ADJOURNED MEETING
BOARD OF EDUCATION
SANTA BARBARA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
October 10, 1963

An adjourned meeting of the regular meeting of October 3, 1963,
of the Board of Education of the Santa Barbara High School District was
called to order by President Henderson on Thursday, October 10, 1963,
at 4:00 p.m. in Room 6 of the Administration Annex.

Present:  Mrs. Elisabetta P. Henderson, President
          Arnold W. Jacquemain, Vice-President
          Robert E. Kallman, Member
          David S. Licker, Member
          C. E. Sovine, Member

Absent:   Dr. Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent and Secretary-Clerk to Board

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting included:
          G. E. Browne, Acting Superintendent and Assistant
          Secretary-Clerk to Board
          Douglas C. White, Assistant Superintendent
          Dr. Charles A. Woodfin, Assistant Superintendent-Elect, Business Services
          Gleeola M. Brun, Executive Secretary

Members of County Committee on School District Organization:
          James R. Garvin, Chairman; Dr. Fred J. Greenough, Recorder;
          David N. Siebert and Arnold C. Van Wyk, Members

A number of members of the City College faculty, including:
          Dr. Robert C. Rockwell, President; M. L. Huglin, Marie Lantagne,
          Lisle Breslin, Carl Hentschke, Ralph Vernon, Stanley C. Sofas,
          Gary Mouck, Henry Bagish, Frank Dobyns, James Foxx, Winifred Lancaster

Several members of the Adult Division staff, including:
          S. O. Wake, Director; Spencer Blickenstaff, Alma R. Ritchie

Several members of the Adult Education Advisory Council, including:
          Eric Maurer, President; Catherine Peake, Mrs. Forrest Gutshall,
          John A. Davie, John Dilot, David Martin
          Frederic Slavin, Past President, City College Community Council Executive Board

Mrs. John S. Kendrick and Mrs. F. W. Nordhoff, League of Women Voters
A number of other staff members, including: Dr. Robert Barry,
          Kenneth G. Johnson, Bruce W. Benedict, Robert Christian, Alice Boettner,
          Lorenzo Dall'Armi
Several other citizens, including: Mrs. Margaret Foster, Mr. Don Rowland

Welcome to Guests and Staff Members

Mrs. Henderson welcomed guests and staff members present

at the meeting.
Communications:

Mrs. Henderson read a letter from Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction, regarding a State-wide conference of the California Junior College Association in San Diego, October 29 to 31, 1963. She suggested that Board Members interested in attending contact the Superintendent's Office.

Mr. Browne, Acting Superintendent, stated this meeting had been scheduled for the primary purpose of discussing various aspects of the formation of a junior college district in the light of new legislation and as requested by the County Committee on School District Organization.

Mr. Browne introduced James R. Carvin, Committee Chairman, and Dr. Fred J. Greenough, Committee Recorder, who had been invited to attend this meeting, along with other members of the Committee.

Mr. Browne reviewed problems before the Board of Education at this time, calling attention to the fact that the plan last spring had been for the County Committee to initiate action for formation of a junior college district under provisions of Chapter 9 of the Education Code. He said the County Counsel had advised against proceeding with this plan because said Chapter did not specify how the division of real property and assumption of bonded indebtedness could be handled. Mr. Browne and Dr. Greenough reported on provisions of new laws enacted by the 1963 State Legislature under Article 3.5, Division 18.5, of the Education Code, which appear to be applicable to the local situation. They reported that this legislation permits the Board of Education to petition the State for formation of a junior college district. Mr. Browne outlined the steps to be taken under this Article.
There was lengthy discussion regarding various aspects of the question at hand. Mrs. Henderson called attention to legislation several years ago stipulating that every high school district in the State shall become a part of a district maintaining a junior college by 1965 (this original deadline was later extended to 1967). She said the County Committee on School District Organization, which is responsible for submitting a master plan on school district organization for the County, had determined it could not proceed with its studies on local High School District organization until a junior college district was formed. Mrs. Henderson also commented that all of the districts in the County excepting the Santa Barbara High School District and the Carpinteria Unified School District are in junior college districts.

There was particular discussion concerning the status of the Carpinteria Unified School District, during which it was pointed out that if a Santa Barbara Junior College District were formed, Carpinteria has the option of joining it or the Ventura Junior College District. Mr. Jacquemain stressed, however, that Carpinteria's requirement to join a junior college district is not the basic reason for the formation of a Santa Barbara Junior College District.

Mr. Licker suggested that all aspects of the question at hand be thoroughly discussed at this meeting for purposes of the record. Mrs. Henderson requested that Board members present their questions for discussion before questions by audience members were entertained.

Consideration was given to the division of the present High School District voted tax rate limit of $1.75 between the proposed High School and Junior College Districts. Mr. Browne stated that, upon separation, the Junior College District would assume a statutory
tax rate limit of $.35, and the High School District would retain
a voted tax rate limit of $1.40. In response to questions by Mr.
Licker, Mr. Browne stated the High School District had been spending
approximately $.35 a year for the past several years to operate the
City College, and that he could not foresee any major reasons why
the High School District and the Junior College District would be
unable to operate on their respective tax rates of $.35 and $1.40.

Dr. Rockwell commented that he had not studied the question
to any particular extent but he agreed that a $.35 tax rate would
probably be sufficient for the Junior College District and that he
did not anticipate any difficulty in operating on this tax rate
because of the very favorable relationship between the new district's
assessed valuation and ADA. He voiced his reluctance to make a firm
statement on the question, but said he felt quite sure the $.35 tax
rate would be adequate for a number of years.

Mr. Sovine asked what the financial impact on the Adult Division
program would be if it were separated from the High School District.
Mr. Browne replied that expenses for the City College program included
 operating costs for the Adult Division. He pointed out that tax
rates needed to support the City College and the other secondary
schools, respectively, are now about the same as they will be when
two districts are formed. He also pointed out that the two districts
would have no alternative to operating within their respective tax
rate limits.

Mr. Licker observed it might be possible for the two districts
to share certain staff members and expenses for awhile. Mr. Browne
concurred, explaining that under the present plan the Junior College
District would be formed as of July 1, 1964; and the new governing
board would assume office on July 1, 1965. He said that during the
1964-1965 interim period, at least, certain services and expenses could be shared by the two districts.

In response to a question by Mr. Licker on whether the Board of Education was obligated to take any action at this time, Mr. Garvin stated the County Committee was legally responsible for making definite recommendations on a master plan for school district organization in the County, and that alternatives on various types of action were rapidly being eliminated as time goes on. He pointed out the County Committee had already been granted a one-year extension on its master plan deadline, and that if this deadline is not met, the State might step in and stipulate what changes in organization are to be made. He called attention to the considerable amount of time and study given to High School District reorganization and formation of a junior college district. He noted that reasonable assurance had been given at this meeting that both the High School District and Junior College District could operate on their respective tax rates of $1.40 and $.35. He voiced his belief that these assurances should be taken as facts at this time since any further delay for purposes of exploring the tax rate question further would not be justified.

A question was raised as to whether formation of a separate Santa Barbara Junior College District would be justified if Carpinteria eventually decides to join the Ventura Junior College District. Mr. Garvin reported the County Committee feels it would not be desirable for Carpinteria to join the Ventura District because Carpinteria belongs with the Santa Barbara South Coast Area for a number of reasons, including those of geography, identification, economics, social life, etc.
Mr. Van Wyk spoke in favor of formation of a junior college district, stating a separate district usually results in a better junior college program. Dr. Rockwell said the Master Plan for Higher Education in California was adopted several years ago and that now all but about five of the junior colleges in the State are operated by separate junior college districts.

Discussion followed regarding the steps to be taken according to Article 3.5. Mr. Browne pointed out that, under this procedure, the Board of Education does not have to make a determination on the amount of bonded indebtedness to be assumed by the Junior College District until after the petition has been processed through the County Committee, State, and County Superintendent of Schools. He strongly recommended, however, that in view of the vital importance of this problem, the Board of Education should include a statement of its intentions in this regard in either the petition proper or in supplementary information thereto, in order that there will be no misunderstanding on the part of the County Committee or State on the indebtedness the High School District will expect the Junior College District to assume. In response to questions by Mr. Kallman, Mr. Browne stated the division of bonded indebtedness should not be permitted to have any crippling effect on either of the two districts, and that annexation of Carpinteria would provide additional bonding capacity for the Junior College District of about $1,250,000. (based on assessed valuation of approximately $25,000,000.)

Mr. Kallman stated it appeared an additional high school might be needed in the next few years. In response to questions, Mr. Browne estimated a new high school plant would cost around $5,000,000. He said the High School District must have sufficient unused bonding
capacity to meet urgent school housing needs for junior and senior high school students.

Mr. Browne called attention to supplemental information presented at this meeting on an analysis of the division of bond fund capacity and indebtedness between the two districts (please see Attachment #1 to these Minutes), and there was discussion concerning details of the information included thereon. Mr. Browne stated that the appraisal on the value of properties being used by the City College had not yet been completed. He said the proposed assumption by the Junior College District of $7,000,000 in outstanding bonded indebtedness was based on (1) a reasonable value of the physical properties at the City College on the Mesa, and the Adult Center at 914 Santa Barbara Street; (2) the need to be realistic in providing the High School District with an unused bonding capacity of not less than $2,000,000, as of July 1, 1964, and the Junior College District with sufficient bonding capacity to complete Phase 2 of its Master Plan.

Mr. Browne pointed out that both of the proposed districts would encompass the same boundaries, people, taxpayers, assessed valuation, bonding capacity, indebtedness, etc. He said the same people would be paying the same bills whether they were incurred by one district or two districts and that these factors strengthened the need to be reasonable.

Mr. Slavin objected to basing the cost of properties to be transferred to the Junior College District on their appraised value. He said that for many years the $.35 tax rate available because of the Junior College had not been used entirely for Junior College purposes. He stated he firmly believed the property and indebtedness questions should result in a reasonable division of properties
that would not hurt either of the districts, and that market value should not be used to determine the division. Mr. Browne concurred, stating that the proposed division outlined at this meeting was based on a reasonable and realistic approach to the problem. Mr. Browne said the appraisal now being conducted was based on the use of City College properties for school purposes rather than on their "highest and best" use.

There was an exchange of comments on whether the properties used by the City College and the Adult Division had been purchased from bond funds, general funds, or had been donated to the School System. Mrs. Henderson observed that these details had no particular bearing on the problem at hand.

Mr. Van Wyk said he wished to comment as President of the City College Community Council. He observed that the present High School District has two educational functions, (1) the junior and senior high schools, and (2) the junior college, and that in the past it has used some junior college monies for other High School District purposes. He said that if this fact were taken into account now, the fiscal division between the districts would leave the High School District in a very bad way financially. Mr. Van Wyk said that for this reason some adjustments were going to have to be made to take care of the High School District situation. He said it would be unfair to the Junior College District to use the present appraised value on the Mesa Campus in determining the transfer of bonded indebtedness to the new district and that the problem was one of working out a plan that would be equitable to both districts. He voiced his personal opinion that an appraisal on the City College property on the Mesa was entirely unnecessary. In response to
a comment that the County Committee on School District Organization, of which Mr. Van Wyk is a member, had requested said appraisal, Mr. Van Wyk stated he had not agreed with this recommendation.

Mr. Siebert said there appeared to be agreement on the need to divide assets and liabilities between the districts in such a way as to hurt neither district. He said the County Committee had hoped an appraisal would justify an agreed figure, since it was not the intent of the Committee to recommend a division that might require the High School District to go on State aid before it could build another high school, and provide the Junior College District with more bonding capacity than it could use. He defended the recommendation of the County Committee that an appraisal be made, stating it was a logical decision made in the hope that it would justify the terms of the division of property and indebtedness between the two districts.

Dr. Greenough pointed out the importance of recognizing several basic points:

1. The County Committee made its request when it expected to initiate a petition for formation of a junior college district. One of the questions then was whether the value of the Mesa Campus should be based on full market value, the amount the District paid to the University of California, or some other basis.

2. The people of Santa Barbara are entitled to an intelligent and unbiased determination of the answer to this question as well as other questions involved with the whole matter.

3. The Adult Division program is using a number of High School District properties in addition to those located in the Downtown Center. This is one of the factors the Board should weigh in determining district separation details.

4. All of the questions presented at this meeting as well as many other aspects of the total problem point up the fact that this is a very complex matter.

5. Public relations demand that those with various viewpoints on the problem forget any vested interests they may have, since there is only one vested interest, which is the good of all young people in this area from grades kindergarten through junior college.
In response to a question by Mr. Slavin on whether the State would be likely to reject the Board's petition if the County Committee ruled against it, Dr. Greenough replied the County Committee would have to justify its rejection in terms of the proposal's adverse affect on a long-range master plan for school district organization.

Mr. Licker said he concurred with the recommendation that the Board indicate at this time its intentions regarding the division of real and personal property between the two districts, as well as the division of bonded indebtedness, in order to help the County Committee and the State. Mr. Sovine agreed.

Mr. Maurer called attention to the fact that the Adult Program has primary use of three other facilities in addition to the 914 Santa Barbara Street property: 814 Santa Barbara Street, property at 215 and 219 East Canon Perdido Street, and 202 East De la Guerra Street. He asked if the latter three could also be included in properties to be transferred to the Junior College District. Mr. Browne stated it was his personal feeling that the properties on Canon Perdido Street and 814 Santa Barbara Street could very well be included, but that he would not recommend transfer of the De la Guerra Street property since it is contiguous to the Warehouse-Service Shop units that serve the elementary and secondary schools, and it will very likely be needed in the future for purposes other than those of the Adult Program.

Mrs. Catherine Peake, daughter of Mrs. Max Schott and a member of Adult Education Advisory Council, read the following letter and requested that it be included in its entirety as part of the Minutes of this meeting:
"Board of Education
Santa Barbara City Schools
Santa Barbara, California

"Dear Mrs. Henderson and Gentlemen:

"I have been asked about my feelings regarding the transfer of the property at 914 Santa Barbara Street to the new junior college district, if formed.

"When I gave the property at 914 Santa Barbara Street to the City Schools in 1946, I was delighted to have it used for adult classes and theatre activities.

"If the Adult Center decides to go with the new junior college district, I support such a move, since it is my understanding that these facilities will thus become available for even wider use. With increased leisure time and adult education ever more vital to meet the challenge of the great changes in our society, there is even more need for these educational facilities.

"It is my wish that the Board of Education administering this property at 914 Santa Barbara Street should safeguard its continuance as an educational Center and not submit to any pressure to sell the property for financial gain. I will resent it very bitterly if this property is ever sold. I wish it to remain the Adult Education Center. The dream of establishing a more complete cultural center here under the direction of the Adult Education administrative staff and Advisory Council has my enthusiastic support.

Sincerely,
/s/ (Mrs.) Alice F. Schott"

Mrs. Henderson thanked Mrs. Peake, and said the Board had never considered selling the subject property.

In response to a question by Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Browne recommended that the County Counsel be requested to prepare a petition for consideration by the Board of Education at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Licker said it would be necessary for the Board to give the County Counsel some instructions on the matter of transfer of property, division of bonded indebtedness, etc.

He observed that a consensus of comments at this meeting indicated the indebtedness question should be settled without regard to the appraised value of the City College Campus and other properties being discussed.
Mr. Browne recommended that the Board stipulate bonded indebtedness assumption in the amount of $7,000,000, by the Junior College District on July 1, 1964. In response to questions by Mr. Licker, Mr. Browne said the $7,000,000 figure represented a reasonable compromise between the money spent for the City College from bond funds and the actual value of the City College Campus. He said this figure would also be fair and reasonable as far as the High School District is concerned.

Mr. Browne called attention to the Board’s present responsibility to provide for roughly 8600 students from grades 7 through 12 and approximately 2400 students at the City College (excluding Adult Education). He stated it was also his obligation to recommend planning that would enable the Board to provide the best educational opportunities for all of these students. Mrs. Henderson commented that Mr. Browne’s recommendation would leave the High School District with an unused bonding capacity of approximately $2,000,000, as of July 1, 1964, and she asked if this would be sufficient. Mr. Browne replied he wished it were $5,000,000, but that he could not in good conscience recommend that the Junior College District assume more than $7,000,000.

Frank Dobyna, City College teacher, asked why the High School District could not apply for State aid if it were left with insufficient bonding capacity. He said this solution would alleviate the present conflict between the two districts concerning bonded indebtedness. Mr. Browne said this might be an obvious question, but that no district likes to go on State aid for several reasons, which he outlined. He reviewed the State formula for allocating building funds on the basis of square footage per pupil, and he named portions
of existing secondary schools that would work against the District's eligibility for such aid. Mr. Browne said he had investigated the matter and understood the present secondary schools would probably have to be on double session for awhile before any State aid would be granted. Mr. Licker and Mrs. Henderson both commented on class sizes that are required for State-aid school districts. Dr. Woodfin also commented on the class size factor, stating that there is no local option on the size of classes in State-aid school districts. There was an exchange of comments among Mr. Slavin, Dr. Rockwell, and Mr. Browne on the possibility of being released from such State requirements and on the basis for assessed valuation figures used in Mr. Browne's analysis of bonded indebtedness and capacity.

Mrs. Winifred Lancaster asked if there were danger of encumbering the Junior College District with bonded indebtedness to the extent of jeopardizing the future growth of the junior college and making it unattractive for annexation by Carpinteria. Mr. Browne stressed that an unused bonding capacity of about $5,500,000, next year would be more than sufficient for completion of Phase 2 of the City College Master Plan, and that Carpinteria's eventual decision was not an argument on the question at this time. Mrs. Henderson said it would be possible to invite Carpinteria to join the Junior College District without its having to assume any bonded indebtedness, but that this was a problem to be faced at a much later time rather than now.

Mr. Jacquemain confirmed the facilities available at the De la Guerra Street property. He said that negotiations were now being conducted with the City on certain aspects of the question of whether an Administration Center should be located in that particular block.
Mr. Licker called attention to the recommendation before the Board that the entire Adult Education program and all but one of the properties used for downtown Adult classes be transferred to the Junior College District. He commented that problems attendant upon moving the Adult classes away from the De la Guerra Street location could be ironed out in the course of a year or so. Mrs. Henderson said perhaps some arrangement could be made to provide other space for Adult classes. Mr. Kallman stated the Adult Division could use this particular property until it was needed for other purposes.

Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Licker, and Mr. Browne replied to questions by Mrs. Charles McCasland on whether the terms of the property gift by Mrs. Schott would preclude said property being absorbed under the plan now being discussed. She also asked what effect this absorption would have on the Adult Education program. It was pointed out that the Adult Division would continue its present program excepting perhaps for the Evening High School, which must be conducted by the High School District. Dr. Charles N. Campbell, Past President of the Adult Advisory Council, said the Council felt the Adult Program should logically go with the Junior College.

Mr. Browne stated that before the Board took any formal action, he wished to call specific attention to provisions of Education Code Section 25450.5, which he read aloud. He said that certain portions of the wording might preclude the High School District from transferring $7,000,000 in indebtedness to the Junior College District unless the County Committee and the State knew in advance the amount of indebtedness the High School District would expect the Junior College District to assume.
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Henry Bagish, City College teacher, asked whether strict interpretation of this section would mean the Junior College District would expect to assume only about $4,000,000. in indebtedness. Mr. Browne said that this was the reason he felt the intentions of the High School District should be clearly set forth in either the petition or supplemental information thereto.

Dr. Woodfin asked whether the implications from questions raised by several City College staff members at this meeting meant they felt the City College was going to be put in a position where it could not develop the College as it should be developed. Mr. Bagish and several others nodded their heads affirmatively. Dr. Woodfin voiced his understanding that the Junior College District would not be stymied by insufficient unused bonding capacity since an unused capacity of about $5,500,000. next July, with annual increases thereafter, would be more than ample to complete Phase 2 of the Master Plan. He said that if the Junior College District were to assume only $4,000,000. in outstanding indebtedness, the High School District would definitely be stymied for at least 2½ to 3 years, possibly longer. He stated the Board, the County Committee, and the State should properly be concerned not only with the welfare of the City College but with the welfare of the High School District, and that this question is vital to the Board in determining whether it even wants to petition the State for formation of a new district.

Mrs. Lancaster asked whether it were possible that the Board of Education "is a prejudiced jury in making the decision." She said the present Board will be responsible for the High School District and a completely new Board will be responsible for the
Junior College District. She said that "the weight of evidence" indicates the present Board is prejudiced in favor of the High School District.

Mr. Jacquemain stated it was obvious the High School District would be over-bonded next year by about $1,000,000., if the Junior College District assumed only $4,000,000. Mr. Browne said that if this were the case the High School District would be unable to provide additional funds for construction of new buildings until it accrued more bonding capacity.

Dr. Greenough referred to eligibility for State aid and reviewed the requirements, stating that if the High School District had to qualify for State aid, the junior and senior high schools would first have to be on double sessions for probably 2 years or so. Mr. Jacquemain said that if the High School District were put in this position, the High School District would actually be unable to provide school housing for enrollment increases in the next few years.

Mr. Browne said he did not understand the implications that the High School District was being unfair to the City College, or the inference that the High School District should be stymied in meeting its responsibility toward junior and senior high school students in order that the Junior College District could have an excessive bonding capacity.

Mr. Siebert said that as a taxpayer he questioned any justification for forcing the High School District to qualify for State aid by arranging for excessive bonding capacity in the Junior College District. He also questioned whether taxpayers would support
bonds for additional City College facilities at a time the High School District had to borrow money to meet its construction needs. Mr. Sovine also questioned the effect double sessions in the secondary schools would have on a bond proposal by the Junior College District. Mr. Licker stated that many people feel a greater responsibility for the education of younger children than they do for older students, and it has generally been more difficult to vote bonds for higher levels of education. He stated that an unfair and unreasonable division of property and indebtedness could do damage to both school districts.

There was an exchange of a considerable number of additional comments on various aspects of the question at hand, following which it was moved by Mr. Licker that the County Counsel be requested to prepare a petition on behalf of the Board of Education of the Santa Barbara High School District with boundaries coterminous with those of said High School District, said petition to include provisions for transfer of that portion of real and personal property used for junior college purposes, including adult education, excepting for property at De la Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets; and further, to indicate the Board's intention for the Junior College District to assume $7,000,000 in bonded indebtedness as of July 1, 1964. There was discussion on wording of the motion, and Mr. Licker accepted several amendments in the form of modifications of wording. Mr. Jacquemain then seconded the motion in its final form as set forth below:

That, in accordance with provisions of Chapter 2, Division 18.5, Article 3.5 of the Education Code, the County Counsel be requested to prepare a petition on behalf of the Board of Education of the Santa Barbara High School District for formation of a junior college district, said petition to provide for:
1. Boundaries coterminous with those of the Santa Barbara High School District

2. Transfer to the Junior College District of properties now used exclusively or primarily for purposes of the City College and its Adult Division, excluding property located at 202 East De la Guerra Street in Block 190. These are to include:
   a. The City College Campus on the Mesa
   b. Property in Block 155 located at 914 Santa Barbara Street, and 215 and 219 East Canon Perdido Street
   c. Property in Block 172 located at 814 Santa Barbara Street

3. Assumption by the Junior College District of bonded indebtedness in the amount of $7,000,000. as of July 1, 1964.

(Provision #3 regarding assumption of bonded indebtedness to be included either as an integral part of the petition or in supplementary information thereto.)

In response to a question by Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. Huglin and Dr. Rockwell reported the City College could not legally provide education for students wishing to earn their diplomas for high school graduation. They said that some kind of arrangements could probably be worked out, perhaps by lease or contract, for the Adult Education program to conduct the Evening High School for the High School District.

Mr. Sovine called for the question, and the motion was carried unanimously.

In response to further questions Dr. Greenough reviewed the time schedule for action by the County Committee, State Board of Education, and County Superintendent if the new Junior College District is to be formed as of July 1, 1964. A number of people left the meeting at this point.
Mr. Browne reviewed discussion at recent Board meetings concerning lease of the avocado orchard on the future junior high school site on San Ysidro Road, and stated an affirmative vote thereon by two-thirds of the Board Members was required for adoption. He reviewed the terms and conditions of the prescribed resolution of intent. It was moved by Mr. Jacquemain and seconded by Mr. Sovine to adopt a resolution of intent to lease said property according to details outlined at this meeting; and to set Thursday, November 7, on or about the hour of 4:00 p.m. as the date and time for public hearing thereon and the opening of advertised bids on said lease. Roll call on motion was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. Sovine, Mr. Licker, Mr. Kallman, Mrs. Henderson
Nays: None
Note Voting: None
Absent: None

It was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried to authorize payment in the amount of $44,856.67 from the High School District Bond Fund to Colombo Construction Company, Inc., for work done on new buildings at Santa Barbara High School.

No further business being presented, the meeting adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

Attest:

Elisabetta P. Henderson, President

Approved by Board of Education on ______________, 1963