesses and residents without regard to race, culture or income, which will continue following annexation. Some governmental facilities will become more easily accessible to landowners once the annexation occurs.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$2,958,563; Los Angeles County Tax Assessor Assessed Valuations 2010

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

The annexation area is currently designated as a mixture of Transportation Corridor (TC), Watershed (W), Non-Urban 1 (N1), and Hillside Management (HM) under the Santa Clarita Area Wide Plan of the LA County General Plan. Further, the annexation area consists of the Agricultural Zones A-1 and A-2 under the LA County zoning map.

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

The 57 acres owned by the City will be preserved as open space; of the remaining 130 acres, 88 acres is proposed for development of 40 single family residences; with the remaining 42 acres to be left in its current use as roll right of way, existing residential structure, and vacant land uses.
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).

57 acres of the subject site has been prezoned Open Space (OS), with 42 acres of the subject site designated as Residential Estate (RE), and 88 acres as Residential Low (RL).

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

North of the subject area is SR14, east of the subject area is a mixture of existing sand and gravel mining operations and land within the Angeles National Forrest, and west and south of the subject area is the existing Sand Canyon Community. Uses in the neighboring Sand Canyon Community include residential uses, a golf course, vacant land considered for future residential development, and other accessory and complimentary residential uses.

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

The City of Santa Clarita has designated the project area Open Space (OS) and Non-Urban 1 (NU1) under the City of Santa Clarita's One Valley One Vision General Plan.

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

Yes, the designations under the City will be consistent with the designations under the County of Los Angeles. The City and County have jointly endeavored to prepare a General Plan for the Santa Clarita Valley that is consistent with their respective General Plan documents known as One Valley, One Vision (OV2OV). The City has adopted the OV2OV General Plan while the County is in the middle of the public hearings associated with their proposed Santa Clarita Valley Area-wide 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).

Annexation to the City would not cause development in and of itself. There is an inactive application on file with the City for the creation of 40 single family residential lots for the future development of 40 custom homes. However, regardless of the approval of this annexation, this application could progress in either the City or the County depending on the jurisdiction at the time that the developer re-activates the proposed entitlement processing.

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

If the proposal was denied, there would be 57 acres of property that the City owns under the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles. In addition, the applicant for the development of the 40 single family residential lots within the annexation area would need to withdraw their application and re-submit their application to the County of Los Angeles for consideration by Los Angeles County Regional Planning.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No, the site is not, and is not proposed to be, included 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?

No, there are no agricultural lands within the proposed annexation area. 57 acres of the annexation area (owned by the City) would be designated Open Space (OS) upon annexation.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

Portions of the annexation area are currently owned by the City of Santa Clarita, and while not required, it is beneficial, to have City-owned land within the City's boundaries whenever possible. In addition, the annexation would help to square the boundary between the City, the County of Los Angeles, and the Angeles National Forrest, making the jurisdictional boundaries more logical. Finally, the owner of the 98 acres proposed for subdivision with the City at this time would prefer their property be in the City of Santa Clarita, preferring to deal with local government agencies and services that are more conveniently located in the Santa Clarita Valley.

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 of the proposed area would not have a significant impact on the surrounding areas. The annexation would reduce any uncertainty regarding the jurisdictional responsibility of providing services to this area. The City boundary would be squared up with the existing City boundary, the Angeles National Forrest, and property owned by the City in the vicinity.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

Mutual social interests are not expected to change as a result of annexation since the site is predominantly vacant, undeveloped land and minimal services are currently being provided. Following annexation and the development of the 40 residences proposed at this time, residential property owners would benefit from local City services.
c. The local government structure of the County:

Annexation of predominantly vacant, undeveloped land would not negatively impact the County's government structure. The requirement to comply with the zoning restrictions of the City versus those of the County Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division would be the only noticeable difference, although this would be a relatively minor change. The City would take responsibility for its fair share allocation of the County's Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation for annexed areas, so the County would not be affected.

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.

Currently, the cost of governmental services is minimal as it pertains to the proposed annexation area since it predominantly consists of vacant, undeveloped land. While the 57 acres owned by the City within the annexation area will be preserved as Open Space, the development of the remaining portions of the annexation area would have a minimal increase in the need for services in terms of police and fire protection, building, fire, and code enforcement. The roadway network connecting to the annexation area is currently private and would not require additional City services upon annexation.

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

During and following development of the site, if development occurs, governmental services will increase in terms of police and fire protection and building, fire and traffic signal inspections. The City of Santa Clarita routinely evaluates the adequacy of government services during its budget cycle. An appropriate level of government services is expected to be provided following annexation and development, if any, of the site.

3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

Annexation and ultimate development of additional single-family residences on the subject site will have minimal impact on the City's ability to provide adequate services and controls and will be absorbed as a part of the City of Santa Clarita's existing municipal service provision.
4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

The service demands of this annexation will not exceed the existing capacity of any affected service providers. There will be no need for service providers to increase capacity. Should the residential subdivision of 40 single-family homes proceed with their request to develop, the existing capacity of services would be evaluated as a part of their development request.

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 following is a list of assessments that would apply to a portion of the annexation area proposed for development at this time. The publicly owned parcels in the annexation area would not be assessed. However, all private development or adding residential development to the annexation area will be assessed the following fees upon development/annexation to the City of Santa Clarita:

1. Open Space Preservation District: $50.00 per Equivalent Benefit Unit (EBU) annually at each time site is developed
2. Stormwater Facility Maintenance: $25.00 per EBU annually at each time site is developed
3. Landscape Maintenance District: $50.00 per EBU annually at each time site is developed
4. Streetlight Maintenance District: $57.27 per EBU annually at each time site is developed

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes [ ] Name of Agency: City of Santa Clarita [ ] No [ ]

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

   The Sand Canyon neighborhood is located west and south of the subject site. This neighborhood is already in the City and will not be affected by the proposal.

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

   No Sphere of Influence is requested with this application.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

No, the City has no voted bond debt.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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>
<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>Patrick Leclair</td>
<td>23920 Valencia Blvd., Santa Clarita, CA 91355</td>
<td>(661) 255-4330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hogan, AICP</td>
<td>23920 Valencia Blvd., Santa Clarita, CA 91355</td>
<td>(661) 255-4330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION– ATTACHMENT “A”

Plan for Municipal Services

Pursuant to Government Code 56653, any local agency submitting an application for a change in organization must also submit a plan for providing services to the subject territory. Please provide information for provision of services.

(*) Special districts need only submit those pages of this application that apply.

1. Describe how his proposal will result in the provision of new services and changes in existing services, including location from which such services are or will be provided, service level or capacity (i.e., sewer line capacity, average response time for emergency vehicles, etc.) and how services will be financed.

No new services will need to be provided as a result of the annexation and/or ultimate development of the subject site. Any increase in service capacity, such as increased sizing of sewer lines, will be required from the developer as a part of the approval of infrastructure plans for the development of any additional residential units in the annexation area.

Fire and Emergency Services

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

The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides both fire protection and emergency medical services, the latter of which is divided between basic life support emergency medical technicians (EMT) and advanced life support (paramedics).

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

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

The Los Angeles County Fire Department will continue to provide these services at current levels.

4. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? ☐ All services will continue without interruption upon annexation

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

The Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County provides funding for fire and emergency medical services through a combination of the ad valorem tax and the special Fire parcel tax. The construction of new facilities is also financed by developer mitigation fees imposed on new construction. No changes to property taxes or mitigation fee rates will occur as a result of this annexation.

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? ☐ Yes ☑ No
Flood Control Services

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

Flood control and storm water disposal services are currently provided by the Los Angeles County Flood Control and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

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

Services would be continuous without interruption.

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

Library Services

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

As of July 1, 2011, library services are being provided by the City of Santa Clarita. There are three community library facilities located within the City that serve the Santa Clarita Valley. One new library is under construction by the City of Santa Clarita in the community of Newhall and additional "Bookmobile" services are available.

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

The City of Santa Clarita will provide library services. The City has expanded hours of operation to include Sundays, and additional hours during the week. No change in service level is anticipated with the annexation.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? [Services will continue to be available without interruption.]

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

Library services are financed with a portion of funds from the County's ad valorem property tax. A Library Development Mitigation Fee requires all new residential projects in the City to pay a per unit fee. None of the existing library funding mechanisms will be affected by the proposed annexation. The funds from the County's ad valorem tax for libraries have been redirected to this City of Santa Clarita to use for City library services.

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

If yes, please give details.

---

Park and Recreational Services

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

Current park services are provided by Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation and by the City of Santa Clarita Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Department. Park services in both County and City parks are currently available to residents of the City and to residents of the surrounding unincorporated areas.

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

No City or County parks are located within the proposed annexation area, and no residential units are located within the proposed annexation. The property owners and visitors to the future development within the annexation area will continue to enjoy the availability of the other numerous City parks, trails, open space, and recreational facilities. In addition, the City offers a wide range of recreational, educational, and entertainment activities and programs for all ages. The list of programs offered includes adult classes, special events, sports, workshops, equations programs, child development classes, youth sports and recreational classes.

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

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

City Parks and recreational services are provided through general fund sources. Insured acquisition and development of new facilities are funded by developer fees. Developer fees, development impact fees, public financing districts, bond issues, and grants. The City has established a joint powers authority with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to manage open space. Parks development is paid for through general fund sources, Open Space and Park fees, and bonding districts. Parks and recreational services are provided through general fund sources, Open Space and Park fees, and bonding districts.

5. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? [ ] Yes [ ] No
If yes, please give details.

Police Services

1. Which police protection agency currently provides service to the subject territory? Provide a brief description of how this service is provided and to what extent.

   Current general police protection for the annexation area is provided by the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. The Santa Clarita Sheriff's Station is located at 23740 Magic Mountain Parkway, Santa Clarita, CA. The station is staffed by 190 sworn officers and 40 sworn officers on reserve, 35 assigned civilian personnel, 58 volunteers, with 89 vehicles (67 patrol cars).

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

   The City contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department as described above. In addition to basic law enforcement services, the City works in conjunction with the Sheriff's Department to include a number of special community programs which serve City of Santa Clarita residents including a Citilink Task Force, a CIT Team to build relationships between law enforcement and the community, and an extensive "youth at risk" program. Further, the City of Santa Clarita's Sheriff's Business Alliance partners with local businesses for increased coordination and provides a full time Sheriff's Sergeant to convey valuable safety and crime prevention information.

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

   Services will continue to be available without interruption.

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

   Upon annexation, police services for this area will be funded through the City of Santa Clarita General Fund and Transit Fund monies under contract with the County Sheriff's Department and the special City programs.

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

If yes, please give details.
Road Maintenance Services

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

The City's Public Works Department provides street and sidewalk maintenance and repairs for all public streets within the annexation area, which will not change following annexation. In addition, the majority of the residential streets in the vicinity of the annexation area are private streets and are maintained by the owners of those streets, which will not change following annexation.

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

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

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

N/A

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

Funding for road maintenance comes from gas tax funds, Transportation Development Act dollars, the City's General Fund and from miscellaneous grants, such as for rubberized asphalt.

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

No roads, facilities or capital improvements are anticipated to be transferred to or from the City as a result of this request.

Solid Waste Services

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

The project site is currently vacant and does not require solid waste service.

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

The City contracts with Waste Management for residential disposal service. The City has Temporary Bin and Roll Off Bin franchise agreements with nine haulers. Residents and businesses would be required to use services from these haulers when using temporary and roll-off bin contracts. All of the franchised haulers are required to carry minimum levels of insurance and comply with a minimum of 50% of the materials they collect.

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

The City's service will be available upon annexation.
4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.).

Solid waste services are provided on a fee for service basis.

Special Assessment District Services

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

City of Santa Clarita: Streetlight Maintenance District No. 1 for maintenance of streetlights along Soledad Canyon Road; Landscape Maintenance District No. 2008-1 for maintenance of center medians Citywide; Stormwater Maintenance District to prevent stormwater pollution Citywide; and the Open Space Preservation District to preserve open space in and adjacent to the City.

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

Yes, the privately held parcels within the annexation area will be assessed a new stormwater and urban runoff pollution control fee, open space and preservation district fee, and area-wide landscape maintenance district fee annually.

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

Upon development of property within the annexation area fee for stormwater runoff would be $22.45 per Equivalent Benefit Unit (EBU) per residential lot annually; open space preservation fee is $29.00 per EBU per residential lot annually; fees will be approximately $58.69 per EBU per residential lot annually for LMD 2008-1; and $57.27 per EBU for streetlight maintenance per residential lot annually. There would be no assessment for the property held in public ownership.

Street Lighting Services

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

The project area is currently located within the County of Los Angeles Street Lighting District LLA-1 for the maintenance of streetlights in the unincorporated County areas and therefore does not pay into the City's Streetlight Maintenance District. However, the annexation area is located in the Sand Canyon Community with minimal street lighting.

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

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

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

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

1. Is annexation of water service part of this request? Yes □ No □

If yes, provide details.

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

The annexation area consists of predominantly vacant, undeveloped land. 57 acres are owned by the City with the intent of remaining open space, 62 acres are vacated at this time with the potential for up to 40 residential lots in the future (if approved), with the remaining 95 acres a mixture of existing uses include a cell line for LACMTA and an existing single-family residence. No change in water needs is anticipated with the proposed annexation.

3. What agencies will be providing water service to the affected territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the capacity level and range of services to be provided and the approximate date in which those services will be made available.

Water services are provided by Santa Clarita Water. These services will not be affected by the proposed annexation.

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

Property owners will continue to pay a fee for water service. No changes to water fees will occur as a result of the annexation.

Wastewater Services

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

This annexation area would be served by the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District. If the property is not already part of the district upon development, the developer would be required to annex the property into the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District prior to any parcels. No changes to wastewater services or agency boundaries will occur as a result of this annexation.

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

No change to current services will occur upon annexation.
3. **What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?**

   Services will continue to be available without interruption.

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

   ![Yes/No] Yes  No

   If yes, provide details.

   The land owner will be required to request annexation into the Sanitation District as a part of the development of a portion of the annexation area (if approved). The City contracts with the County to perform maintenance on local City-owned sewer lines, however, District-owned trunk lines are maintained by the District.

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

   ![Details]

   Annexation will not change funding of these services. Wastewater services will be paid as a part of yearly property tax assessments.

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

   ![Yes/No] Yes  No

   If yes, provide details.
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-23 TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
“NORLAND-ROBINSON RANCH”

Those portions of Section 13 and of the northeast quarter of Section 24, all in Township 4 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of said Section 24; thence
(L1) along the easterly line of the northeast quarter of said Section 24 South 00°23'25" West 2649.07 feet to the southeasterly corner of the northeast quarter of said Section 24, said corner being an angle point in the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on February 15, 2011; thence
(L2) along said City Boundary the following courses and curves, South 89°53'52" West 1318.81 feet; thence
(L3) North 00°16'28" East 2340.95 feet; thence
(L4) South 70°26'05" West 640.20 feet; thence
(L5) North 19°33'55" West 367.72 feet to a point on a curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1522.47 feet, a radial line through said point bears North 33°17'02" West; thence
(C6) northeasterly along said curve through a central angle of 10°10'51" an arc distance of 274.07 feet; thence
(L7) non-tangent to said curve South 89°44'42" West 346.96 feet; thence
(L8) North 49°22'39" East 262.45 feet; thence
(L9) North 00°17'03" East 377.03 feet to a point on a curve concave northerly having a radius of 2469.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 14°15'51" West; thence
(C10) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 16°20'51" an arc distance of 704.45 feet; thence
(L11) tangent to last said curve North 87°55'00" west 1048.88 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence

(C12) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 08°22'03" an arc distance of 146.04 feet to the beginning of a tangent reverse curve concave southerly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence

(C13) westerly along last said curve through a central angle of 10°56'29" an arc distance of 190.96 feet; thence

(L14) tangent to last said curve South 89°30'34" West 1232.56 feet; thence

(L15) North 00°02'46" West 895.35 feet to a point on the centerline of Antelope Valley Freeway (State Highway 14); thence

(L16) along said centerline South 88°11'45" East 1255.76 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 5800.00 feet; thence

(C17) northeasterly along said centerline and along last said curve through a central angle of 20°44'36" an arc distance 2099.83 feet to a point on the northerly prolongation of the westerly line of the land described as Parcel 1 in document recorded August 01, 1988 as Instrument No. 86-1209676 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said county; thence

(L18) leaving said City Boundary and along said prolongation and along said westerly line South 00°17'03" West 491.67 feet to the northerly line of the land described as Parcel 1 in document recorded February 27, 1968 as Instrument No. 3275 of said Official Records; thence

(L19) along said northerly line South 89°42'57" East 200.00 feet to the westerly line of last said Parcel 1; thence

(L20) along said easterly line South 00°17'03" West 200.00 feet to the southerly line of last said Parcel 1; thence

(L21) along said southerly line North 89°42'57" West 200.00 feet to the westerly line of Parcel 1 as described in said document recorded August 01, 1988; thence
(L22) along last said westerly line South 00°17'03" West 341.67 feet to the southerly line of last said Parcel 1; thence
(L23) along last said southerly line North 89°40'54" East 465.88 feet to the southeasterly line of last said Parcel 1; thence
(L24) along said southeasterly line North 43°11'47" East 94.85 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 1532.47 feet; thence
(L25) northeasterly along last said curve and along said southeasterly line through a central angle of 33°12'00" an arc distance of 887.89 feet; thence
(L26) non-tangent to last said curve and along last said southerly line North 80°41'09" East 112.38 feet; thence
(L27) continuing along last said southerly line North 87°05'09" East 594.72 feet to the easterly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 13; thence
(L28) along last said easterly line South 00°26'42" West 1218.04 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 204.32 acres, more or less.
NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

The Honorable Michael Antonovich
Antelope Valley East Kern Water Agency
Antelope Valley Healthcare District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
City of Palmdale -- City Clerk
City of Palmdale -- Planning Department
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Committee on School District Organization
County Chief Executive Office
County Assessor
County Auditor -- Controller
County Sanitation Districts
County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Department of Regional Planning
Littlerock Creek Irrigation District
Sheriff Department -- Enforcement Bureau

Subject: City of Palmdale Annexation No. 2011-09 (Granite Expansion)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County. The application involves approximately 44 acres of uninhabited, unincorporated territory generally located north of Pearblossom Highway between 70th Street East and the Littlerock Creek. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

City or District
City of Palmdale

Change of Organization
Annexation

The proposed application, map and legal description are attached for your information. Please submit comments to the LAFCO office by November 21, 2011. If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (818) 254-2454.

Date: October 18, 2011

Sera Wirth
Senior Government Analyst

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: City of Palmdale Annexation 2011-09

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Palmdale
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

1. Annexation
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

APPLICANT: City of Palmdale

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

ADDRESS: 38250 Sierra Hwy

CITY: Palmdale  STATE: CA  ZIP CODE: 93550

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Juan Carrillo, Assistant Planner I  TELEPHONE: 661-267-5200

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

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]         DATE: October 12, 20xx

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

A request to initiate annexation proceedings on 44 acres for future expansion to an existing mining operation to a total of 280 acres. The proposed annexation is located north of Pearblossom Highway between 70th Street East and the Littlerock Creek.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

| 44 |

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 adjacent to an active mining operation consisting of 236 acres on a total of five parcels located on the east side of 70th Street East and the south side of Avenue T, on the western side of the Littlerock Creek alluvial fan which has been classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area. The proposed site is also adjacent to an existing aggregate mining operation to the west. Vegetation in the surrounding area includes Creosote brush shrub, Shadescal shrub, Joshua trees and Desert riparian.

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

The project site, the proposed 44 acre expansion area, is a relatively flat area with proposed major man made landforms or areas with landslide potential as part of the existing mining activity and related reclamation activity. The project site lies within the alluvial fan of the Littlerock Wash and it is located north of Perablossom Highway and east of 70th Street East.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? [ ] Inhabitants

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

[ ] N/A

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

[ ]

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

[ ]

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

The nearest populated area is 400 feet east of the proposed annexation site with more existing residential uses one mile to the northwest.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

Highly unlikely. The proposed annexation, and immediate surroundings, is on the western side of the Little Rock Creek alluvial fan which has been classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area. The pre-zone areas within the City's sphere of influence are QR-PZ (Quarry and Reclamation Pre-Zone).

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?

The proposed annexation will continue to provide jobs and possibly additional jobs as the existing mining operation expands and extends its life. California and Federal Employment Regulations will ensure fair treatment of people of all races as employment opportunities become available. With respect to the location of public facilities and provision of public services, any applicable development fees will be applied to the aforementioned uses of all City residents.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

$1,498,041.00 Los Angeles County Assessors information

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

N1 (Non-Urban) / A2 (Heavy Agricultural) Within unincorporated Los Angeles County

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

SP-14 (Specific Plan-Eastside Quarry-Proposed) / MRE (Mineral Resource Extraction)
4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city).

The proposed annexation area is Pre-Zoned QR (Quarry and Reclamation) and no change in land use is proposed.

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

Existing QR (Quarry and Reclamation) to the north, east and west with exiting mining operations. N1 (Non-Urban) / A2 (Heavy Agricultural) south of Pearblossom Highway within unincorporated Los Angeles County

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

SP-14 (Specific Plan-Eastside Quarry-Proposed)/ MRE (Mineral Resource Extraction)

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

Yes, the proposal is consistent with the City General Plan, Specific Plan-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 44-acre annexation area is a possible expansion to Granite Construction Company. Granite Construction Company has obtained Conditional Use Permit approval from the City of Palmdale to continue to operate on its existing site. If approved, the proposed annexation area would increase their operation to 280 acres and it would increase the amount of aggregate material available to the construction industry.

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

If the proposed 44-acre annexation is denied, Granite Construction Company would not be able to expand its operations, thereby limiting the amount of aggregate material available to the construction industry and minimizing the length of existing employment and not being able to provide future employment opportunities with the proposed expansion. The land would remain vacant with no other potential land use since the site has being classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

The subject territory is not 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?

The nearest agricultural land is located approximately 5 miles northwest of the proposed annexation site, therefore agricultural land will not have any effects. The Little Rock Creek runs along the proposed annexation and it will not be disturbed by the proposed annexation or future expansion of mining activities.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

Granite Construction Company obtained a Conditional Use Permit from the City of Palmdale to continue its mining activities. The proposed annexation would allow for an expansion of its current mining operation. If the annexation is approved, then mining activities will be expanded and aggregate material will be provided to the construction industry. Mining activities are market dependent and when the construction industry picks up then more sand and gravel material would be available to supply the demand. The proposed annexation and future mining of aggregate material will maintain and expand the State's infrastructure and economy. Additionally, aggregate demand has increased from 13.5 billion tons from 12 billion tons according to Dr. John Parris, CA State Geologist.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The proposed annexation is zoned A2 (Heavy Agricultural) within the unincorporated Los Angeles County. This zoning designation does not allow for mineral extraction. If the proposed annexation is approved, the pre-zoning designation within the City of Palmdale will allow for mineral extraction and production of aggregate material to supply the construction industry and expand the State's infrastructure and economy.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

The proposed annexation and future expansion of the existing mining operation will continue to provide and create new jobs. The future mineral extraction will also provide potential significant benefits and cost savings. Providing aggregate materials to the local construction industry and local road improvement projects will provide various benefits. These benefits include a reduction in emissions from trucks traveling for hauling aggregates, reduction of pavement distress and lower truck miles traveled, shorter hauling distance reducing aggregate truck trips of travel and the cost of the material. An even bigger benefit will be the potential reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG's), which is State wide goal, by lowering vehicle miles traveled (VMT's)
c. The local government structure of the County:

The local government structure of the County:

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.

Fire and police services are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department by annual contracts. These contracts are reviewed annually and any additional services are provided Citywide. The proposed annexation area is located on the western side of the Little Oak Creek alluvial fan which has been classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area. Currently, there is minimal fire and policing services due to the area not being a commercial or residential area where fire and policing services are more prominent. The proposed annexation area will not demand more policing or fire services due to the nature of the future land use, if the annexation is approved.

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

The proposed annexation and future land use will not require any further government services since annexation area would expand an existing mining operation from 236 acres to 280 acres, approximately 17%. Any applicable development fees will be paid by the mining operator and the fees will be applied to government services, including public facilities, if applicable.

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 proposed 44-acre annexation area has been classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area and the future use is reclamation of aggregate materials. As indicated before, if the annexation is approved, additional aggregate material will be available for the construction industry and for the maintenance of local roads. An alternative course of action would be to leave the land as is, vacant. Currently, the adequacy of services and controls in the proposed 44-acre annexation area and adjacent areas is adequate, no services are required. With the approval of the annexation and future land use, a minimal increase in the adequacy of services and controls in the area would be expected since no commercial or residential development would be approved. The existing mining operation consists of 236 acres and the proposed 44-acre annexation is only an increase of 17 per cent to a total of 280 acres.
4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

There will be no increased service demand as a result of this proposal. The proposed annexation area is to expand an existing mining operation with existing services which are minimal due to the nature of industry.

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.

Police and Fire contract fees paid by the City of Palmdale may increase due to increased City boundary. No assessments, or other charges will result as part of this proposal.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes [✓]  Name of Agency: City of Palmdale  No [ ]

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

   The aggregate industry, particularly Granite Construction Company, will have an economic interest by expanding its current operation by 44 acres. The construction industry would have additional aggregate material in the Antelope Valley and surrounding areas to supply future demand of sand and gravel materials.

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

   N/A
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

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.

   Name: Juan Carrillo, Assistant Planner I
   Address: 38250 Sierra Hwy Palmdale, CA 93550
   Telephone: 661-267-5200

   Name: William Taylor, Granite Construction
   Address: P.O. Box 902500 Palmdale, CA 93590
   Telephone: 661-726-4460
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION—ATTACHMENT “A”

Plan for Municipal Services

Pursuant to Government Code 56653, any local agency submitting an application for a change in organization must also submit a plan for providing services to the subject territory. Please provide information for provision of services.

(*Special districts need only submit those pages of this application that apply.)

1. Describe how his proposal will result in the provision of new services and changes in existing services, including location from which such services are or will be provided, service level or capacity (i.e., sewer line capacity, average response time for emergency vehicles, etc.) and how services will be financed.

The owner of the proposed annexation area, Granite Construction Company, is proposing to expand their existing surface mining operation, located within the City of Palmdale. The proposed expansion areas is adjacent to the City of Palmdale. Approval of the proposal will not result in the provision of new services or changes in existing services currently provided by the City of Palmdale or LA County.

Fire and Emergency Services

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

LA County Fire Department currently provides fire protection and EMS service to the subject territory. The proposed expansion will not affect services currently provided.

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

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

LA County Fire Department currently provides fire protection and EMS service to the subject territory. The proposed expansion will not affect services currently provided.

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

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

The proposed expansion will not affect services currently provided. No additional financing will be needed.

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? [ ] Yes [ ] No
If yes, please give details.

Flood Control Services

1. Give a brief description of how flood control service is currently provided and by which agency.
   The subject property currently receives flood control services from Los Angeles County. The proposal will not require additional flood control services.

2. What agency will be providing flood control services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.
   The proposal will not require additional flood control services.

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

4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e., assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.).
   The proposal will have no impact on flood control services currently provided by Los Angeles County. No additional financing will be needed.

Library Services

1. Give a brief description of how this service is currently provided and by which agency.
   Library services are currently provided by the City of Palmdale. The proposal will have no impacts to library services.

2. What agency will be providing library services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.
   The proposal will have no impacts to Library services currently provided by the City of Palmdale.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?  
   [currently available]

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

   The proposal will have no impact Library services currently provided by the City of Palmdale. No additional financing will be needed.

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

   If yes, please give details.

---

Park and Recreational Services

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

   The proposal will have no impact on parks and recreational service needs currently provided by LA County or the City of Palmdale.

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

   The proposal will have no impact to parks and recreational services currently provided by the City of Palmdale.

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

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

   The proposal will have no impact to parks and recreational services currently provided by the City of Palmdale. No additional financing will be needed.

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

1. Which police protection agency currently provides service to the subject territory? Provide a brief description of how this service is provided and to what extent.

   Police protection for the existing quarry operations are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department via contract with the City of Palmdale. The proposal will have no impact to police protection services currently provided.

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

   The proposal will have no impact to police protection services currently provided.

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

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

   The proposal will have no impact to police protection services currently provided, further no additional financing will be needed.

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

If yes, please give details.
Road Maintenance Services

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

   Road maintenance services for the existing quarry operations are provided by the City of Palmdale. The proposal will not require additional road maintenance services.

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

   Road maintenance services for the existing quarry operations are provided by the City of Palmdale. The proposal will not require additional road maintenance services.

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

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

   Road maintenance services for the existing quarry operations are provided by the City of Palmdale. The proposal will not require additional road maintenance services. No additional financing is needed.

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

   None.

Solid Waste Services

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

   Solid waste services are provided to the existing quarry operations by Waste Management. The proposal will not generate or require additional solid waste services.

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

   Solid waste services are provided to the existing quarry operations by Waste Management. The proposal will not require additional solid waste services.

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? Currently available
4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.).

The proposal will not generate or require additional solid waste services. No additional financing will be required.

Special Assessment District Services

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

Special assessment district Littlerock Irrigation District (LID) is within the subject territory. LID currently does not provide water service to the subject territory. The proposal will not require additional water services.

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

The proposal will not affect current assessment district levies or generate the need for additional services.

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

None.

Street Lighting Services

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

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

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

1. Is annexation of water service part of this request?  [□] Yes  [☑] No

If yes, provide details.

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

The proposal will not affect water usage or generate new water usage. Water is currently provided to the existing operations by existing wells operated by Granite Construction.

3. What agencies will be providing water service to the affected territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the capacity level and range of services to be provided and the approximate date in which those services will be made available.

Water is provided to existing operations by on site wells. The proposal does not involve the request for municipal water services. Granite Construction will continue to self provide water via the on site wells.

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

The proposal does not involve a request for municipal water services. Granite Construction will continue to self provide water via the on site wells. No additional financing needed.

Wastewater Services

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

The proposal does not involve a request for municipal wastewater service. Wastewater service is currently provided to existing facilities by on site septic and "port-a-potties" services by a 3rd party contractor.

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

The proposal does not involve a request for municipal wastewater service. Wastewater service is currently provided to existing facilities by on site septic and "port-a-potties" services by a 3rd party contractor. The proposal will not generate a change in service level.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? [Currently available]

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, provide details.

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

The proposal does not involve a request for municipal wastewater service. No additional financing will be needed.

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

If yes, provide details.
EXHIBIT "A"

LAFCO CITY OF PALMDALE

ANNEXATION 2011-09

That portion of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of Section 14, Township 5 North, Range 11 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, described as follows:

COMMENCING at the North Sixteenth Corner of said Northwest Quarter of Section, being a corner of the existing boundary of the City of Palmdale in said County and State;

1. THENCE along the north line of said South Half of the Northwest Quarter of Section 14 and along said existing City boundary, North 89°39'53" East, 118.83 feet to its intersection with the centerline of Pearblossom Highway (State Highway 138), the POINT OF BEGINNING;

2. THENCE continuing along said north line and said existing City boundary, North 89°39'53" East, 2,333.24 feet;

3. THENCE leaving said north line and said existing City boundary, South 06°54'04" West, 329.71 feet;

4. THENCE South 27°34'42" West, 237.07 feet;

5. THENCE South 13°50'06" West, 123.70 feet;
6. THENCE South 16°47'26" West, 344.83 feet;

7. THENCE South 20°57'54" East, 307.17 feet to the aforementioned centerline of Pearblossom Highway;

THENCE along said centerline of Pearblossom Highway the following five courses:

8. THENCE North 83°37'34" West, 26.30 feet;

9. THENCE North 83°48'19" West, 609.67 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve;

10. THENCE along said non-tangent curve, concave northeasterly, from a tangent which bears North 83°50'03" West, with a radius of 1,800.00 feet, an arc length of 1735.38 feet and a central angle of 55°14'19".

11. THENCE North 28°36'13" West, 189.88 feet;

12. THENCE North 28°50'11" West, 111.46 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 47.72 acres, more or less.

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.
This legal description was prepared by me or under my direction.

BY: [Signature]

Brian D. Glidden, L.S. 7727

Dated: 9/27/11
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization  
(County Committee)

Performance and Development Plan

Secretary and Staff to the  
County Committee

For the Period  
October 2010 through September 2011

Instructions:

This form is provided to the County Committee's Evaluation Committee to assist them in evaluating staff as a unit (Section I); evaluating and commenting on specific assignments (Section II); and providing for goals, objectives and other comments from the County Committee to staff (Section III).

Section I: Evaluation of Staff as a Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Staff provides the County Committee with a written agenda and appropriate backup material before each regular or special County Committee meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agendas are received far enough in advance of meetings to provide the County Committee adequate time to review before discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agendas, meeting minutes, and corresponding material are in a format that is easy to follow and comprehend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Staff's work is accurate, reliable, and timely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff is knowledgeable and offers professional advice and appropriate recommendations on items requiring action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Staff keeps the County Committee informed of issues, needs, and trends regarding school district organization issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staff comes well prepared to meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Staff arrives on time for meetings.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Meeting rooms are appropriately set up.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Staff demonstrates awareness and adherence to the Education Code, Brown Act, and County Committee Policies.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Staff maintains a professional relationship with the County Committee, which includes seeking and accepting constructive criticism.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Staff is responsive and follows through on requests made by the County Committee.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Staff actively pursues the goals and objectives of the County Committee.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Staff strives to maintain a harmonious relationship with state, county, and local representatives.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Staff strives to provide equitable assistance/resources to all parties involved in a school district organization proposal.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Staff maintains high standards of ethics, honesty, and integrity in all professional matters relating to the County Committee.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Staff devotes time and energy effectively to their duties.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Staff is professionally courteous in their relationship to the County Committee and others that they deal with on a routine basis.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Staff performs well in new and/or emergency situations.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Staff is easily approachable.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
u. Staff communicates effectively, expressing ideas in a logical and concise manner.

v. Staff strives to maintain a positive relationship with the news media.

Section II: Evaluation and Comment for Specific Assignment

Please rate and comment on the performance of clerical staff, technical staff, and the Secretary to the County Committee.

Clerical staff is responsible for administrative details for monthly and special County Committee meetings such as: preparation/organization of meeting room; mailing and posting of agenda; communicating with County Committee members both orally and in writing regarding attendance, mileage, and other accommodations as may be required; and compiling and maintaining accurate documents and correspondence.

Clerical Staff Performance

[Check boxes for Excellent, Good, Average, and Improvement Needed]

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Technical staff is responsible for providing the County Committee with written reports; summaries; flow charts; and legislative information concerning the school district organization process. Technical staff is also responsible for demonstrating awareness and compliance with the Education Code, Brown Act, and County Committee policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Staff Performance</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

The Secretary to the County Committee is responsible for coordinating the school district organization process and operations of the County Committee including coordination of regular and special meetings. The Secretary demonstrates awareness and compliance with the Education Code, Brown Act, and County Committee policies and procedures. The Secretary maintains proactive and positive relationships with the public, State, and local agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary’s Performance</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

The Secretary to the County Committee is responsible for coordinating the school district organization process and operations of the County Committee including coordination of regular and special meetings. The Secretary demonstrates awareness and compliance with the Education Code, Brown Act, and County Committee policies and procedures. The Secretary maintains proactive and positive relationships with the public, State, and local agencies.
Section III: Goals, Objectives, and Other Comments from the County Committee.

Development Plan (Include goals and objectives):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Evaluation Committee's Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ (Chairperson) ___________________________ (Date)

Secretary’s Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ (Secretary) ___________________________ (Date)

Signature: ___________________________ (Director, Division of Business Advisory Services) ___________________________ (Date)

DBAS/RBS
Adopted 10/3/2001
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION (LACOE)
DIVISION OF BUSINESS ADVISORY SERVICES

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

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 821/Fuller
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 10/08/11: Approved by the Governor; chaptered by the Secretary of State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
DESCRIPTION OF BILL
Existing law provides for California community college districts to receive general supervision from the California Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In addition, each community college district is under the control of its own elected board of trustees. Those independent boards of trustees develop the election structure that each community college district uses.

The latest version of this bill authorizes community college districts to adopt trustee area voting plans through which candidates for election to their board of trustees are elected by trustee area. It authorizes boards of trustees to adopt resolutions in support of trustee area voting and for the reapportionment of any existing trustee areas under the guidance of the 2010 U.S. Census data and to seek waivers for elections validating these new trustee area plans from the community college district chancellor’s office. The bill specifies that it would not apply to any community college district that enacts a specific statutory framework for its own trustee elections. Further, the bill was amended to state that reimbursements for mandates issued under this bill would not be required. In its final amendment, the bill was declared an urgency measure that would go into effect immediately upon signing by the Governor.

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 1252/Davis
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 05/03/11: In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

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

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

November 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of October 21, 2011.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

* South Gate SD-Los Angeles USD/October 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

None

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

November 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of October 21, 2011.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On October 7, 2011, staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD that the Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs had communicated to them that their boards have decided not to participate in any additional regional meetings, and that they were not in favor of the unification proposals reviewed to date (including the proposed legislation circulated by the Wiseburn SD). Staff was informed that a joint letter was forthcoming from Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs to the County Committee and to LACOE staff. 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 the proposed legislation supporting unification. Staff requested that district or board representatives communicate any agreements and/or decisions in writing to the County Committee and to LACOE.

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

**Status Date:** October 20, 2011

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

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

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

On August 15, 2011, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. On August 16, 2011, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On August 29, 2011, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the petitions contained 697 valid signatures, out of 753 signatures submitted. The Registrar-Recorder also reported that the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD was 63,963. Under the guidelines of EC §5019(c), the petition contains enough valid signatures to move forward to review at a public hearing and a vote by the County Committee. It will be presented to the County Committee at its next meeting on November 2, 2011.
PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY FROM THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (CCD) TO THE NORTH ORANGE COUNTY CCD

On September 6, 2011, LACOE staff received notice of a petition to transfer certain territory currently within the Mount San Antonio CCD to the North Orange County CCD. The petition was presented via resolutions by the board of trustees of both colleges. Under EC §74104, if a territory petitioned for transfer contains less than five percent of the adult age population of a district, it is considered a “minor” transfer of territory and does not require review by the County Committee. The Education Code requires a review by the County Superintendent and the petition is then forwarded directly to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for both impacted counties (in this case, Los Angeles and Orange Counties). Staff will discuss this petition at the next meeting of the County Committee to provide additional information and answer any questions members may have.

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.

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

**Status Date:** May 12, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; action ended.

Status Date: August 16, 2010

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Status Date: May 11, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: March 20, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: January 17, 2007

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD, RETAINING THE AT-LARGE VOTING METHOD

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: January 17, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: October 2, 2006

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 11, 2006

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/May 2011

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/June 2011
- Compton CCD/June 2011
- Cerritos CCD/July 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.