



Local Agency Formation Commission
for the County of Los Angeles

Commission

Jerry Gladbach
Chair

Donald Dear
1st Vice-Chair

Gerard McCallum
2nd Vice-Chair

Kathryn Barger
Richard Close
Margaret Finlay
Janice Hahn
John Mirisch
Greig Smith

Alternate Members

Lori Brogin-Falley
Sheila Kuehl
Judith Mitchell
Joseph Ruzicka
David Ryu
Vacant
(Public Member)

Staff

Paul Novak
Executive Officer

Adriana Romo
Deputy Executive Officer

Amber De La Torre
Doug Dorado
Michael Henderson
Alisha O'Brien
Patricia Wood

80 South Lake Avenue
Suite 870
Pasadena, CA 91101
Phone: 626/204-6500
Fax: 626/204-6507

www.lalafco.org

REGULAR MEETING

MINUTES OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

February 13, 2019

Present:

Jerry Gladbach, Chair

Kathryn Barger
Richard Close
Donald Dear
Janice Hahn
Gerard McCallum
John Mirisch
Greig Smith

Lori Brogin-Falley, Alternate
Judith Mitchell, Alternate
Joe Ruzicka, Alternate

Paul Novak, Executive Officer
Carole Suzuki, Legal Counsel

Absent:

Margaret Finlay

Sheila Kuehl, Alternate
David Ryu, Alternate

Vacant:

Alternate General Public Member

1 CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. in Room 381-B of the County Hall of Administration by Chair Jerry Gladbach.

2 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Jerry Gladbach.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Gladbach announced that Los Angeles City Council President Herb Wesson appointed Greig Smith as the Voting Member representing the City of Los Angeles.

Chair Gladbach requested that Agenda Item 7.a. be taken out of order. The Commission had no objections.

3 DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION(S)

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

The EO read an announcement, asking if any Commissioner had received a campaign contribution that would require disclosure and recusal from any item on today's agenda (None).

4 SWEARING-IN OF SPEAKER(S)

The EO swore-in over ten (10) members of the audience who planned to testify.

The Commission moved to Agenda Item 7.a.

7 PUBLIC HEARING(S)

The following item was called for consideration:

- a. Dissolution No. 2018-09 of the Sativa County Water District.

The EO indicated that a letter was received by the State Water Resources Control Board (dated February 11, 2019) after the posting of the Agenda which was e-mailed to the Commissioners and hard copies were provided at today's meeting. The letter was in support of the dissolution of the Sativa County Water District and appointment of the County of Los Angeles as the successor agency.

The EO noted that there was a numbering error in the resolution (Exhibit “J”). A revised resolution was provided to each of the Commissioners.

The EO summarized the staff report on Dissolution No. 2018-09 of the Sativa County Water District (“District” or “Sativa”).

The public hearing was opened to receive testimony.

Dan Lafferty (Deputy Director, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works) came before the Commission. Mr. Lafferty stated that the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) supported the staff recommendation and conditions within the resolution to dissolve the Sativa County Water District. Mr. Lafferty provided an overview of the District’s progress. He indicated that LACDPW’s goals are to rebuild the trust of the Sativa ratepayers through transparency, move the District into a better position financially, and address the brown water issues. He stated that the LACDPW terminated contracts and agreements that were not in the best interest of the District. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved a \$1.4 million loan (line of credit) to Sativa, which has been managed by LACDPW as Administrator. A portion of the loan has helped balance the District’s operating budget and pay outstanding debt which were caused by the lack of bookkeeping and lack of financial controls by Sativa’s prior management. The LACDPW is actively seeking grant loans from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Mr. Lafferty indicated that water wells were not properly maintained, and that sediment is not the primary cause of the brown water. He indicated that the LACDPW has created an interconnection with a neighboring system in order to take each water well off-line, one-by-one, to inspect each well, and identify the cause of the problems; and the necessary corrective actions.

Commissioner Mirisch asked if the lack of bookkeeping and lack of financial controls is criminal. Mr. Lafferty indicated that all questionable items have been flagged and documented. Commissioner Mirisch suggested that the Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office be notified regarding the possibility of criminal intent by Sativa’s prior management.

Commissioner Hahn thanked the LACDPW for agreeing to “step in” as the State administrator and thanked the County of Los Angeles for providing the \$1.4 million loan. Commissioner Hahn asked when will the LACDPW release the Request for Proposal (RFP) for a new service provider.

Russ Bryden (Principal Engineer, LACDPW) came before the Commission. Mr. Bryden indicated that the LACDPW is currently working to create an RFP and that it should be released to bidders in July of 2019.

Commissioner Hahn asked if Condition 9.s. in the resolution is for Commissioners to evaluate the RFP or to evaluate the bids. Carole Suzuki (Legal Counsel) stated that the condition would serve to have LAFCO participate in evaluation of the bids.

Commissioner Hahn asked if the Commission can be involved with reviewing what is included

in the RFP before it goes out to the bidders. Mr. Lafferty indicated that the LACDPW would be open to receive input from the Commission. The EO stated that there are four key points within the resolution as Condition 9.u. that must be addressed in the RFP. Commissioner Hahn requested that a future item be agendaized for the Commission to review the Request for Proposal before it goes out to the bidders.

Commissioner Hahn asked if it is the strategy of the LACDPW to get the District in the “best shape” possible before the new service provider assumes responsibility. Mr. Lafferty stated that the goal is for the LACDPW to address the brown water issues before a new provider assumes water service and have the system as attractive as possible.

Commissioner Barger asked what the reasoning is for utilizing an RFP instead of opting for a Request for Information (RFI). Carole Suzuki (Legal Counsel) indicated that an RFI is used to solicit information which is then used to formulate the RFP. The RFP is the solicitation relied on to get bids and proposals from the future service provider. Ms. Suzuki indicated that an RFP would be more appropriate for this situation unless the County determines otherwise.

Commissioner Mitchell asked how the system will be upgraded without imposing financial burden on the ratepayers. Mr. Lafferty stated that the SWRCB is interested in providing grants funding opportunities to fix the various problems with the water system, such as failure to meet fire flow and brown water issues.

Commissioner Hahn asked if no rate increases can be stipulated within the RFP. Mr. Lafferty indicated the LACDPW had discussions with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). There are limitations to what the County could require in the RFP process and the CPUC has jurisdiction over rate setting and increases.

Commissioner Mitchell suggested that the Commission request special legislation to consider no rate increases (assuming the new service provider may seek approval of rate increases from the CPUC). The EO indicated that the Commission can draft letters to the offices of Assembly Speaker Rendon and Assemblyman Gipson, respectively, to request special legislation addressing no rate increases from the CPUC. Carole Suzuki (Legal Counsel) stated that, potentially, the LACDPW could consider whether the RFP can include the rates as an evaluated category (proposers are to project anticipated rates according to Condition 9.u. of the resolution).

Commissioner Mirisch asked if the LACDPW can have franchising agreements with a private utility company as a subcontractor to operate the water system but remain under the control and leadership of the LACDPW. Mr. Lafferty indicated that is a potential approach. Carole Suzuki (Legal Counsel) indicated that such a hybrid approach (a public agency subcontracting with a public utility company regulated under the CPUC) would require further legal review. The EO indicated that the Commission’s authority, when an agency is dissolved, is that it can designate a successor agency which is a public agency. The EO indicated that Commissioner Mirisch’s question can be referred to the County, as this will be a County contract.

Mr. Lafferty indicated that if the County were to remain in control of the water system, and

subcontract to a public utility, all of the expenses incurred by the County and the public utility would be passed on to the ratepayers of the District. He stated that one benefit of having a private entity is that the costs and charges that are incurred can be spread over a larger customer base.

Commissioner McCallum indicated that he believed the Commission and the District's customers were continuously misled by District officials.

Eddie Lamont (resident of the District and a previous Board member of Sativa) came before the Commission. Ms. Lamont stated that she was concerned that water rates would increase if a private water company gained control of the system.

Tony Hicks (resident of the District and a previous Board member of Sativa) came before the Commission. Mr. Hicks indicated that he is concerned about the ratepayers of the District. It is a low-income area and fears that water rates will increase if a private water purveyor takes over the system. He indicated that the District should remain as a public agency, as much as possible.

Mark Ravis (attorney) came before the Commission. Mr. Ravis indicated that he contacted the Los Angeles County District Attorney's office to follow-up with possible criminal charges against District representatives and that residents want to submit impact statements; he stated that the District Attorney representative he spoke with did not seem to know anything about the allegations against the Sativa County Water District.

The EO indicated that a letter was mailed to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (dated July 26, 2018) which noted public testimony regarding possible criminal and civil violations at Sativa.

Commissioner Hahn asked if there is a conflict of interest with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works creating the RFP, and the LACDPW responding to the RFP as a bidder. The EO indicated that the LACDPW could look further into this matter.

There being no further testimony, the public hearing was closed.

The Commission took the following actions:

- Adopted the Resolution Making Determinations, including the California Environment Quality Act determinations, Approving and Ordering Dissolution No. 2018-09 of the Sativa County Water District; Resolution No. 2019-02RMD; and
- Directed the Executive Officer to draft letters, signed by Chair Gladbach, to Assembly Speaker Rendon and Assemblyman Gipson, respectively, to request special legislation addressing no rate increases granted from the California Public Utilities Commission.

MOTION: Hahn SECOND: Mirisch APPROVED: 9-0-0

AYES: Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach

NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Finlay

5 INFORMATION ITEM(S) – GOVERNMENT CODE §§ 56751 & 56857 NOTICE

- a. Annexation No. 2018-11 to the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 37, Acton.

The Commission took the following action:

- Received and Filed.

MOTION: Dear SECOND: McCallum APPROVED: 9-0-0
AYES: Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Finlay

6 CONSENT ITEM(S)

The Commission held Agenda Item 6.d. in order to receive public testimony (see page 7).

The Commission took the following actions under Consent Items:

- a. Approved Minutes of December 12, 2018.
- b. Approved Operating Account Check Register for the months of December 2018 and January 2019.
- c. Received and filed update on pending proposals.

MOTION: Dear SECOND: Barger APPROVED: 9-0-0
AYES: Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Finlay

6 CONSENT ITEM(S)

The Commission took the following action:

- d. Resolution Making Determinations Disapproving Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road).

Commissioner Close stated that the February 12, 2019 letter from the City of Calabasas (City) addresses legal issues, and he asked Legal Counsel to address those issues. Carole Suzuki (Legal Counsel) indicated that what is before the Commission today is to review the resolution (which is sufficient under the law), and to approve the content of the resolution as appropriately documenting the Commission's determinations at last month's meeting. Ms. Suzuki stated that many of the issues addressed in the City's letter are legal arguments which amounted to the City of Calabasas requesting that the Commission reconsider its determination to disapprove the annexation. A request for reconsideration was not timely and not before the Commission at this hearing.

Commissioner Close asked if the Commission should restrict public testimony to only non-legal issues. Ms. Suzuki indicated that this a consent item, not a public hearing (the public hearing was closed at last month's meeting). She indicated that members of the audience have filled out speaker cards for this consent item and are permitted to provide testimony about the item.

Commissioner Mitchell asked what the requirements are for reconsideration. Ms. Suzuki stated that the requirements for reconsideration are outlined in the statute and in LAFCO's policy. In sum, the applicant must present new or different facts that could not have been presented previously at the hearing on the annexation.

The item was opened to receive testimony.

Illece Buckley-Weber (Mayor Pro Tem, City of Agoura Hills) came before the Commission. Ms. Buckley-Weber indicated that members of the audience who planned to testify agreed with the analysis made by the Commission, that reconsideration was not before the Commission, and therefore withdrew their speaker cards. A total of five (5) members of the audience who planned to testify withdrew their speaker cards.

Ms. Buckley-Weber; Deborah Klein Lopez (Councilmember, City of Agoura Hills); and Lloyd "Bill" Pellman (Partner, Nossaman LLP) who served as Special Counsel to Sachi Hamai (Chief Executive Officer, County of Los Angeles) came before the Commission. Each of them stated that they supported the resolution disapproving Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas.

Matthew Summers (Assistant Attorney, City of Calabasas) came before the Commission. Mr. Summers indicated that the City of Calabasas does not support the resolution disapproving Annexation No. 2014-04. Mr. Summers suggested that the Commission return with a resolution approving the annexation that was originally before the Commission at last month's meeting to avoid possible litigation.

Ms. Suzuki indicated that the City has an opportunity under the statute to seek reconsideration (during a 30-day reconsideration period) after the resolution is approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Smith stated that he voted against disapproving the annexation at last month's meeting and he does not support the original determination.

There being no further testimony, the Commission closed this item.

The Commission took the following action:

- Adopted the Resolution Making Determinations Disapproving Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road); Resolution No. 2019-01RMD.

MOTION: McCallum SECOND: Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay) APPROVED: 9-0-0
AYES: Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Finlay

8 PROTEST HEARING(S)

None.

9 OTHER ITEMS

- a. FY 2018-19 Mid-Year Budget Status Report.
- c. Alternate Public Member

The Commission continued Agenda Items 9.a. and 9.c. until next month's meeting.

[Commissioner Brogin-Falley left at 10:29 a.m.]

9 OTHER ITEMS

The following item was called up for consideration:

- b. As-Needed Alternate Legal Counsel.

The EO summarized the staff report on As-Needed Alternate Legal Counsel.

The Commission took the following action:

- Directed the Executive Officer to execute contract amendments, for a new term of three years and adjusting billing rates, with no other changes, with the law firms of Best Best & Krieger; Meyers Nave; Nossaman LLP; and Renne Sloane Holtzman Sakai LLP; and bring back the contracts to the Commission for approval at a future meeting.

MOTION: Dear SECOND: Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay) APPROVED: 9-0-0
AYES: Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach

NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Finlay

10 LEGISLATION

a. Legislative Update.

The Commission continued Agenda Item 10.a. until next month's meeting.

11 MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

- a. Letter from Los Angeles City Council President Herb J. Wesson, Jr., appointing City Councilman Greig Smith as a voting member on the Commission representing the City of Los Angeles, dated January 23, 2019; and
- b. Letter from City of Los Angeles City Clerk Holly L. Wolcott informing LAFCO that Los Angeles City Council President Herb J. Wesson, Jr. of the appointment of Councilman Greig Smith as a voting member on the Commission representing the City of Los Angeles, dated January 23, 2019.

12 COMMISSIONERS' REPORT

Commissioner Dear and Chair Gladbach stated that they attended the Southern Region of CALAFCO on January 14th, and that it was an informative meeting.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

The EO announced that the Form 700 filing (elected officials are required to file as Form 700 which provides transparency and ensures accountability) is due April 2, 2019.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

15 FUTURE MEETINGS

March 13, 2019
April 10, 2019
May 8, 2019
June 12, 2019

16 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Commissioner Hahn requested that a future item be agenized for the Commission to review the

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Request for Proposal before it goes out to the bidders as it relates to the Sativa County Water District.

17 ADJOURNMENT MOTION

On motion of Commissioner Hahn, seconded by Commissioner Smith, the meeting was adjourned at 10:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Paul Novak, AICP
Executive Officer

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02RMD

**A RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES MAKING DETERMINATIONS APPROVING AND ORDERING
DISSOLUTION NO. 2018-09 OF THE SATIVA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles (the "Commission"), that;

WHEREAS, the Sativa County Water District ("Sativa" or "District") was incorporated by the State of California Secretary of State on December 30, 1938, under the County Water District Law; and

WHEREAS, Sativa is a legally-established county water district pursuant to Division 12 of the State of California Water Code; and

WHEREAS, the affected territory includes all land within the boundaries of Sativa, the boundaries of which are found to be definite and certain, as depicted in the map attached as Exhibit "A" to the Executive Officer's staff report dated February 13, 2019 ("staff report"); and

WHEREAS, the affected territory within the boundaries of Sativa is inhabited as defined in Government Code § 56046; and

WHEREAS, the Commission initiated the proposed dissolution of Sativa by adopting a resolution of application pursuant to Government Code § 56375(a)(2)(B) at its meeting of July 11, 2018 for a change of organization to dissolve Sativa ("Proposal"); and

WHEREAS, the proposed dissolution is being considered because, for many years, if not decades, the District has suffered from financial, managerial, operational, and governance challenges; and

WHEREAS, at the July 11, 2018 Meeting, and in accordance with Government Code § 56375(a)(3), the Commission adopted the determinations specified in Government Code § 56881(b) that the public services costs are likely to be less than or substantially similar to the cost of alternative means of providing the service and that this action will promote public access and accountability for community service needs and financial resources; and

WHEREAS, the territory within the boundaries of the Sativa County Water District consists of approximately 180 acres with approximately 1,300 water service connections located within a residential area in the unincorporated community of Willowbrook and three small non-contiguous areas within the City of Compton; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is required, pursuant to Government Code § 56000 *et seq* (the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000), to determine and update, as necessary, the Sphere of Influence (SOI) of each local agency, as provided in Government Code § 56425(a), and to review and update each SOI as necessary, every five years thereafter, as provided in Government Code § 56425(g); and

WHEREAS, the Commission adopted a Coterminous Sphere of Influence, wherein the boundaries of the District and its SOI are the same, for Sativa, on October 24, 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Final Municipal Services Review (“MSR”) for Water Services for the Gateway Region (in which Sativa is located) in November of 2005 was prepared pursuant to Government Code §§ 56425 and 56430; and

WHEREAS, the Final MSR for Water Services for the Gateway Region in November of 2005 recommended that the Commission adopt a Zero Sphere of Influence for the District, but

based upon public testimony, the Commission approved the November 2005 MSR for Sativa and confirmed the District's Coterminous SOI on February 22, 2006; and

WHEREAS, the August 2012 Sativa County Water District MSR was prepared pursuant to Government Code §§ 56425 and 56430; and

WHEREAS, the August 2012 Sativa County Water District MSR recommended that the Commission adopt a Zero SOI and consolidate the District; and

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2014, the Commission adopted the Round 2 MSR and SOI Update and assigned a Zero Sphere of Influence for the District; and

WHEREAS, the proposed dissolution of the District is consistent with the Zero Sphere of Influence for the District, and, further, implements the Commission's original intent when the Zero SOI designation was adopted; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56035 defines dissolution as "the disincorporation, extinguishment, or termination of the existence of a district and the cessation of all its corporate powers, except as the Commission may otherwise provide pursuant to § 56886 or for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the district;" and

WHEREAS, on June 1, 2018, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued Compliance Order No. 04_22_18R_003 to the District, wherein the SWRCB determined that the District had violated the California Safe Drinking Water Act by providing water to customers that exceeded secondary drinking water standards for discoloration (turbidity) and by failing to maintain adequate water pressure at four fire hydrants during flushing procedures; and

WHEREAS, on October 31, 2018, the SWRCB appointed Los Angeles County ("County") as the State Administrator for the District, pursuant to § 116687 of the Health and Safety Code; and

WHEREAS, concurrent to the SWRCB appointment of the County as State Administrator, the Sativa County Water District Board of Directors ceased to exist; and

WHEREAS, on November 1, 2018, a representative of the County Department of Public Works staff assumed full administrative, managerial, and financial control of the District, and has been operating the District from that time to the present; and

WHEREAS, Revenue and Taxation Code § 99 requires an agreement for the exchange of property tax revenues in the event of a jurisdictional change of local agencies; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the property tax transfer resolution, determining that there will be no exchange of property tax revenue from the proposed dissolution because the District does not currently receive any share of the ad valorem (1%) property taxes; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code § 56658(f), the Executive Officer issued the Certificate of Filing on December 18, 2018; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code § 56658(h), which requires that the public hearing be set within 90 days of issuance of the Certificate of Filing; the Executive Officer set the Proposal for hearing on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 9:00 a.m., at the County Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration Room 381-B, located at 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012; and

WHEREAS, notice of the Commission's review of this Proposal was advertised (English language version) in the Daily Commerce on December 20, 2018; and advertised (English language version) in the Compton Bulletin on December 26, 2018; and advertised in La Opinión (Spanish language version) on December 25, 2018; all of which are newspapers of general circulation within Los Angeles County, pursuant to Government Code § 56153; and that said publication occurred at least twenty-one (21) days prior to the date of the February 13, 2019 public hearing, pursuant to the requirements of Government Code § 56154; and

WHEREAS, notice (English language version and Spanish language version) of the Commission's review of this Proposal was sent first class, and deposited, postage prepaid, in the United States Mail, pursuant to Government Code § 56155; to all landowners within the affected territory, to all landowners within 300 feet of the exterior boundary of the affected territory, to all registered voters within the affected territory, and to all registered voters within 300 feet of the exterior boundary of the affected territory, pursuant to Government Code § 56157 (d) and (f); and that said notice was mailed at least 21 days prior to the date of the February 13, 2019 public hearing, pursuant to the requirements of Government Code § 56156; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has reviewed the Proposal and prepared a report, including recommendations thereon, the Proposal and report having been presented to and considered by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission called for and held a public hearing on February 13, 2019, the hearing having been held on the date and at the time and place noticed therefore, and,

after all parties wishing to testify before the Commission were sworn in, the Commission heard, received, and considered all oral and written comments and evidence which were made, presented, or filed, and all persons were given an opportunity to hear and be heard with respect to the Proposal and the Executive Officer's report; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has considered all factors pursuant to Government Code § 56668, the staff report, and the "Sativa County Water District Plan of Services (aka 'Sativa Los Angeles County Water District') Pursuant to Government Code § 56653" ("Plan of Services"), attached as Exhibit "I" to the staff report.

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF THE FOREGOING, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. This resolution making determinations is made pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, California Government Code § 56000 *et seq*;
2. The Proposal is assigned the following short-form designation: "Dissolution No. 2018-09 of the Sativa County Water District;"
3. The boundaries of the District are as they exist on February 13, 2019, and as depicted on the map in Exhibit "A" attached to the staff report;
4. The dissolution is consistent with the Zero Sphere of Influence adopted by the Commission on May 14, 2014;
5. The Commission finds that the proposed dissolution is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines § 15061, because

it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the dissolution of the District will have a significant effect on the environment;

6. The Commission finds that the dissolution of the District is not a project for purposes of CEQA because it is an organizational activity of government with no direct nor indirect effects on the physical environment, pursuant to § 15378(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines;
7. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56881(b)(1), the Commission hereby determines that the public service costs of a proposal that the Commission is authorizing are likely to be less than or substantially similar to the costs of alternative means of providing the service, in that the successor agency has, and a future long-term service provider will have, the necessary extensive and documented financial, technical, and management capabilities relative to providing retail water service consistent with all federal, state, and local water quality standards, and that the successor agency and future service provider will bring significant resources to bear in order to address the infrastructure deficiencies, operational shortcomings, and accounting inconsistencies formerly perpetrated by Sativa's board of directors and staff;
8. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56881(b)(2), the Commission hereby determines that the proposed dissolution will promote public access and accountability for community service needs and financial resources, in that the Commission has designated a successor agency, the County, which has a documented history of being accessible to the public, and conducting its affairs in a transparent manner, and the

County as successor agency will require the future long-term service provider to conduct its affairs in a transparent manner, in contrast to the prior practices of Sativa's board of directors and staff;

9. The Commission hereby dissolves the Sativa County Water District, subject to the following terms and conditions:
 - a. The dissolution of the District is not subject to majority protest nor election procedures, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 116687 (c)(3), which provides that this dissolution "shall not be subject to the provisions of § 57113 of the Government Code, nor to any other requirement for a protest proceeding or election," and "[t]he commission shall not impose any condition on the successor agency that requires a protest proceeding or an election;"
 - b. The dissolution is subject to completion of the 30-day reconsideration period provided under Government Code § 56895, and said reconsideration period ends at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, March 18, 2019;
 - c. In accordance with Government Code §§ 56886(p) and 57202, the effective date of the dissolution of the District is the date of recordation of the Certificate of Completion with the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk;
 - d. Upon the effective date, the District will be dissolved, disincorporated, and extinguished, and all of its corporate powers shall cease;
 - e. Upon the effective date, the County shall be the successor agency for the District, for the purposes of succeeding to all of the rights, duties and obligations of the

District with respect to enforcement, performance, or payment of outstanding bonds or other contracts and obligations of the District and winding up the affairs of the District pursuant to Government Code §§ 56886(m) and 57451(c) and subject to Health and Safety Code §116687;

- f. The County shall provide retail water service within the affected territory pursuant to the Plan of Services, until such time as an alternative service provider is identified and service responsibility is transferred to that provider;
- g. All of the moneys or funds, including cash on hand and moneys due but uncollected, and all property, real or personal of the District is vested in the County as the successor agency for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the dissolved District pursuant to Government Code §57452;
- h. As the successor agency, and upon the effective date, and for the sole and exclusive purpose of winding up the affairs of the dissolved District, the County shall have the power to exchange, sell, or otherwise dispose of all property, real and personal, of the District; to compromise and settle claims of every kind and nature; to sue or be sued in the same manner and to the same extent as the District and the officers and legislative body of the dissolved District, to the extent permitted by law pursuant to Government Code § 57453 and subject to Health and Safety Code § 116687(f);
- i. All property tax revenues and voter-approved special tax or special assessment revenues (if any), received or receivable by the District as of the effective date shall

be collected or collectible by the County, to be used for the purposes for which said taxes or special assessments were imposed;

- j. Subject to any authorizations provided in Health and Safety Code § 116687, until payment or provision for payment of amounts owing on account of outstanding bonds, contracts, or other obligations that are outstanding upon the effective date of the dissolution, which are payable in whole or in part from the revenues of a revenue-producing enterprise of the District, the County, prior to distribution, or any city or county, after distribution, shall not sell, encumber or otherwise dispose of all or any part of the revenue-producing enterprise or the revenues derived from that enterprise, except as expressly authorized by the ordinance, resolution, or indenture authorizing or providing for the issuance of any bonds, contracts, or other obligations. Prior to distribution, the County shall succeed to all rights and liabilities of the dissolved District under the ordinance, resolution or indentures authorizing such bonds, contracts or other obligations and may sue or be sued upon those rights and liabilities in the same manner and to the same extent as the dissolved District;
- k. The ownership, possession, and control of all books, records, papers, offices, equipment, supplies, moneys, funds, appropriations, licenses, permits, entitlements, agreements, contracts, claims, judgments, land, infrastructure, and other assets, 474 acre feet of adjudicated water rights in the Central Basin, priorities of use, right of use of water, capacity rights of public improvements or facilities, and property, real or personal, owned or leased by, connected with the administration of, or held for

the benefit or use of, the District, shall be vested in the County as the successor agency, and shall be administered to wind up the affairs of the District;

- I. Said books, records, papers, offices, equipment, supplies, moneys, funds, appropriations, licenses, permits, entitlements, agreements, contracts, claims, judgments, land, infrastructure, and other assets and property, real or personal, owned or leased by, connected with the administration of, or held for the benefit or use of, the District, includes, but is not limited to, the following:

Water Rights:

Four hundred seventy-four (474) acre feet of adjudicated Central Basin water rights;

Real Property:

1. Grant Deed recorded March 21, 1952 as Document No. 94 in Book 38524 Page 35 of Official Records, Lots 1 and 2 in Block D of Tract 4631, as per map recorded in Book 49 page 90 and 91 of Maps, AIN 6152-019-900;
2. Grant Deed recorded June 1, 2009 as Document No. 20090807841 of Official Records, Lots 46 and 47 in Block D of Tract 4631, as per map recorded in Book 49 page 90 and 91 of Maps, AIN 6152-019-901;
3. Grant Deed recorded December 23, 1943 as Document No. 1822 in Book 20440 Page 384 of Official Records, Lots 18 and 19 in Block 8 of the East Richland Tract, as per map recorded in Book 10 Page 1 of Maps, AIN 6154-010-900;
4. Grant Deed recorded July 1, 1992 as Document No. 92-1204743 of Official Records, Lots 58 and 58 in Block M of Tract 4631, as per map recorded in Book 49 page 90 and 91 of Maps, AIN 6155-005-900 and 6155-005-901;

Real Property (continued):

5. Grant Deed recorded October 26, 1940 as Document No. 189 in Book 17899 Page 280 of Official Records, Lots 35 and 36 in Block Q or Tract No. 4631, as per map recorded in Book 49 page 90 and 91 of Maps, AIN 6155-017-900;

Vehicles:

1. 2000 Ford F250 (VIN 1FTNF20L3YBC85558);
 2. 2008 Nissan Frontier (VIN 1N6BD06T78C426127);
 3. 2005 Chrysler Town & Country (VIN 2C4GP44R75R227368);
- m. Consistent with Government Code § 57462, the funds “of a dissolved district which have been impressed with any public trust, use or purpose shall continue to be so impressed;”
- n. Consistent with Government Code § 57463, any funds, money or property of the dissolved District may be used by the County for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the District, and after any distribution to any city, County or district, so far as practicable, the funds, money or property shall be used for the benefit of the lands, inhabitants, and taxpayers within the territory of the dissolved District.
- o. The County shall comply with all existing obligations and commitments to existing employees, consistent with State law, any existing employment agreements or contracts, and any adopted personnel policies, however this condition is not to be construed as creating an employment relationship between the County as the successor agency and any employee(s) of the District;

- p. The County shall “represent the interests of the public and the ratepayers within the former territory of the district,” pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 116687(c)(4);
- q. Within one hundred twenty (120) days of the effective date of the dissolution, and consistent with authority granted in Health and Safety Code § 116687(c)(4), the County as the successor agency shall issue a Request for Proposals (“RFP”), or equivalent, to solicit proposals to provide long-term water service for the customers of the dissolved District;
- r. If additional time is required to comply with Condition 9.q., above, the County shall notify the Commission in advance, in writing, with an anticipated schedule for completion;
- s. Consistent with language in Health and Safety Code § 116687(c)(4), which authorizes the successor agency to solicit proposals “in consultation with the commission,” the County shall appoint a LAFCO representative (or representatives) to the evaluation committee (or equivalent) which reviews all RFP submittals and makes a recommendation to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, unless said appointment is prohibited by law;
- t. Consistent with its efforts to “represent the interests of the public and the ratepayers within the former territory of the district,” and in making its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, the County shall consider the proposed rate structures submitted in responses by bidders to the RFP, unless said consideration is prohibited by law;

- u. Within the RFP, the County shall require all bidders to include:
 - i. a projection of water rates following acquisition of the system;
 - ii. anticipated schedule for design, funding, and construction of capital projects as described in the RFP;
 - iii. a proposed schedule, identifying key milestones and anticipated completion dates, for submittal, consideration, and approval of the bidder's application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to expand the bidder's existing, authorized service territory as currently approved by the CPUC, if applicable, as described in the RFP;
 - iv. a community outreach program, defining how the successful bidder intends to communicate with Sativa ratepayers upon acquisition of the system and thereafter;
- v. The County shall convene meetings with the community no less than four (4) times per year, until the County completes the RFP process, selects a long-term operator of the system, and/or the CPUC provides approval of the bidder's application to the CPUC to expand the bidder's existing, authorized service territory as currently approved by the CPUC, if applicable;
- w. The County shall maintain, and regularly update, a website, which shall contain the following information and documents:
 - i. Staff contact information, including telephone number, e-mail addresses, and hours of operation;

- ii. Information about the District's location, service territory, and contact information for the County Department of Public Works staff overseeing the dissolved District;
 - iii. Information about establishing service and paying bills;
 - iv. Notice of all upcoming community meetings, with notice posted to the website at least ten (10) days before each community meeting;
 - v. Information, schedule (critical dates/milestones), and progress reports concerning the RFP;
- x. Upon the effective date of this dissolution, and at the conclusion of each ensuing quarter year (every ninety (90) days) thereafter, the County shall provide the Commission with written reports that contain the following:
- i. Documenting the County's provision of retail water service to customers of the former District;
 - ii. the status of capital improvements;
 - iii. information concerning any grant applications or awards;
 - iv. a summary of recent community meetings;
 - v. any actions taken by the Board of Supervisors concerning the former District;
 - vi. the status of the RFP process; and
 - vii. the status of the successful bidder's application and approval by the CPUC, if applicable;

The County shall provide said written reports until the completion of the RFP process and selection of a long-term operator of the system, and/or the effective date of the CPUC approval of the bidder's application to the CPUC to expand the bidder's existing, authorized service territory as currently approved by the CPUC, if applicable;

10. The Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to mail certified copies of this resolution as provided in Government Code § 56882; and

11. As allowed under Government Code § 56107, the Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Officer to make non-substantive corrections to this resolution to address any technical defect, error, irregularity, or omission.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 13th Day of February 2019, by the Commission, by the following

MOTION: Hahn SECOND: Mirisch APPROVED: 9-0-0
AYES: Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Finlay

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



PAUL A. NOVAK, AICP, Executive Officer

**RESOLUTION NO. 2019-01RMD
RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION
COMMISSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
MAKING DETERMINATIONS DISAPPROVING
"ANNEXATION NO. 2014-04 TO THE CITY OF CALABASAS (WEST AGOURA ROAD)"**

WHEREAS, the City of Calabasas (City) adopted a resolution of application to initiate proceedings, which was submitted to the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles (Commission), pursuant to, Division 3, Title 5, of the California Government Code (commencing with § 56000, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000), for annexation of territory herein described to the City, and detachment of said territory from County Road District No. 3 and withdrawal from County Lighting Maintenance District 1687 and County Public Library System, all within the County of Los Angeles (County); and

WHEREAS, the City requested that the Commission amend the existing Sphere of Influence (SOI) for the City of Calabasas, which is currently a Coterminous SOI (one in which the City's jurisdictional boundary is the same as the SOI boundary), to add the affected territory in the proposed annexation to the City's SOI; and

WHEREAS, the proposed annexation ("Proposal") consists of approximately 57.78± acres of uninhabited territory and is assigned the following distinctive short-form designation: "Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road)"; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has reviewed the Proposal and submitted to the Commission a written report, including his recommendations therein, pursuant to Government Code § 56665; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has given notice of the public hearing pursuant to Government Code §§ 56150-56160, 56427, 57025, and 57026, wherein the public hearing notice was published in a newspaper of general circulation in the County on December 6, 2018, which is at least 21 days prior to the public hearing, and said hearing notice was also mailed to all required recipients by first-class mail on or before the date of newspaper publication; and

WHEREAS, on January 9, 2019, after being duly and properly noticed, this Proposal came on 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 Proposal and the report of the Executive Officer; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the Executive Officer's written report, including all factors required by Government Code § 56668; the written testimony submitted in advance of the public hearing; the written testimony submitted during the public hearing on January 9, 2019; and the oral testimony at the public hearing on January 9, 2019;

WHEREAS, the Commission disapproved the proposed annexation and the proposed SOI amendment at its January 9, 2019 meeting; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668 identifies seventeen (17) subsets of factors (identified as subsections (a) through (q)) to be considered in the review of a proposal; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(a) identifies "topography" as a factor, and the affected territory lies westerly of the existing boundary of the City, and the overwhelming majority of the existing City is on the far (easterly) side of a hill, and therefore somewhat removed from, the affected territory in the proposed annexation; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(a) identifies “proximity to other populated areas” as a factor, and the nearest existing homes in the City are found in a neighborhood which is located on the other side of a hill from the affected territory, and another neighborhood which is separated from most of the affected territory by the Ventura (U.S. 101) Freeway; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(b) identifies “the present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in the areas,” and nothing was provided in the record to suggest that existing governmental services and controls in the affected territory are, in any way, inadequate, and, during commission deliberations at the public hearing on January 9, 2019, commissioners stated that the county does a good job in providing services to unincorporated communities, and that all five County Supervisors devote extraordinary efforts to allocating resources to unincorporated communities; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(c) identifies “[t]he effect of the proposed action and of alternative actions, on adjacent areas,” and residents living in the City of Agoura Hills near the affected territory testified at the public hearing, and in writing, that they experience impacts associated with lighting, noise, and traffic from development within the affected territory, and to a degree substantially more significant than is experienced by residents living within the City, all of which were considered by the Commission, as further reflected during the Commission’s deliberations at the public hearing on January 9, 2019, at which time individual commissioners referred to this testimony, noting that the property is contiguous to existing homes in Agoura Hills, whose residents experience these impacts, and that one of the Commission’s purposes is to put residents first; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(i) identifies “[t]he sphere of influence of any local agency which may be applicable to the proposal being reviewed,” and the affected territory is outside the boundaries of the City’s SOI; the SOI was originally as an SOI that is coterminous to the City’s existing boundary by the Commission on July 8, 1992; the SOI was reconfirmed by the Commission on August 25, 2004 and October 10, 2012; in the 2004 and 2012 reconfirmations, the Commission adopted an SOI that is coterminous to the City’s existing boundary; and the Commission reconfirmed that the SOI should remain coterminous at the January 9, 2019 Meeting; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(j) identifies “[t]he comments of any affected local agency or other public agency,” and LAFCO received two letters from the County (dated December 19, 2018; and January 9, 2019) opposing the proposed annexation; four letters from the City of Agoura Hills (dated April 18, 2014; May 6, 2014; April 16, 2018; and January 3, 2019) expressing concerns about and/or opposing the proposed annexation; and four letters from the City (dated June 5, 2014; December 26, 2018; December 28, 2018; and December 27, 2019) supporting the proposed annexation, and addressing concerns raised by opponents of the proposed annexation; all of which were considered by the Commission; and, at the public hearing on January 9, 2019; several individuals spoke on behalf of public agencies; including individuals representing and speaking on behalf of the City (Mayor, Mayor pro Tem, two City Council-Members, City Manager, Assistant City Attorney, Public Works Director/City Engineer, Community Development Director, and City Planner); individuals representing and speaking on behalf of the City of Agoura Hills (Mayor, Mayor pro Tem, City Council-Member); the Senior Manager, Economic Development, in the Chief Executive Office of the County; an attorney

representing and speaking on behalf of the County; as well as several individuals who formerly served on the city councils of the City of Agoura Hills and the City; all of which also were considered by the Commission, as further reflected during the Commission's deliberations at the public hearing on January 9, 2019, at which time individual commissioners referred to specific letters and testimony from various public agency representatives; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 56668(n) identifies "[a]ny information or comments from the landowner, voters, or residents of the affected territory," and LAFCO received separate letters from two different parties owning land in the affected territory and in support of the proposed annexation (both dated December 11, 2018); separate letters from two different attorneys representing one of the landowners in the affected territory (both dated December 19, 2018); and a letter in support of the proposed annexation from a tenant in an existing office building located in the affected territory (dated December 5, 2018); all of which were considered by the Commission; and, at the public hearing on January 9, 2019; an individual who owns land in the affected territory spoke in support of the proposed annexation; and two different attorneys representing one of the landowners in the affected territory; which also was considered by the Commission; as further reflected during the Commission's deliberations at the public hearing on January 9, 2019, at which time individual Commissioners referred to specific testimony from a landowner within the affected territory, as well as lengthy discussions at the hearing between commissioners and an attorney representing a landowner within the affected territory; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is disapproving the proposed Sphere of Influence amendment to the City associated with the Proposal, the Commission therefore does not make

the determinations required in Government Code § 56425(e), subsections (1) through (5); and

WHEREAS, the disapproval of the proposed annexation does not require conducting authority (protest) proceedings pursuant to Government Code § 57000(b), which only requires conducting authority (protest) proceedings when “a proposal is approved by the commission;” and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines § 15270, CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves, and, therefore, the Commission’s disapproval of the proposed annexation and SOI amendment is exempt from CEQA.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. This resolution making determinations is made pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, California Government Code § 56000 *et seq*;
2. The affected territory consists of 57.78± acres, is uninhabited, and is assigned the following short form designation:

"Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road)",

and it is hereby not annexed to the City of Calabasas;
3. Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road) is hereby disapproved;
4. The proposed Sphere of Influence amendment to the City of Calabasas associated with the Proposal is hereby disapproved;

5. In disapproving Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road) and associated Sphere of Influence amendment to the City of Calabasas, the Commission makes the following determinations:

- a. Commission proceedings were commenced by the City in 2014;
- b. The affected territory consists of approximately 57.78± acres of unincorporated territory, composed of commercial and vacant land, and it is unpopulated;
- c. The affected territory is located generally westerly of the existing boundary of the City, and generally easterly of the existing boundary of the City of Agoura Hills;
- d. The Commission conducted a public hearing on January 9, 2018, at which time testimony was provided by twenty-seven (27) individuals, including persons representing and speaking on behalf of the County, the City, and the City of Agoura Hills; separate legal counsel to the County, the City, and a landowner in the affected territory; former elected officials of the City and the City of Agoura Hills; residents of the City of Agoura Hills who live near the affected territory; a resident of the City of Calabasas; and others;
- e. In making its decision to disapprove Annexation No. 2014-14 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road) and the associated Sphere of Influence amendment to the City of Calabasas, the Commission considered all evidence, testimony, and documentation submitted to the Commission from all agencies, jurisdictions, landowners, members of the public, proponents,

opponents, and others, all of which was submitted to the Commission prior to and at the January 9, 2019 public hearing;

- f. The Commission exercised independent judgment and discretion in making a reasonable and well-informed decision based on the information provided and, on that basis, determined to disapprove the annexation and associated SOI amendment; and, further, in making its decision, the Commission exercised independent judgment on behalf of the interests of residents, property owners, and the public as a whole;
- g. Annexation of the affected territory to the City will not promote orderly growth and development, discourage urban sprawl, preserve open space and efficiently extend government services, including providing governmental services and housing for persons and families at all incomes in the most efficient manner feasible;
- h. The affected territory lies westerly of the existing boundary of the City, and the overwhelming majority of the existing City is on the far (easterly) side of a hill, and therefore somewhat removed from, the affected territory in the proposed annexation;
- i. The nearest existing homes in the City are found in a neighborhood which is located on the other side of a hill from the affected territory, and another neighborhood which is separated from most of the affected territory by the Ventura (U.S. 101) Freeway, and both neighborhoods are therefore somewhat removed from the affected territory in the proposed annexation;

- j. The County currently allocates resources to provide adequate, reliable, and sound governmental services and controls in the affected territory; and there was no evidence in the record to suggest that existing governmental services and controls in the affected territory are, in any way, inadequate;
- k. The effect of the proposed action, and/or any alternate action, is felt most by residents living in the City of Agoura Hills near the affected territory, from whom substantial testimony was provided at the public hearing, documenting how these residents experience impacts associated with lighting, noise, and traffic from existing development within the affected territory, and to a degree substantially more significant than is experienced by residents living within the City;
- l. The affected territory is not located within the City's SOI; and the Commission reconfirmed the City's SOI in 1992 and 2004 as an SOI that is coterminous to the City's existing jurisdictional boundary;
- m. The record includes substantial correspondence from representatives of affected public agencies, including multiple letters from the County, the City, and the City of Agoura Hills; as well as testimony at the public hearing from a representative of the County and outside legal counsel for the County; three elected officials of the City of Agoura Hills; and several individuals who formerly served as elected officials of the City and the City of Agoura Hills;
- n. The record includes correspondence from two landowners in the affected territory; letters from two attorneys representing a landowner in the affected

territory; and a letter from a tenant in an existing office building located in the affected territory; as well as testimony at the public hearing from an individual who owns land in the affected territory;

6. The Commission finds that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15270, CEQA does not apply to projects that a public agency rejects or disapproves, and therefore, in disapproving Annexation No. 2014-04 to the City of Calabasas (West Agoura Road) and the proposed SOI amendment, the Commission finds that its actions are exempt from CEQA;
7. The Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to mail copies of this resolution as provided in Government Code § 56882; and
8. As allowed under Government Code § 56107, the Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Officer to make non-substantive corrections to this resolution to address any technical defect, error, irregularity, or omission.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 13th day of February 2019.

MOTION:	Hahn	SECOND:	Mirisch	APPROVED:	9-0-0
AYES:	Barger, Close, Dear, Hahn, McCallum, Mirisch, Mitchell (Alt. for Finlay), Smith, Gladbach				
NOES:	None.				
ABSTAIN:	None.				
ABSENT:	Finlay				

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



**Paul A. Novak, AICP
Executive Officer**