

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**Minutes of Special Meeting of  
December 4, 2001**

A Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Long Beach Community College District, County of Los Angeles, California, was held in Building I, Liberal Arts Campus, 4901 East Carson Street, Long Beach, on Tuesday, December 4, 2001.

**CALL TO ORDER**

President Clark called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Student Trustee Angelica Torres led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL**

Present:                   President Clark, Vice President Uranga,  
                                  Member McNinch, Member Polsky, Member Thorpe,  
                                  and Student Trustee Torres

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Opportunity will be given to citizens to address the Board of Trustees on matters of general District business. This is the time for members of the public to speak and be heard and share their comments with the Board and for the Board to listen. Therefore, the public should not expect the Board to comment or respond to public comments. A particular position should not be inferred if there are no Board member comments during this time.

The time limits are five minutes for items appearing on the agenda and three minutes for items not appearing on the agenda. The time limits may be extended with approval of the Board. Action may not be taken on items not appearing on the agenda. After receiving testimony, the Board may recommend placing such item(s) on the agenda of a future meeting or referring the items to staff for a report.

President Clark: At this time we will have Public Comments and I have one request and others will be honored as well if they speak to the subject that we have before us this evening, which is, fundamentally, only one subject. If there's anything else that you'd like to

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
December 4, 2001**

bring up you can bring it up as far as general district business in that this is an announced meeting of the Board. At this time, I will call Mr. Donaldson who submitted a request to speak. You're limited to five minutes. Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. Donaldson: I'll be glad to wait until you get to the agenda item.

President Clark: Well this is your opportunity to speak.

Mr. Donaldson: This is it?

Member Thorpe: I think our policy does say that they have three minutes for each agenda announced item, if they wish, as they're taken up. That is our policy.

Member McNinch: I think it's five, Darwin.

Member Thorpe: For each agenda item?

Assistant Superintendent-Secretary Bradshaw: Yes.

Member McNinch: Read the Public Comments.

Member Thorpe: I'm not talking about Public Comments, I'm talking about each agenda item.

President Clark: It's three minutes for items not appearing on the agenda.

Member Thorpe: It's three minutes on each agenda item.

Member McNinch: This is today's agenda.

Vice President Uranga: Clarification. Are you addressing an agenda item?

Mr. Donaldson: Yes.

Member Polsky: He gets five minutes.

President Clark: You want to speak when the agenda item comes up? Is that correct? I don't want to miss anybody who wants the opportunity to speak at this time.

Mr. Donaldson: Yes.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

President Clark: I think that everyone realizes that there's only one item that we're really here tonight for, although there are a number of items related to that, and that is having the bond issue placed on the March ballot. I think that we all realize that this is critical to the college if we're going to be able to provide the services and keep the quality of this college up, that we have the resources to do this. I think we all realize that the state does not provide resources; some, yes. If there is a bond issue later in the year, probably not in March,

November, then we'll have matching funds which will enhance what we are able to do. So we're here tonight to discuss this issue of putting the bond issue on the ballot.

Gene, let me ask you to go over just the parameters of the bond issue, the amount, the rate that we would have as far as the bond issue is concerned.

Gene Farrell: I'd be happy to. We approached this by first trying to determine what our needs were, recognizing that if we do a Prop 39 bond, we're limited to a max of \$25 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation. When we went through all of our projects, we began with this document that many of you have read and that's been shared with the Board, and we had an assessment of the condition of all of our buildings. We determined that with that, and a relatively conservative estimate of our growth over the years, we would need \$176 million over the next ten to fifteen years to meet our capital needs. This equates to about, and it's just barely shy of \$15 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation with, of course, the cap being \$25.

President Clark: If we use Prop 39 we have to then select an Audit Committee which annually reviews that the money is spent as it's listed in the proposal. So, that's part of this. It's a seven-member Board that's selecting and meeting certain parameters it has to review the expenditures of these funds. With that, said we can go to item 1.1.

#### **Resolution for General Obligation Bond Election**

It was moved by Member McNinch, seconded by Member Uranga, that the Board approve Resolution No. 120401A authorizing the District to request the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles to call an election authorizing general obligation bonds of the District in consolidation with the general election scheduled for March 5, 2002.

Member Thorpe: I'd like to pass this out to members of the Board. I have abundant copies for everyone in the room later on, if they so desire. I hope there are no environmentalists in the room.

Member McNinch: The trees are shaking, I can tell.

Member Thorpe: This is the addendum for the report, which is backup material for the main remarks. And I have only a half-hour to report Mr. Chairman? I'm just kidding.

President Clark: Well, as a member of the Board you have an obligation to be concise if you possibly can.

Member Thorpe: No. Would you think, maybe ten. I'd like to put these on the record, because I don't want to be misinterpreted in the community. I'm not against bonds. I spent my life in public education. I spent 37 years of those lives in community college education. It's the great American invention. The only American invention on higher education, and all that has nothing to do with the fact that some districts in our state have almost gone belly-up because they misused bond money. I know we won't do that. I know our administration won't do that. In fact, the legislature was so sure we wouldn't do that, that they required us to appoint the committee that Member Clark just said we had to appoint. I'd like to say something about that. That's what my remarks go to.

We have before us this evening a proposal to ask the voters in our District to grant us the authorization to increase their property taxes in order to build, modify, renovate, or update buildings on our two campuses—and for some reason, acquiring real property was left out of the proposed ballot statement we’re dealing with tonight. Since November 3, when I was first given the list of needs to ponder, I often thought of the old saying, “It’s easier to ride a horse in the direction it is going.” But this evening I think we need to reassess where we are going regarding the financing of our proud institution, and set aside this proposal for a later time.

General revenue bonds are a time-honored method of generating funds, and fairly spreading the burden across the public, to pay for clearly identified educational, environmental, safety, and other civic and social needs. And when public support for such revenues is sought, it is customary that the reasons for the increased taxation are specifically and truthfully demonstrated, discussed in open forums at some length, and communicated to the public in an open, timely manner, to assure the fairest and widest input possible. I think Long Beach City College has failed to obtain the necessary input. Let me explain that. The Long Beach City College bond consultant, admitting that the district did not have, “...current polling data....,” also omitted the fact that an \$80 million dollar target was used to conduct telephone interviews in February of 2000, which generated data to show, at that time, that 53.5 percent of the voters would support such a general obligation bond. And this was well before the current “moderate recession,” and September 11!

Member McNinch: Dr. Clark, would it be possible to have Member Thorpe’s remarks entered into the record in order for efficiency in this meeting without the entire reading, or am I out of order?

President Clark: It would be possible, but it’s his choice.

Member McNinch: O.K. Thank you.

Member Thorpe: I’d like to continue with these five pages and this will probably be the last thing I’ll say on the bond.

Joint governance, a hallmark in community college management, has been avoided, as staff was unable to participate in compiling “the list,” before us or project. The “project” now constitutes an unspecified, un-prioritized, largely un-examined, wish list by management. The cost of the “list” has gone from \$80 million in February 2000, to \$163 million being contemplated last November 3, to \$176 million this evening. One of the silliest wishes on the list is an item, 125 new classrooms in the next 20 years, for \$38 million dollars. Which classrooms; which curriculum; and built where? The lack of prioritization means the management can buy the planetarium for that science building, or property to divide the District into two colleges. The college division project was recently placed on the back burner, until we take the bond proposal vote. If such a bond passes, you won’t be able to see PCC for the steam. In fact, indications are—and lamentably, indications are all that we have—that management wishes to conduct such a bond election in almost fanatical haste, to assure the least dissemination of information, to assure passage of the bond by an uninformed, although well meaning, public.

My own attempts to gain background information from which to study and comment on the October 31 consultant's report have met with management contempt and derision, and some of the silliest excuses for non-compliance you have ever seen, and that's in the data appended to this report which you are welcome to a copy of. The legal term "college operations," was ill defined in the law. Even if a bond were to pass, the lack of specificity and prioritization, together with current management's lack of eagerness to provide meaningful information, and the Chancellor's reluctance to clarify budgeting practices in local colleges, brings the efficient and statutory functioning of the required independent oversight committee, which is what Member Clark talked about, into serious question. To paraphrase Herbert, "For want of the specificity, the goal was lost; for want of the goal, the oversight was lost; and for want of the oversight, the bond money was lost."

Any consideration of a new bond for LBCC should first consider management's inability to manage its current funds for building construction and remodeling. In one reprehensible case, while experiencing an average annual 9.4 percent general fund increase over the previous five years, management permitted a \$2.4 million dollar cost overrun on a \$12.5 million dollar remodel of the science building "D," finishing it in June 2000. Then, as one example of the numerous distortions and omissions leading to management's assertion that the college facilities were deteriorated and crumbling, listed the "D" building as having been built in 1973! The public, if such an unwarranted bond were to pass, would be in the position of providing revenues, which cannot be spent on salaries or operations, to an administration which has already demonstrated fund-management deficiencies.

Earlier school bonds, which is the main experience area of the District's bond consultant, were passed in districts by voters in order to support students within those districts. District residence was also required, at one time, for the community colleges. However, students can now attend Long Beach City College from throughout a large region. Indeed, almost a third of our enrollment is made up of students beyond our taxation borders! And I thank you. Although our board clearly is responsible for the academic and economic health of our service programs, we should not be responsible for urging the taxpayers within our college district to commit themselves to huge bonds to pay for facilities acquisition and renovation for future out-of-district students.

Lastly, fear tactics, I'm sorry to say, are the order-of-the-day at Long Beach City College. First, there is the education establishment's popularized notion that the children of the baby boomers will swarm into the community colleges in the next few years, in a phenomenon management terms, "Tidal Wave II." There is absolutely no evidence available suggesting that such an unmanageable student enrollment will occur. If you'd like to check that out, I'm just a Trustee, you can argue with the Legislative Analyst of the State of California. Closely allied with this is the claim that such a bond must be passed in order for the revenues to be leveraged against matching funds from a November 2002 state, and some people call it, a mega-bond, \$14 billion, maybe, recently reactivated and in discussion by the legislature. This is as highly speculative, especially in the current economic climate, as it was last spring when the legislature first discussed it, and then abandoned it.

Then there is the other, more proximal fear, fear by staff at the college to even be seen talking with other people, about anything. The fear that has administrators reporting any

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
December 4, 2001**

Trustee comment directly to the Superintendent; the fear that has a manager, Mr. Bill Flory, holding what I contend are illegal, mandatory meetings with custodians on work time, violating the college's own policy. Not only was a packet handed out to these people declaring we had already passed the bond's project list - in fact when I read it I thought why come to the meeting, we've already passed it this evening. It was passed out last Monday or Tuesday. Some may call this good management anticipation, or does Mr. Flory know something I don't. And a curious agenda item for next Thursday's Budget Advisory Committee Meeting states, "Passing a General Obligation Bond." I will attend that meeting, because I'm sure his message will be - and he's listed, Mr. Flory as the person that will speak to that item - I'm sure his message will be on how to maintain a legal posture while continuing to aid the passage of the bond.

There are a lot of serious distractions in our society this holiday season; the war, lay-offs, anthrax, the recession. This multiplies the normal fears of our students when they're taking final exams. Can I afford to make it through Long Beach City College; are we taking the right courses; and will there be jobs out there when we finish? We need equipment and facilities, but these do not teach students; people do. And the proposal before us this evening does not answer these questions, nor does it contain legitimate reasons why we should ask for \$176 million dollars.

The fear even goes, and let me pass these out... You're welcome to all of these. This is the second addendum to my report. This is one of the students at the college who was handcuffed and arrested, I'm sorry not a student, a staff member of this college, for going to a meeting she had been told earlier not to go to, the way I got the story; a meeting which was held to select the new Vice President of, I believe, is still Administrative Affairs -- the new business manager. This is an example of the thing that this college cannot, absolutely cannot tolerate if we were to pass any kind of a bond.

(Member Thorpe handed out two attachments to his report, including two pictures.)

And let me just switch right now, to the last two paragraphs. There is now abundant time to provide for an independent outside audit of district finances, by an auditor other than our current vendor—never a bad idea as we are now in the process of hiring a new Vice President of Administrative Services; and assess real need beyond the current District's revenue-capacity to satisfy it; learn if the legislature's mega-bond proposal to aid community colleges comes true; and only if indicated, place a bond proposal on the November 2002 ballot. And I can tell you now, that if this bond election tonight were on money to students, I wouldn't even be reading this, I'd just vote it and maybe try to steer it.

Arising out of such a process will be a renewed look at the facilities needed to promote our mission. And instead of, in the words of John Naisbitt, "Finding a parade, and running to get out in front of it to lead it," we on the Board can help, with the students, the community, and all of the staff of Long Beach City College, to create a new and even superior parade of our own.

Our founding fathers established our country on the principle of "no taxation without representation." Before we ask Avalon, Lakewood, Long Beach, and Signal Hill voters to rush to taxation, we need to pause and at least give the public honest and intelligent

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
December 4, 2001**

information on which to make an informed decision. It seems to me we owe our constituents nothing less. And I simply want to thank Member Clark for allowing me to read this.

Member Clark: Is there anyone else who would like to speak to item 1.1.

Mary Williams: Members of the Board and the voting public. My name is Mary Williams, I'm a voting member of the public, participating in all Long Beach elections for the past 17 years. I vote in every election held here and also advise my neighbors, other Long Beach voters of the elections, if they are unsure of the measure.

In addition, I am a former employee of Long Beach City College, working here from 1990 through April of this year. I was employed in Facilities for the first three years and Fiscal Operations for the last seven years. The former Vice President of Administrative Services, Barbara Kalbus, was a great asset to the college, and would always make sure that the district would not be offering bonds to help out the finances. To be offering bonds to help out the district would be a sign of failure that the district financial planning was not done correctly in a conservative manner. Since I was working in Fiscal Operations, I know that the last time the cash and accounts were balanced was for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998. Since then, the new administration has never balanced the cash, nor the accounts in any of the funds. Unfortunately, it appears the external auditing firm have waived this requirement. Bonds should not be approved by the Long Beach public until the Long Beach Community College is financially stable, until the cash and remaining accounts are balanced and the information that the district supplies the public can be verified by another external auditing firm. The district did not need to spend a half-million dollars on the Human Resources trailers, along with other pet projects. There are loopholes where the district can find other funding needs. Citizen of Long Beach say no the Long Beach City College bond measure.

Member Thorpe: Can I.....

President Clark: No. John do you want to speak?

Member Thorpe: Pardon me. Before you speak. The Chairman has just advised me that I can't ask a question of the person who testified because I've had four pages of stuff.

President Clark: I think that we listen to the public and then you can ask questions.

Member Thorpe: Oh, o.k. I just wanted to make that clear.

John Donaldson: My name is John Donaldson. I live approximately two miles from here at Clark and Spring Street. I've been in business in the City of Long Beach for almost 20 years and ran one of its largest companies, and have been in partnership with this college for almost the same period of time. In fact I taught here almost 20 years ago, and have engaged in instructional partnership with PCC and LAC.

I come to you today as a business person and ask you as the body of people who we place in trust, to do the right thing for the taxpayers in the city since you're the city, to do no less than what a business would do. Put a financial plan and match it up with an operational plan. Let's see the vision. Let's see the plan that goes with the vision and let's see the financial,

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
December 4, 2001**

the budgetary or the capital plans that work that out. I ask you to do no less for the public than I as a business would have to do for a banker or stakeholder in the business I'm operating.

I called here for documentation on this agenda item because I saw it in the newspaper and I am concerned as a local citizen about taxes. I watched our city float \$138 million dollar bond to float an aquarium based on bogus numbers. I watched our school district now float a major bond issue and have not heard a single report back from the oversight committee that was supposed to monitor the spending of those funds. I read reports about the citizens of Los Angeles who went in and knew the deficits of their district, put a great oversight committee in place, and watched the administration stonewall for three years the oversight committee that was put in place for the spending of those funds, and they are now spent and less than half of the projects been done. I'm just concerned; there are no accusations, other than when I call and I look for documents and I get an unspecified, unprioritized list, wish list, I look at it as, and I'm sure that many, if not all of the projects on there are necessary. What would be No. 1? What would be No. 2? How do you back that analysis of the deficits of these structures up with real project estimates? Has the project estimator done a good takeoff on them? Do we have an idea how projects would be managed. I didn't find anything in here in terms of an outline of how one would execute a capital plan like this.

I would think that one of the first things you'd want to do in selling the \$176 million bond to the public would be name that oversight committee and create a pact between that oversight committee and the management of this college to assure the community that those funds are going to get looked over and spent - every penny of it - in the wisest and best possible way, with no project overruns. It's really not the job of the management of this college to be great project managers. But you do have a responsibility under Proposition 39 to make sure you set up an oversight committee that does its job; it's empowered to do it. And I'd like to know who that's going to be and I'd like to know that they're not going to meet more than once annually; that they're going to meet regularly to monitor how the money is spent - not in megaways, but down to examining small things in the project. To be the kind of community auditors that an oversight committee was meant to be.

I do not think that my neighbors are willing to float another bond issue, as they have in the past. Times have changed. The economy is on decline and we're having all kinds of other spending priorities, not the least of which are going to come at the state level from their bungling of the energy crisis, and the increased needs for security. People are going to be more careful and look at things more closely. People like myself want to speak out in support of this, but I can't do it; not based on the information that I've been given and not based on the experience in the past -- not just with this particular institution, although there have been some mismanaged construction projects here -- but almost all government and education construction projects have been botched. We need to assure the community that this will not be the case in this instance and you need to do more work. You are our trustees. You should not take management's information and simply pass resolutions. You should look into this. You should know the answer to all the questions I've put forward, particularly, the business questions. Every one one of you has probably had to go to a banker. Would you take this to your banker?

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
December 4, 2001**

President Clark: I don't think that we can appoint an audit committee until this is successful. Is that correct? We would have been very happy to do that, Mr. Donaldson, if we could do that. But I don't think that we can do that until the bond issue passes. Mr. Francis is with our legal firm that's assisting us and hopefully keeping us out of trouble.

David Francis: I apologize. I'm late. I got stuck on the freeway. The Citizens Oversight Committee does not get elected until after a successful bond election and then the Board has 60 days in which to accomplish that. Obviously it would be a good thing to do sooner rather than later after the election, but that's the Proposition 39 requirement.

President Clark: So, that's the problem we have, John, we can't give you a committee, because we can't appoint one. I'd be very happy to do it if we could.

John Donaldson: Mayor Riordan did.

President Clark: Well, I don't know about Mayor Riordan, but that's a different issue. This is state law and we're not under Riordan law. Anyone else from the public who would like to speak to this item 1.1? (No response.) Any more discussion on the part of the Board? You want to speak to it?

Member Thorpe: No, no, no. I just want to ask a question.

Member McNinch: Call for the question.

President Clark: Well, go ahead. Darwin has the floor. Go ahead and ask your question.

Member Thorpe: Let's see. Who was the first speaker - Mary Williams? You had stated something about balancing the cash for three years? Did I get that wrong, or the numbers?

Mary Williams: Yes. The cash has not been reconciled to the County since the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998. Somehow the external auditing firm had waived the requirement. It hasn't been done.

President Clark: Catalina do you want to speak to this? Catalina come to the microphone. If we have statements made.....

Mary Williams: I do know that Catalina has tried and her daughter when she was a LTE.

President Clark: Let me let her speak. You've had your chance. Catalina, do you want to go to the microphone. We had statements made and I think if we have people here that have different answers we should hear them.

Vice President Uranga: Can I ask for a point of order? It seems to me that we're entering a different phase of this hearing here where we're going into a public debate on issues other than the bond. What happened between 1998 and today, or what happened prior to 1998, I guess, is what this discussion is going to, I think have been resolved and I think perhaps our financial person will address that; but what I'm saying basically is that if we can hold our discussions and hold our viewpoints related to this issue that we have on the table and not to

anything other than that. I think if we talk about what happened with Building D or what happened with financials in prior years, I think, is detrimental, you're just raising old skeletons, or whether they are skeletons or not, I have no idea. I've been on this Board a year and a half and I have seen nothing, absolutely nothing that would lead me to believe that this administration and this Board have done anything other than to maintain its integrity and to hold the college as its highest priority, especially when it comes to addressing the needs of the buildings, of its infrastructure, of its students, and, most importantly, Darwin, you'll like this, its faculty and its staff. I have seen nothing to defray my belief in that and I'm very proud that I'm on this Board and I'm proud of the fact that when it comes to decision-making that I keep politics out of it when it comes to making a decision on this, because I feel that this bond for this issue, this topic, is the right thing to do. It's right for the college, it's right for the community, it's right for the students and that's my belief and let's hold our comments, please, to this specific item that we have right here before us.

President Clark: I would totally agree, but I think we have an issue as far as credibility of the Board and I think that is an issue. We've had people raising the fact that we're not credible. I think this is an issue of that type.

Member Thorpe: Member Clark, it's not an issue that the Board's not credible; the issue's been raised that management is not credible.

President Clark: No, Darwin, I have not recognized you.

Member Thorpe: I'm sorry, Member Clark.

President Clark: Catalina, do you want to answer this question. I would agree 100% with Roberto. We can keep specifically to the bond issue instead of this whole myriad of outside issues that have been raised and unfortunately, have nothing to do with the bond issue. Catalina.

Catalina Cruz: Yes, I would like to have that opportunity to respond because I do not actually savor listening to the criticism of what's happening in the office. I know and so do the auditors know the importance of reconciling cash and that does not have to be told to me to my face. The thing is the auditors, and Mary Williams does not know this, the auditors have looked at our working papers on the reconciliation, but there are issues of materiality, there are issues of priorities. As all of you know, we ventured into the PeopleSoft implementation system almost hands down. We were told, "Do that. That's what you're going to do." That was the priority. However, even though we were continuing with implementation of PeopleSoft, we continued with the reconciliation of the cash because we knew how important it was and the auditors looked at our working papers. They were satisfied that we knew the responsibility. We made an effort to do the reconciliation, but the priorities were there and they did not see any material effect on the financial statements because the cash was not reconciled. And that is the position up to now. We're continuing to reconcile and, as I said, the working papers have been shown to the auditors; they were satisfied with an explanation. As I said, the question is resources and the priorities. PeopleSoft implementation went ahead, but the auditors looked at our working papers, the auditors looked at the financial statements, and they expressed an opinion on whether the non-reconciliation of the cash materially affected the statements and they said it didn't.

President Clark: Thank you, Catalina.

Member Thorpe: Could I just have one question?

Member McNinch: No. The question has been called.

President Clark: Wait a minute. We're trying to keep this to the issue of the bond, as Roberto indicated.

Member Thorpe: That's what I'm trying to do.

President Clark: No, it's not.

Member Thorpe: I see. I've got the muzzle on.....

President Clark: Do we have anybody else from the audience who wanted to speak to this? (no response). O.K. I've had a call for the question. Madam Clerk would you call the roll.

The motion carried with Members Clark, McNinch, Polsky and Uranga voting aye, and Member Thorpe voting no.

Vice President Uranga: I know we've taken the vote, but I'd like to ask Member Thorpe specifically why he voted no on this issue? Specifically, for the record. Why? Why a "no"?

Member Thorpe: I've been in politics a long time and to hear someone on this Board say that they leave politics out when they cast a decision; well, so do I, Member Uranga, and there's nothing in what I read to you tonight that's political. It's out there. If you want to pass this bond, then you'd better use this as a manual and help clean up management's act, because that's why I'm against it. I'm not against bonds. If there was a proposal tonight specifically, you wanted specifically, and if you want a "yes" or "no" answer, then get on Double Jeopardy. This is not Double Jeopardy. This is Long Beach City College and the Board of Trustees.

**General Obligation Bond Facilities Project List**

It was moved by Member McNinch, seconded by Member Uranga, that the Board approve the following General Obligation Bond Facilities Projects List:

**LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Prop 39 Project List**

In connection with the decision by the Board of Trustees of the Long Beach Community College District (the District) to call for a general obligation bond election on March 5, 2002, the Board has approved the following as the list of projects for which bonds issued under Proposition 39 would be expended:

General Improvements. At both the Liberal Arts Campus (Carson and Clark Streets) and the Pacific Coast Campus (Orange Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway), the District intends to use bond proceeds to reimburse the District for state or other District funds that may be used to provide for any project on the list below, and to make improvements to internal walkways, access roads and parking lots, to install new and safer exterior lighting, signage and security systems, to landscape and sprinkler open areas at and between buildings and at physical education facilities, to install modern infrastructure and utilities, including water, sewer, heating, ventilation and air conditioning, fiber-optic cables and related technological improvements, to improve access ways in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, remove and replace hazardous building materials, and to purchase and install furnishings and equipment at all facilities being constructed, renovated, improved or remodeled with the proceeds of bonds. The following projects lists are in no priority order.

The listings do not suggest any particular priority for construction amongst the proposed projects, which remains a province of the Board of Trustees.

Liberal Arts Campus Improvements. The District intends to undertake the following specific projects at the Liberal Arts Campus, each of which involves major renovations, remodeling and improvements, and some of which involve removing old hazardous building materials and making, where required, seismic safety improvements:

- Administration Building (Building A)
- Technical Building (Building B)
- Nursing, Health and Technology Building (Building C)
- Math/Science Building (Building D)
- College Center (Building E)
- Family Consumer Studies Building (Building F)
- Music Building (Building G)
- Theater Arts Building (Building H)
- Auditorium (Building J)
- Library/Learning Center (Building L)
- Business, Computer, Social Sciences Building (Building M)
- Administrative Services Building (Building N)
- Language Arts Building (Building P)
- Physical Education Building
- Small Gymnasium (Building Q)
- Large Gymnasium (Building R)
- Aero-Pilot Building (Building T)
- Grounds Department (Building U)
- Construct new Bookstore/Student Services Building
- Replace and Construct new Child Development Center
- Construct New Classroom Building or Buildings to accommodate student growth and future program demands

Pacific Coast Campus. The District intends to undertake the following specific capital improvement projects at the Pacific Coast Campus, each of which involves major

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
December 4, 2001**

renovations, remodeling and improvements, and some of which involve repairing fire damage, removing old hazardous building materials and making, where required, seismic safety improvements:

General/Administration Building (Building AA)  
Humanities/English as a Second Language Building (Building BB)  
Fitness Center (Building CC)  
Social Science Building (Building DD)  
Student Center/Bookstore (Building EE)  
Fine Arts/Senior Center (Building FF)

Library/Learning Resource Center (Building GG)  
Constructions Trades Building (Building MM)  
Machine Shop (Building UU)  
Welding Shop (Building VV)  
Parent Education Building (Building OO)  
Replace and Construct New Diesel Shop, Automotive Shop, Aeronautics  
Shop and Auto Body Shop (Buildings RR, SS, TT and QQ)  
Replace and Construct Child Development Center  
Construct New Classroom Building or Buildings to accommodate student  
growth and future program demands

NOTE: Any construction program is subject to the review of the Citizens Oversight Committee, as provided in Education Code Section 15278 *et seq.*

President Clark: Is there anyone who would like to speak to item 1.2? (no response)  
Any discussion on the part of the Board?

The motion carried, with Members Clark, McNinch, Polsky and Uranga voting aye, and Member Thorpe voting no.

**Tax Rate Statement**

It was moved by Member McNinch, seconded by Member Polsky, that the Board approve the Tax Rate Statement regarding the proposed \$176,000,000 Long Beach Community College District general obligation bonds.

Vice President Uranga: I have a question on that. The numbers that were put together here for assessed value \$1.50 per \$100.....

President Clark: It's 1.1 cent. We made the same mistake.

Vice President Uranga: 1.1 cent. O.K. I'm sorry. Thank you. That clarifies it for me.

President Clark: Anyone in the audience who wants to speak to this. Anyone on the Board who wants to discuss it? (no response)

The motion carried with Members Clark, McNinch, Polsky and Uranga voting aye, and Member Thorpe voting no.

**Resolution, Reimbursement of Expenses**

It was moved by Member McNinch, seconded by Member Polsky, that the Board adopt Resolution No. 120401B to enable the District to be reimbursed for expenditures for certain capital projects from the proceeds of tax exempt securities.

President Clark: Anyone from the audience who would like to speak to this item?  
Anyone from the Board who wants to speak to this item?

Member Thorpe: Yes, I have a question. I'm not going to support it, obviously, but it says, "NOW, THEREFORE,..... Section 1. All of the foregoing Recitals are true and correct." If someone could interpret that for me. Does that mean everything that's in the other resolutions, or part of that, or all of it? It's a pretty absolute statement, "All of the Recitals are true and correct." If we vote that makes them true.

David Francis: That statement in the resolution refers to the recitals in that particular resolution which is the reimbursement of expenditures and not to the prior resolution.

Member Thorpe: Only this resolution.

David Francis: Yes.

The motion carried, with Members Clark, McNinch, Polsky and Uranga voting aye, and Member Thorpe voting no.

**ADJOURNMENT**

President Clark: Unless there is any further business, at this point we're adjourned. Thank you very much for coming. Now we've got to go out and win this bond issue.

President Clark adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on January 15, 2002. The first order of business will be adjournment to a closed session, as needed. The Board will reconvene in open session at 5:00 p.m. in Building I, Liberal Arts Campus.

Assistant Secretary