

MINUTES OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

November 14, 2012

Present:

Jerry Gladbach, Chair

Richard H. Close

Donald L. Dear

Margaret Finlay

Tom LaBonge

Gloria Molina

Henri F. Pellissier

David Spence

Zev Yaroslavsky

Don Knabe, Alternate

Paul A. Novak, AICP; Executive Officer

Bob Cartwright, Legal Counsel

Absent:

Lori Brogin, Alternate

Lillian Kawasaki, Alternate

Paul Krekorian, Alternate

Gerard McCallum, Alternate

Judy Mitchell, Alternate

1 CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m., in Room 381-B of the County Hall of Administration.

2 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Jerry Gladbach.

3 DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION(S)

The Executive Officer (E.O.) read an announcement, asking that persons who made a contribution of more than \$250 to any member of the Commission during the past twelve (12) months to come forward and state for the record the Commissioner to whom such contributions were made and the item of their involvement (None).

4 SWEARING-IN OF SPEAKER(S)

The Executive Officer swore in members of the audience who planned to testify (None).

5 CONSENT ITEMS

The Commission took the following actions under Consent Items:

- a. Approved and Ordered Annexation No. 731 to Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 21, Resolution No. 2012-47RMD;
- b. Approved and Ordered Annexation No. 367 to Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 22, Resolution No. 2012-48RMD;
- c. Approved Minutes of October 10, 2012 and October 24, 2012;
- d. Approved Operating Account Check Register for the month of October 2012; and
- e. Received and filed update on pending applications.

MOTION:	LaBONGE
SECOND:	KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR YAROSLAVSKY)
AYES:	CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR YAROSLAVSKY), LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER, SPENCE, GLADBACH
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE
ABSENT:	YAROSLAVSKY
MOTION PASSES:	9/0/0

6 PUBLIC HEARING(S)

The following item was called up for consideration:

- a. Reconfirmation of the Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) and Spheres of Influence (SOIs) for Cities and Special Districts.

The public hearing was opened to receive testimony. There being no testimony, the public hearing was closed.

The Commission took the following action:

- Found that the approval of this Sphere of Influence Update was exempt from CEQA because no change in the existing individual Spheres of Influence is being adopted, and, further, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines section 15061, it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the Sphere of Influence Update will have a significant effect on the environment;
- Reconfirmed and Approved the current Municipal Service Reviews and Spheres of Influence for the following cities: Arcadia, Avalon, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Carson, Cerritos, Claremont, Covina, Culver City, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendale, Glendora, Hidden Hills, Huntington Park, Irwindale, La Habra Heights, La Puente, La Verne, Lawndale, Long Beach, Lynwood, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Palmdale, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Pomona, Rolling Hills Estates, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, San Marino, Santa Fe Springs, South Gate, Temple City, Walnut, and West Covina, Resolution No. 2012-49RMD;
- Reconfirmed and Approved the current Municipal Service Reviews and Spheres of Influence for the following special districts: Antelope Valley Health Care District, Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District, Beach Cities Health District, Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District, Green Valley County Water District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 5, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 16, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 17, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 18, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 21, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 22, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 23, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 28, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 37 - Acton, Malibu Garbage Disposal District, Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County, Valley County Water District, and Walnut Valley Water District, Resolution No. 2012-49RMD;
- Directed the Executive Officer to add the words "SOI Reconfirmed on November 14, 2012" to the official LAFCO maps for the cities and special districts referenced in Sections 2 and 3, above; and
- Directed the Executive Officer to mail copies of the resolution as provided in Section 56882 of the Government Code.

MOTION: PELLISSIER  
SECOND: FINLAY  
AYES: CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR  
YAROSLAVSKY), LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER,  
SPENCE, GLADBACH  
NOES: NONE  
ABSTAIN: NONE  
ABSENT: YAROSLAVSKY  
MOTION PASSES: 9/0/0

[Commissioner Yaroslavsky in at 9:06 a.m.]

## 6 PUBLIC HEARING(S)

The following item was called up for consideration:

- b. Palmdale Water District Municipal Service Review.

The public hearing was opened to receive testimony. There being no testimony, the public hearing was closed.

The Commission took the following action:

- Adopted the Palmdale Water District Municipal Service Review dated August 2012 and the determinations contained in the report, as required by Government Code Sections 56425 and 56430; and
- Adopted Resolution Making Determinations No. 2012-50RMD Approving an Update to the SOI for the Palmdale Water District.

MOTION: FINLAY  
SECOND: LaBONGE  
AYES: CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, LaBONGE, MOLINA,  
PELLISSIER, SPENCE, YAROSLAVSKY,  
GLADBACH  
NOES: NONE  
ABSTAIN: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE  
MOTION PASSES: 9/0/0

## 7 PROTEST HEARING(S)

The following item was called up for consideration:

- a. Annexation No. 2012-06 to Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District.

The protest hearing was opened to receive testimony. There being no testimony, the protest hearing was closed.

The Commission took the following action:

- Approved Annexation No. 2012-06 to Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District, Resolution No. 2012-20PR.

MOTION:	FINLAY
SECOND:	PELLISSIER
AYES:	CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER, SPENCE, YAROSLAVSKY, GLADBACH
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE
MOTION PASSES:	9/0/0

## 8 OTHER ITEMS

- a. As-Needed Alternate Legal Counsel.

In addition to the Staff Report, the E.O. commented on the issue of billing rates. The E.O. provided the Commission with a range of billing rates which included a summary. Several firms were clustered around the proposed \$325 per hour “blended rate”, generally between the ranges of \$200 to \$300. Two firms who had individual attorneys had higher rates. One of those firms had a substantial higher rate and one firm had a “blended rate” that was substantially lower than the \$325 “blended rate”. The E.O. stated that the Ad-Hoc Committee (Committee) felt it was appropriate to avoid multiple billing rates across various different firms. Instead the Committee recommended that a “blended rate” of \$325 per hour for all five recommended firms. In conversation with Legal Counsel, the E.O. noted that the Commission is ultimately empowered to appoint alternate legal counsel and to make all related decisions.

The Executive Officer stated that the Commission’s determinations may differ from the recommendations of the Committee or recommendations made by him. An alternate approach would be for the Commission to direct the E.O. to negotiate the lowest possible rate with each firm and direct that no firms negotiated rate does not exceed the top rate of \$325 per hour. The E.O. suggested he would like to have the authority, if possible, to include any contracts with reasonable accommodations for Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) to those rates. The E.O. stated he would appreciate receiving some direction from the Commission on the billing rate issue of whether the Commission prefers the \$325 “blended rate” for all firms or whether the Commission would prefer him to negotiate the lowest possible rate with each firm with the maximum of \$325 per hour.

Chair Gladbach thanked the Executive Officer.

Chair Gladbach stated that it is important that the Commission set contracts, but that the Commission does not negotiate rates higher than what is offered. He believed it was important to adopt the alternate proposal mentioned and to direct the E.O. to negotiate the lowest possible rate with each firm and direct that no firms negotiated rate does not exceed the top rate of \$325 per hour.

The Executive Officer stated if the Commission wanted to go in that direction, it would be appropriate to make a motion to direct him to negotiate with the five firms to get the lowest rate possible from each, not to exceed \$325 per hour, and with the opportunity to include some type of reasonable COLA or annual adjustment.

Supervisor Molina stated why would the Commission pay a firm more than what is being offered. Chair Gladbach stated the Commission would not pay more than what is offered by a firm. Molina stated the Commission is not paying \$325 to a \$225 per hour firm. The E.O. stated that is correct.

The E.O. stated the two firms that had either the highest rate were above the \$325 and those two firms agreed to accept the \$325 per hour. Other firms with a lower hourly rate would be contracted at that lower rate. Supervisor Molina asked why it is important to have a series of firms instead of one firm awarded the contract. The E.O. stated from summary and discussion from the Ad-Hoc Committee, depending on the individual issue, the Commission may require different levels of expertise from the five proposed firms. The other reason is that in addition to the potential for Legal Counsel having a conflict, an individual firm could have a conflict. One firm may do substantial legal work for developers and other firms may perform legal work for cities.

Supervisor Molina stated if the Commission negotiates these contracts and if there is a reason to select a firm that is charging more than \$225 per hour, would this go before the Commission for approval. The E.O. stated all of the contracts would have to come back to the Commission for approval. He would like to have all contracts on one Agenda. Every contract would have to go before the Commission for approval, whether it is on one Commission Agenda or on several Commission Agendas.

Supervisor Molina asked if LAFCO would be receiving a collection of lawyers. Would the E.O. choose a particular firm and be billed according or would the E.O. report back to Commission to whom was hired and at what billed rate. The E.O. responded that he would be authorized to go forward and negotiate a contract with each of the five firms, then go before the Commission for final approval. Executing the contracts would be no guarantee of future work. The thought was that six months or two years later, if an issue arises, and County Counsel said they have a conflict or potential conflict, the E.O. would go before the Commission and ask if the Commission would like to use an alternate firm which is already under contract, the rate is agreed upon, and the Commission would direct him to a particular firm which would then be hired immediately.

Supervisor Molina thanked the Executive Officer for the clarification.

Bob Cartwright, Legal Counsel, clarified that the lowest “blended rate” from one firm was \$225 per hour, not \$220 per hour.

The Commission took the following action:

- Directed the Executive Officer to negotiate individual contracts with the lowest possible rate, and not to exceed \$325 per hour, approved as to form by Legal Counsel, with the firms of Best Best & Krieger; Meyers Nave; Miller & Owen; Nossaman LLP; and Woodruff, Spradlin & Smart to serve as LAFCO’s As-Needed Alternate Legal Counsel;
- Directed and Authorized the Executive Officer to include any contracts with reasonable accommodations for Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for those rates offered by the above mentioned law firms; and
- Upon the conclusion of contract negotiations, agendize each contract for Commission approval at a future meeting.

MOTION:	DEAR
SECOND:	PELLISSIER
AYES:	CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER, SPENCE, YAROSLAVSKY, GLADBACH
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE
MOTION PASSES:	9/0/0

## 8 OTHER ITEMS

- b. Update to LAFCO’s Conflict of Interest Code.

The Commission took the following action:

- Approved the proposed update to the LAFCO Conflict of Interest Code; and
- Directed the Executive Officer to transmit the letter and the completed “Conflict of Interest Code Amendment Form for Adding a Position” to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

MOTION:	YAROSLAVSKY
SECOND:	FINLAY
AYES:	CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER, SPENCE, YAROSLAVSKY, GLADBACH
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE

MOTION PASSES: 9/0/0

## 9 COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Chair Gladbach attended the California Coalition of LAFCO's (CCL) Meeting in San Diego on November 7, 2012. He suggested to the Chair, after the meeting, that CCL be renamed "Southern Region of CALAFCO". Chair Gladbach also attended the CALAFCO meeting on November 9, 2012. This was the first meeting for Pamela Miller who attended as new Executive Director of CALAFCO. Chair Gladbach along with fellow colleagues expressed that she did a tremendous job conducting the meeting.

Gladbach stated he was appointed Chair of the CALAFCO Recruitment Committee for the 2013 Board of Directors and was reappointed to the CALAFCO Achievement Awards Committee. He also was appointed to the CALAFCO Legislative Committee but graciously declined due to time constraints. Chair Gladbach named Paul A. Novak to sit on the CALAFCO Legislative Committee. Steve Tomanelli of the CCL was selected as Treasurer of CALAFCO.

## 10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

The E.O. spoke to the Commission about the new format of staff reports for Sanitation District applications. The re-formatting of staff reports more specifically addresses each of the factors the Commission must consider pursuant to Government Code Section 56668. The E.O. noted that the new format also makes it easier to identify basic background information, all of which is provided on the first page of the reports. Finally, the E.O. noted that staff reports for other special district and city annexation applications will be re-formatted in a similar manner.

With respect to Annexation No. 2011-12 to the City of Santa Clarita (North Copperhill), which was the subject at the last Special Meeting on October 24<sup>th</sup>, the E.O. reported that the Santa Clarita City Council unanimously approved a 5-0 vote, the pre-annexation agreement with Daniel Singh.

The Commission unanimously agreed to cancel the meeting of December 12, 2012.

## 11 PUBLIC COMMENT (None.)

## 12 FUTURE MEETINGS

November 28, 2012 (Special Meeting)  
~~December 12, 2012~~ (Meeting Cancelled)  
January 9, 2013  
February 13, 2013



Minutes  
November 14, 2012  
Page 9

13 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS  
(None.)

14 ADJOURNMENT MOTION

On motion of Commissioner Yaroslavsky, seconded by Commissioner LaBonge, unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:26 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Novak", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Paul A. Novak, AICP  
Executive Officer

**RESOLUTION NO. 2012-47RMD**  
**RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION**  
**COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY**  
**MAKING DETERMINATIONS APPROVING AND ORDERING**  
**"ANNEXATION NO. 731 TO**  
**LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 21"**

WHEREAS, the County Sanitation District No. 21 adopted a resolution of application to initiate proceedings before the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County (the "Commission") pursuant to Part 3, Division 3, Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with section 56000, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000), for the annexation of territory located within unincorporated Los Angeles County; and

WHEREAS, the principal reason for the proposed annexation is to provide offsite sewage disposal for one proposed single-family home; and

WHEREAS, a description of the boundaries and map of the proposal are set forth in Exhibits "A" and "B", attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, the territory consists of 0.584± acres and is uninhabited; and

WHEREAS, the short-form designation given this proposal is "Annexation No. 731 to County Sanitation District No. 21"; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has reviewed the proposal and submitted to the Commission a report, including his recommendation thereon; and

WHEREAS, on November 14, 2012, at its regular meeting this Commission considered the proposal and the report of the Executive Officer, along with public comment on the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56663(a) and (b), the Commission hereby finds and determines that:

- a. The owners of land within the affected territory have given their written consent to the change of organization; and
- b. No subject agency has submitted a written demand for notice and hearing on this proposal.

Based thereon, notice and hearing requirements are waived.

2. The Commission finds that this annexation is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(b).
3. Annexation No. 731 to the County Sanitation District No. 21 is hereby approved subject to the following terms and conditions:
  - a. The property so annexed shall be subject to the payment of such service charges, assessments or taxes as the District may legally impose.
  - b. The regular County assessment roll is utilized by the District.
  - c. The affected territory will be taxed for existing general bonded indebtedness, if any, of the District.

- d. Except to the extent in conflict with a through c, above, the general terms and conditions contained in Chapter 2 of Part 5, Division 3, Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with Government Code Section 57325) shall apply to this annexation.
- 4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56663(c), the Commission hereby finds and determines that:
  - a. The territory to be annexed is uninhabited;
  - b. The owners of land within the affected territory have given their written consent to the change of organization; and
  - c. No subject agency has submitted written opposition to a waiver of protest proceedings.

Based thereon, protest proceedings are waived.

- 5. The Commission hereby orders the uninhabited territory described in Exhibits "A" and "B" annexed to County Sanitation District No. 21.

6. The Executive Officer is directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the General Manager of the District, upon the District's payment of the applicable fees required by Government Code Section 54902.5 and prepare, execute and file a certificate of completion with the appropriate public agencies, pursuant to Government Code Section 57200, et seq.

PASSED AND ADOPTED 14<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012.

MOTION: LaBONGE

SECOND: KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR YAROSLAVSKY)

AYES: CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR  
YAROSLAVSKY), LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER,  
SPENCE, GLADBACH

NOES: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

ABSENT: YAROSLAVSKY

MOTION PASSES: 9/0/0

**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR  
THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**



---

**PAUL A. NOVAK, AICP Executive Officer**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2012-48RMD**  
**RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION**  
**COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY**  
**MAKING DETERMINATIONS APPROVING AND ORDERING**  
**"ANNEXATION NO. 367 TO**  
**LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 22"**

WHEREAS, the County Sanitation District No. 22 adopted a resolution of application to initiate proceedings before the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County (the "Commission") pursuant to Part 3, Division 3, Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with section 56000, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000), for the annexation of territory located in the City of West Covina; and

WHEREAS, the principal reason for the proposed annexation is to provide offsite sewage disposal for one single-family home; and

WHEREAS, a description of the boundaries and map of the proposal are set forth in Exhibits "A" and "B", attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, the territory consists of 0.556± acres and is uninhabited; and

WHEREAS, the short-form designation given this proposal is "Annexation No. 367 to County Sanitation District No. 22"; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has reviewed the proposal and submitted to the Commission a report, including his recommendation thereon; and

WHEREAS, on November 14, 2012, at its regular meeting this Commission considered the proposal and the report of the Executive Officer, along with public comment on the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56663(a) and (b), the Commission hereby finds and determines that:

- a. The owners of land within the affected territory have given their written consent to the change of organization; and
- b. No subject agency has submitted a written demand for notice and hearing on this proposal.

Based thereon, notice and hearing requirements are waived.

2. The Commission finds that this annexation is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(a) and (b).
3. Annexation No. 367 to the County Sanitation District No. 22 is hereby approved subject to the following terms and conditions:
  - a. The property so annexed shall be subject to the payment of such service charges, assessments or taxes as the District may legally impose.
  - b. The regular County assessment roll is utilized by the District.
  - c. The affected territory will be taxed for existing general bonded indebtedness, if any, of the District.



- d. Except to the extent in conflict with a through c, above, the general terms and conditions contained in Chapter 2 of Part 5, Division 3, Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with Government Code Section 57325) shall apply to this annexation.
- 4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56663(c), the Commission hereby finds and determines that:
  - a. The territory to be annexed is uninhabited;
  - b. The owners of land within the affected territory have given their written consent to the change of organization; and
  - c. No subject agency has submitted written opposition to a waiver of protest proceedings.

Based thereon, protest proceedings are waived.

- 5. The Commission hereby orders the uninhabited territory described in Exhibits "A" and "B" annexed to County Sanitation District No. 22.



6. The Executive Officer is directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the General Manager of the District, upon the District's payment of the applicable fees required by Government Code Section 54902.5 and prepare, execute and file a certificate of completion with the appropriate public agencies, pursuant to Government Code Section 57200, et seq.

PASSED AND ADOPTED 14<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012.

MOTION: LaBONGE

SECOND: KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR YAROSLAVSKY)

AYES: CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR  
YAROSLAVSKY), LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER,  
SPENCE, GLADBACH

NOES: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

ABSENT: YAROSLAVSKY

MOTION PASSES: 9/0/0

**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR  
THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAUL A. NOVAK, AICP Executive Officer**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2012-49RMD**

**RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION  
COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES RECONFIRMING THE  
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEWS (MSRs) AND THE SPHERES OF  
INFLUENCE (SOI's) FOR THE FOLLOWING CITIES AND SPECIAL  
DISTRICTS:**

**CITIES:**

**ARCADIA, AVALON, AZUSA, BALDWIN PARK, BRADBURY, CARSON,  
CERRITOS, CLAREMONT, COVINA, CULVER CITY, DIAMOND BAR,  
DUARTE, GLENDALE, GLENDORA, HIDDEN HILLS, HUNTINGTON PARK,  
IRWINDALE, LA HABRA HEIGHTS, LA PUENTE, LA VERNE, LAWDALE,  
LONG BEACH, LYNWOOD, MONROVIA, MONTEREY PARK, PALMDALE,  
PASADENA, PICO RIVERA, POMONA, ROLLING HILLS ESTATES,  
ROSEMEAD, SAN DIMAS, SAN GABRIEL, SAN MARINO, SANTA FE  
SPRINGS, SOUTH GATE, TEMPLE CITY, WALNUT, AND WEST COVINA;**

**SPECIAL DISTRICTS:**

**ANTELOPE VALLEY HEALTH CARE DISTRICT, ANTELOPE VALLEY  
MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT, BEACH CITIES HEALTH  
DISTRICT, GREATER LOS ANGELES COUNTY VECTOR CONTROL  
DISTRICT, GREEN VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, LOS ANGELES  
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 3, LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 5, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION  
DISTRICT NO. 15, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 16,  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 17, LOS ANGELES  
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 18, LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 21, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION  
DISTRICT NO. 22, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 23,  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 28, LOS ANGELES  
COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 37 - ACTON, MALIBU GARBAGE  
DISPOSAL DISTRICT, SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT  
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, AND  
WALNUT VALLEY WATER DISTRICT;**

WHEREAS, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Governmental Reorganization  
Act of 2000 (California Government Code Section (Section) 56000 et seq) provides that a  
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) must adopt the Spheres of Influence  
(SOIs) of each local governmental agency within its jurisdiction (Section 56425(a)) and

that it must update, as necessary, each Sphere every five years (Section 56425(g)); and

WHEREAS, the Sphere of Influence is the primary planning tool for LAFCO and defines the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency as determined by LAFCO;

WHEREAS, proceedings for adoption, update and amendment of a Sphere of Influence are described at Section 56427 et seq;

WHEREAS, Section 56430 requires that in order to prepare and to update Spheres of Influence, the Commission shall conduct a Municipal Service Review prior to or in conjunction with action to update or adopt a Sphere of Influence;

WHEREAS, the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles (LA LAFCO, LAFCO, or Commission) has previously prepared Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) as an accompanying report to the Sphere of Influence Updates for the following cities: Arcadia, Avalon, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Carson, Cerritos, Claremont, Covina, Culver City, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendale, Glendora, Hidden Hills, Huntington Park, Irwindale, La Habra Heights, La Puente, La Verne, Lawndale, Long Beach, Lynwood, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Palmdale, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Pomona, Rolling Hills Estates, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, San Marino, Santa Fe Springs, South Gate, Temple City, Walnut, and West Covina and has furnished a copy of this report to each person entitled to a copy;

WHEREAS, the Commission has previously prepared MSRs as an accompanying report to the SOI Updates for the following special districts: Antelope Valley Health Care District, Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District, Beach Cities Health District, Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District, Green Valley County

Water District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 5, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 16, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 17, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 18, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 21, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 22, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 23, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 28, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 37 - Acton, Malibu Garbage Disposal District, Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County, Valley County Water District, and Walnut Valley Water District and has furnished a copy of this report to each person entitled to a copy;

WHEREAS the Commission previously reviewed the MSRs and approved SOI updates for the cities and special districts identified in this resolution during the initial MSR/SOI update cycle as required by Section 56425;

WHEREAS the information and findings contained in the MSR and SOI updates for each of the cities and special districts identified in this Resolution are current and do not raise any significant boundary or service-related issues;

WHEREAS, for each of the cities and special districts identified in this Resolution, staff has determined that the reconfirmation of existing MSR and SOI updates does not present any issues with respect to the present and probable need of itemized services to Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs) pursuant to Government Code Section 56425(d)(5), either because there are no DUCs in these agencies' SOI's, or because reconfirmation of the SOI is consistent with the present and probable need for the itemized public services to any DUCs;

WHEREAS, based upon staff review and the feasibility of governmental reorganization identified in Section 56425(h), staff has determined that any such reorganizations will not further the goals of orderly development and affordable service delivery, and therefore will not recommend reorganization of the cities and special districts identified at this time;

WHEREAS, the Commission is able to establish the nature, location, and extent of any functions or classes of services provided by the existing districts, consistent with Section 56425, which information may be based in part upon written statements obtained by the Commission from the districts;

WHEREAS, the reports for the MSR and SOI updates for the cities and districts identified in this Resolution contain statements of determination as required by Section 56430 for the municipal services provided by the cities and districts;

WHEREAS, copies of the MSR and SOI reports, SOI maps, and statements of determination for each of the cities and special districts identified in this Resolution have been previously reviewed by the Commission and are available for public review in the Commission offices and on the Commission website;

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer, pursuant to Government Code Section 56427, set November 14th, 2012, as the hearing date on this MSR and SOI study proposal, and gave the required notice of public hearing;

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer notified the City Manager of each city identified in this Resolution in writing, of the Executive Officer's intent to agendize the reconfirmation of each city's SOI as a public hearing item on the agenda for the November 14, 2012 Commission meeting;

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer also notified the General Manager of each special district identified in this Resolution in writing, of the Executive Officer's intent to agendize the reconfirmation of each city's SOI as a public hearing item on the agenda for the November 14, 2012 Commission meeting;

WHEREAS, the proposed action consists of the reconfirmation of the MSRs and SOIs for the following cities: Arcadia, Avalon, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Carson, Cerritos, Claremont, Covina, Culver City, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendale, Glendora, Hidden Hills, Huntington Park, Irwindale, La Habra Heights, La Puente, La Verne, Lawndale, Long Beach, Lynwood, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Palmdale, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Pomona, Rolling Hills Estates, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, San Marino, Santa Fe Springs, South Gate, Temple City, Walnut, and West Covina;

WHEREAS, the proposed action also consists of the reconfirmation of the MSRs and SOIs for the following special districts: Antelope Valley Health Care District, Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District, Beach Cities Health District, Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District, Green Valley County Water District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 5, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 16, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 17, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 18, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 21, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 22, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 23, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 28, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 37 - Acton, Malibu Garbage Disposal District, Santa Clarita Valley

Sanitation District of Los Angeles County, Valley County Water District, and Walnut Valley Water District;

WHEREAS, this Commission called for and held a public hearing on the proposal on November 14, 2012, and at the hearing the Commission heard and received all oral and written protests, objections, and evidence which were made, presented, or filed, and all persons present were given an opportunity to hear and be heard with respect to this proposal and the report of the Executive Officer; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the reconfirmation of existing SOIs was determined to be categorically exempt under Section 15061 of the State CEQA Guideline because it can be seen with certainty that the recommended actions have no possibility of having a significant adverse effect on the environment because they reconfirm existing SOIs, and, in the alternative, that these recommendations are not a project for purposes of CEQA because they are organizational activities of governments with no direct nor indirect effects on the physical environment pursuant to Section 15378 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. The recommended actions are exempt from CEQA as set out herein;
2. The Executive Officer's staff report and recommendations for reconfirmation of

the current MSRs and SOIs for the following cities are hereby adopted:

Arcadia, Avalon, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Carson, Cerritos,  
Claremont, Covina, Culver City, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendale, Glendora,  
Hidden Hills, Huntington Park, Irwindale, La Habra Heights, La Puente, La  
Verne, Lawndale, Long Beach, Lynwood, Monrovia, Monterey Park,



Palmdale, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Pomona, Rolling Hills Estates, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, San Marino, Santa Fe Springs, South Gate, Temple City, Walnut, and West Covina;

3. The Executive Officer's staff report and recommendations for reconfirmation of the current MSRs and SOIs for the following special districts are hereby adopted: Antelope Valley Health Care District, Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District, Beach Cities Health District, Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District, Green Valley County Water District, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 5, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 16, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 17, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 18, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 21, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 22, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 23, Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 28, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 37 - Acton, Malibu Garbage Disposal District, Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County, Valley County Water District, and Walnut Valley Water District;
4. The Executive Officer is hereby directed to add the words "SOI Reconfirmed on October 10, 2012" to the official LAFCO maps for the cities and special districts referenced in Sections 1 and 2, above; and
5. The Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to mail copies of this resolution as provided in Section 56882 of the Government Code.



PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2012.

MOTION:	PELLISSIER
SECOND:	FINLAY
AYES:	CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, KNABE (ALTERNATE FOR YAROSLAVSKY), LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER, SPENCE, GLADBACH
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE
ABSENT:	YAROSLAVSKY
MOTION PASSES:	9/0/0



---

PAUL A. NOVAK, Executive Officer

**RESOLUTION NO. 2012-50RMD**

**RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION  
COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
MAKING DETERMINATIONS AND APPROVING AN UPDATE TO  
THE SPHERE OF INFLUENCE OF THE PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT**

WHEREAS, the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County (the "Commission"), is required pursuant to Part 3, Division 3, Title 5, (commencing with Section 56000, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000), to determine and update, as necessary, the Sphere of Influence of each local agency; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has undertaken the Municipal Service Review the and Sphere of Influence Update for Palmdale Water District; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has submitted to the Commission a Palmdale Water District Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update report, including proposed determinations and recommendations; and

WHEREAS, said report recommends that the Commission confirm the existing Sphere of Influence of the Palmdale Water District; and

WHEREAS, a map of the Sphere of Influence of the Palmdale Water District is set forth in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein; and

WHEREAS, on November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2012, after being duly and properly noticed, this matter came up for hearing at which time this Commission heard and received all oral and written testimony, objections and evidence which were made, presented or filed, and all persons present were given an opportunity to hear and be heard with respect to this matter, and the report of the Executive Officer.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. The Commission finds that the approval of this Sphere of Influence Update is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines section 15061, it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the Sphere of Influence Update will have a significant effect on the environment.
2. The Commission adopts the following written determinations and approves the Sphere of Influence Update for Palmdale Water District.:

Present and Planned Land Uses in the Area. The Palmdale Water District encompasses an area of approximately 140 square miles overlying more than thirty non-contiguous areas throughout the southern Antelope Valley. The District's service area customers include municipal, residential, irrigation, commercial, industrial, and institutional users. The population is expected to more than double over the next 25 years, which is expected to double the District's water demands. However, the District has developed a Strategic Water Resources Plan, which takes into consideration the projected future population, anticipated water demand, and anticipated future water supplies to ensure that the District is able to continue to provide a safe and reliable source of water.

Present and Probable Need for Public Facilities and Services in the Area. The District is currently able to meet its water demands through a combination of groundwater, water obtained from the Littlerock Dam Reservoir, and imported water from the State Water Project (through the District's contract with the State of California Department of Water Resources). The District currently does not have recycled water supplies, but is in the process of developing the use of non-potable water to offset potable water demand and to diversify its water supply options. Additionally, the District is developing new sources of supply via groundwater banking and anticipated new supplies from transfer and exchange opportunities.

Present Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Service that the Agency Provides or is Authorized to Provide. The Palmdale Water District provides an adequate level of public facilities and services to meet the current needs of its customers. The District provides potable water service to its residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional customers within its service area, and serves supplemental water to several customers outside its Primary Service in accordance with agreements made with the Antelope Valley East Kern Water Agency (AVEK).

The District currently receives water from three sources: groundwater, Littlerock Dam Reservoir, and imported water from the State Water Project. The District is diversifying its water supply sources to meet its service area's future water demands by using three new sources: recycled water, groundwater banking, and transfer and exchange opportunities.

Existence of Any Social or Economic Communities of Interest:

There are many distinct social and economic communities of interest within the boundaries of the territory served by the Palmdale Water District. The existence of these communities is not relevant to the agency, given the District's records of providing an adequate level of public facilities and services to meet the needs of its customers.

The present and probable need for sewers, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection services and facilities of any Disadvantaged Unincorporated Territory (DUC) within the existing Sphere of Influence. As noted in Section 10 of the MSR, there are multiple census tracts within the Palmdale Water District's primary service territory that meet the 80% criteria, but only one of those tracts (Census Tract 9101.01) is in unincorporated territory (the others are within the City of Palmdale). The Palmdale Water District is currently providing retail water service to customers within this census tract, as it is located within the District's Primary Service Area. This census tract is adjacent to several other census tracts in County unincorporated territory which meet the criteria for DUCs, but those tracts are within the Sphere of Influence for Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, and, therefore, do not represent a service obligation of the Palmdale Water District. In short, the District is providing service to customers inside the DUC that is within its boundaries, and providing service to the DUC to the north of Palmdale Water District is a service obligation of County Waterworks District 40. In this regard, the findings of the Palmdale Water District MSR are consistent with the intent of the DUCs legislation, which is that public agencies should serve customers within DUCs, rather than serving wealthier communities that surround them and avoiding providing services to customers who live, own property, or operates businesses within DUCs. Any issues involving sanitary sewer disposal are beyond the scope of this MSR and SOI Update, as the District does not provide such services anywhere within its service territory.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012.

MOTION: FINLAY  
SECOND: LaBONGE  
AYES: CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER,  
SPENCE, YAROSLAVSKY, GLADBACH  
NOES: NONE  
ABSTAIN: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE  
MOTION PASSES: 9/0/0

**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION  
COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS  
ANGELES**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Novak", written in dark ink.

---

**PAUL NOVAK, Executive Officer**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2012-20PR  
RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION  
COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
MAKING DETERMINATIONS ORDERING  
"ANNEXATION NO. 2012-06 TO THE  
MESA HEIGHTS GARBAGE DISPOSAL DISTRICT"**

WHEREAS, the County of Los Angeles as the governing board of the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District (the "District") filed an application to initiate proceedings before the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles (the "Commission"), pursuant to Title 5, Division 3, commencing with section 56000, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, for an annexation of territory to the District and for a simultaneous amendment to the Sphere of Influence (SOI) of the District; and

WHEREAS, the principal reason for the proposed annexation and amendment to the SOI was to provide garbage disposal services including refuse, recycling, and green waste collection to 218 existing single-family dwellings and 10 existing commercial units; and

WHEREAS, a description of the boundaries and map of the proposal are set forth in Exhibits "A" and "B", attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, the territory consists of 88.13± acres and is inhabited; and

WHEREAS, the short-form designation given this proposal is "Annexation No. 2012-06 to Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District"; and

WHEREAS, on September 12, 2012 the Commission approved Annexation No. 2012-06 to Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District and the related SOI amendment; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 57002, the Executive Officer of the Commission has set November 14, 2012 as the date for the protest hearing pertaining to the annexation and has given notice thereof; and

WHEREAS, at the time and place fixed in the notice, the hearing was held, and any and all oral or written protests, objections and evidence were received and considered; and

WHEREAS, the Commission, acting as the conducting authority, has the ministerial duty of tabulating the value of protests filed and not withdrawn and either terminating these proceedings if a majority protest exists or ordering the annexation directly or subject to confirmation by the registered voters.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. The Commission finds that the number of registered voters within the boundary of the territory is 374, and the number of property owners is 241, and the total assessed value of land within the affected territory is \$112,593,822.
2. The Commission finds that the number of written protests filed in opposition to Annexation No. 2012-06 to the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District and not withdrawn is 0, which, even if valid, represents less than 25 percent of the number of registered voters residing within the boundaries of the affected territory, and less than 25 percent of the number of owners of land who also own at least 25 percent of the assessed value of land within the affected territory.
3. The Commission hereby orders the annexation of the territory described in Exhibits "A" and "B" hereto, to the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District.
4. Pursuant to Government Code section 56886, the annexation shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:
  - a. The territory so annexed shall be subject to the payment of such service charges,

assessments or taxes as the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District may legally impose.

- b. The regular County assessment roll is utilized by the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District.
  - c. The affected territory will be taxed for existing bonded indebtedness, if any, of the Mesa Heights Garbage Disposal District.
  - d. Except to the extent in conflict with a through c, above, the general terms and conditions contained in Chapter 2 of Part 5, Division 3, Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with Government Code section 57325) shall apply to this annexation.
5. The Executive Officer is directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the General Manager of the District, upon the District's payment of the applicable fees required by Government Code Section 54902.5, and prepare, execute and file a certificate of completion with the appropriate public agencies, pursuant to Government Code Section 57000, *et seq.*

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012.

MOTION:	FINLAY
SECOND:	PELLISSIER
AYES:	CLOSE, DEAR, FINLAY, LaBONGE, MOLINA, PELLISSIER, SPENCE, YAROSLAVSKY, GLADBACH
NOES:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE
MOTION PASSES:	9/0/0



**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Novak", written over a horizontal line.

**PAUL A. NOVAK,  
Executive Officer**