NOTICE ABOUT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT BOARD MEETINGS

The Board welcomes public discussion

- The public’s comments on agenda items will be taken at the time the item is discussed by the Board.
- To comment on items not on the agenda, a member of the public may address the Board under “Statements from the Public on Non-Agenda Items”; at this time, there can be discussion on any matter related to the Colleges or the District, except for personnel items. No more than 20 minutes will be allocated for this section of the agenda. No Board response will be made nor is Board action permitted on matters presented under this agenda topic.
- If a member of the public wishes to present a proposal to be included on a future Board agenda, arrangements need to be made through the Chancellor’s Office at least seven days in advance of the meeting. These matters will be heard under the agenda item “Presentations to the Board by Persons or Delegations”. A member of the public may also write to the Board regarding District business; letters can be addressed to 3401 CSM Drive, San Mateo CA 94402.
- Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services will be provided such aids with a three-day notice. For further information, contact the Executive Assistant to the Board at (650) 574-6550.
- Regular Board meetings are taped; tapes are kept for one month.

6:00 p.m. ROLL CALL

Pledge of Allegiance

NEW BUSINESS

06-10-1A Approval of personnel actions: changes in assignment, compensation, placement, leaves, staff allocations and classification of academic and classified personnel

06-10-1B Adoption of Resolution No. 06-13 of the San Mateo County Community College District in Support of Proposition 87, The Clean Alternative Energy Initiative

06-10-2B Adoption of Resolution No. 06-14 of the San Mateo County Community College District Opposing Proposition 88, the Statewide Parcel Tax for Education Funding

06-10-3B Report on local ballot issues of interest to the District and adoption of “support” position for Measures A, I, M and N

06-10-100B Review of College Vista budget and approval of budget transfers

06-10-101B Construction Improvement Program Management Contract Authorization

STUDY SESSION

06-10-1C Information on Program to Accelerate Issuance of Remaining General Obligation Bond Proceeds
RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

1. Closed Session Personnel Items
   A. Public Employment
      Employment: College of San Mateo – Admissions and Records Assistant II, Admissions and Records/Student Services Division
   B. Public Employee Discipline, Dismissal, Release

CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS TAKEN

ADJOURNMENT
BOARD REPORT NO. 06-10-1A

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: Ron Galatolo, Chancellor-Superintendent

PREPARED BY: Harry W. Joel, Vice-Chancellor,
Human Resources and Employee Relations, (650) 358-6767

APPROVAL OF PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Changes in assignment, compensation, placement, leaves, staff allocations and classification of academic and classified personnel:

A. Reassignment

Cañada College

1. Maria Lara
   Program Services Coordinator
   for Degree Audit
   Student Services Division

   Reassignment from Admissions and Records Assistant II, effective September 18, 2006. The new allocation was Board approved on August 16, 2006.

District

1. Virginia Brooks
   Administrative Assistant
   Office of the Chancellor

   Reassignment from Staff Assistant in Executive Vice Chancellor’s Office, effective September 18, 2006.

B. Changes in Staff Allocation

District

1. Recommend reclassification of one Accounting Technician position (1C0013) in Accounts Payable, from Grade 24, “Accounting Technician,” of the Classified Salary Schedule 60, to Grade 28, “Senior Accounting Technician,” of the Salary Schedule 60.

   This reclassification is the result of increased scope and level of responsibility, and was agreed upon with CSEA. It is also recommended that the incumbent, Wulfrano Pena be placed at the new salary and title, effective October 1, 2006.
B. Changes in Staff Allocation (continued)

District

2. Recommend reclassification of one Senior Accounting Technician position (1C0321) in Accounts Receivable, from Grade 28, “Senior Accounting Technician,” of the Classified Salary Schedule 60, to Grade 31, “Senior Accounting Coordinator,” of the Salary Schedule 60.

This reclassification is the result of increased scope and level of responsibility, and was agreed upon with CSEA. It is also recommended that the incumbent, Rebecca Chan be placed at the new salary and title, effective October 1, 2006.

C. Short-Term, Non-Continuing Assignments

The following is a list of requested classified short-term, non-continuing services that require Board approval prior to the employment of temporary individuals to perform these services, pursuant to Assembly Bill 500 and its revisions to Education Code 88003:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Division/ Department</th>
<th>No. of Pos.</th>
<th>Date Start</th>
<th>Date End</th>
<th>Services to be performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/12/2006</td>
<td>06/30/2007</td>
<td>Theatre Production Technician: to assist the Theatre Technician/Event Coordinator with running of shows and events in the theatre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline</td>
<td>Social Science/Creative Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>08/01/2006</td>
<td>05/30/2007</td>
<td>Accompanist: to play piano to assist in voice classes and for choral groups on an as-needed basis. This item was intended for July 26, 2006 Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION 06-13 OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 87, THE CLEAN ALTERNATIVE ENERGY INITIATIVE

WHEREAS, Proposition 87, the Clean Alternative Energy Initiative appearing on the November 7, 2006 ballot, will impose a severance tax (i.e., a tax on the production of any element taken from the ground) on oil production in California to raise $4 billion to be spent on research, education and training programs to help reduce California’s dependence on oil; and

WHEREAS, revenue collected from the severance tax will be used to fund incentives for the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles; for the production of alternative fuel infrastructure; and for private research on alternative fuel production and use; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 87 will fund a $100 million statewide vocational training program through California's community colleges to train new workers and retrain workers for new jobs, and specifically provides grants for low-income students and fossil-fuel energy workers who want to transition to clean alternative energy jobs; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 87 will fund grants to universities to improve the economic viability and accelerate the commercialization of renewable energy and energy efficient technologies; and

WHEREAS, the programs created by Proposition 87 will be managed with transparency and accountability according to existing state open meeting, competitive bidding and conflict of interest rules as well as new, tougher rules enacted by Proposition 87; and

WHEREAS, California consumers will pay no costs for the programs enacted by Proposition 87 because the Proposition specifically prohibits oil producers from passing the cost of the severance tax onto consumers; and

WHEREAS, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell, the American Lung Association of California, the Coalition for Clean Air and a broad and diverse coalition of local government, business, public health, environmental, energy independence and senior organizations are supporting Proposition 87;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the San Mateo County Community College District Board of Trustees supports passage of Proposition 87 on the November 7, 2006 state ballot.

REGULARLY PASSED AND ADOPTED this 11th day of October, 2006.

Ayes

Noes

Attest

Helen Hausman, Vice President-Clerk
Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION 06-14 OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT OPPOSING PROPOSITION 88, THE STATEWIDE PARCEL TAX FOR EDUCATION FUNDING

WHEREAS, Proposition 88, the Statewide Parcel Tax for Education Funding, would create an annual statewide tax of $50 on most real property parcels to generate additional funds for K-12 education in California; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 88 would raise less than half of the revenue generated by the California State Lottery and would increase school funding by less than 1 percent; and

WHEREAS, although Proposition 88 allocates $175 million for class size reduction, in many schools and districts the revenue generated would not be enough to hire additional teachers or acquire additional classroom space, both of which are necessary to reduce class sizes; and,

WHEREAS, while Proposition 88 provides Academic Success Facility Grants of less than $500 per student, these grants eliminate districts’ eligibility for other facility grants of up to $9,805 per student; and,

WHEREAS, Proposition 88 provides $100 million for textbooks and other instructional materials – only enough money to provide approximately one in every four public schools with a new textbook; and,

WHEREAS, Proposition 88 takes control away from local school districts and gives the State Legislature more power to make important education spending decisions; and

WHEREAS, the California School Boards Association, California State Parent Teachers Association, California Association of School Business Officials, California Labor Federation (AFL-CIO), National Federation of Independent Businesses, California Small Business Association, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Small Business Action Committee, and the California Business Properties Association oppose Proposition 88; and

WHEREAS, while opponents of Proposition 88 agree that education in California is under funded, they believe that Proposition 88 is the wrong remedy because the $450 million it will raise is far short of the amount needed to comprehensively address under funding in California schools;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of the San Mateo County Community College District opposes Proposition 88 on the November 7, 2006 ballot.

REGULARLY PASSED AND ADOPTED this 11th day of October, 2006.

Ayes:

Noes:

Attest
Helen Hausman, Vice President-Clerk
Board of Trustees
BOARD REPORT NO. 06-10-3B

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees
FROM: Ron Galatolo, Chancellor-Superintendent
PREPARED BY: Barbara Christensen, Director of Community/Government Relations

REPORT ON LOCAL BALLOT ISSUES OF INTEREST TO THE DISTRICT AND ADOPTION OF “SUPPORT” POSITION FOR MEASURES A, I, M, AND N

District Rules and Regulations Section 1.70, Board Action on Legislative Issues, stipulates that the Board may take an official position on state, local or national issues or government regulations that directly affect the District or its students. The November 2006 ballot contains four measures that the Board has determined will affect the District and its students: Measures A, I, M, and N.

**Measure A** would enact a one-eighth cent sales tax to support parks and recreation services provided by cities, the county and special districts, including, but not limited to: maintenance, repair, and replacement of equipment and facilities, preservation of natural open space, improving access to parks, and maintaining hiking, walking and biking trails.

**Measure I** is a $15 million facilities bond measure for the La Honda Pescadero School District that is needed for a variety of projects including repairs and replacement of buildings, replacement of roofs, removal of hazardous materials and improvement of earthquake safety.

**Measure M** is a $298 million facilities bond measure for the San Mateo Union High School District that will provide funds for the District to continue renovation and rehabilitation of 45- to 83-year-old buildings and facilities on seven campuses to provide safe, healthy teaching and learning environments.

**Measure N** is a $136.9 million facilities bond measure that will be used by the Jefferson Union High School District to construct, acquire, renovate and upgrade classrooms and facilities throughout the school district.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board adopt a “support” position for local Measures A, I, M, and N and direct the administration to communicate this position to the local agencies sponsoring the measures.
REVIEW OF COLLEGE VISTA BUDGET AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET TRANSFERS

To construct College Vista, the Board, in separate Board actions beginning in 2003, authorized expenditures in three distinct areas: preconstruction costs (architect and various engineers for preliminary plans and entitlements); District costs (city fees, district inspector, PG&E, AT&T, etc.); and construction costs. While the overall project came in $63,285 under budget, the construction costs were higher than anticipated and the District-paid costs were lower than anticipated. The higher-than-anticipated construction costs occurred because 1) the District chose to upgrade some of the finishes (cabinets, wood entry floors, deck and railing wood trims, enhanced landscaping, etc.); 2) there were several unknown ground conditions that needed to be addressed (rock breaking, serpentine soil); and 3) the project experienced unavoidable delays due to rain in Fall and Winter 2004.

Following is a summary of the costs and variances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre construction Costs</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Costs</td>
<td>$524,437</td>
<td>$343,700</td>
<td>($180,737)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$7,950,000</td>
<td>$8,067,452</td>
<td>117,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$9,424,437</td>
<td>$9,361,152</td>
<td>($63,285)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board transfer $150,000 from the “District Costs” category to the “Construction Costs” category within the College Vista budget.
The District has been negotiating with Swinerton Management a basis for extending the current construction management agreement to include management of Capital Improvement Program II (CIPII) projects. The agreement must take into account the assumption of preconstruction and post construction duties of a new Construction Planning Department and the introduction of a “multiple-prime” project delivery method in addition to design-build and design-bid-build currently being used. While the District is prepared to commence with several CIPII projects, there is much that must first be determined by the design-build planning process that will occur over the next few months at Cañada, CSM, and Skyline.

Compared to CIPI, CIPII is greater in magnitude, more complex in scope and design, and involves longer timetables. For these reasons, the approach to reaching an agreement on terms has focused on agreeing to professional hourly rates that may be applied as the Program Definition for CIPII develops.

The District and Swinerton Management have agreed to the following maximum hourly rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager/Director</td>
<td>$175/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager</td>
<td>150/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>135/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimator</td>
<td>140/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>135/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructability Review</td>
<td>125/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>85/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assistance</td>
<td>75/hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rates are within industry standard for construction management rates and include Swinerton’s overhead, indirect costs, and expected profit margins. The total cost to the District for services will depend upon the projects schedules and delivery methods. Construction schedules must account for the instructional needs and schedules of the three colleges and management costs will vary depending upon duration required for each project, sequencing, accommodating for swing space, and quantity of projects occurring at the same time.
RECOMMENDATION

The Board of Trustees approve the formation of a construction management contract with Swinerton Management and Consulting based upon the maximum hourly rates listed above and that the total cost of the contract authorization shall not exceed 6.5% of total project costs and shall not exceed $23 million over the life of the contract.
BOARD REPORT NO. 06-10-1C

Information on Program to Accelerate Issuance of Remaining General Obligation Bond Proceeds

There is no printed report for this agenda item.