REGULAR MEETING  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
SANTA BARBARA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT  
November 21, 1963  

A regular meeting of the Board of Education of the Santa Barbara High School District was called to order by President Henderson on Thursday, November 21, 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: None

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting included:  
Dr. Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent and Secretary-Clark to Board  
George E. Browne, Associate Superintendent and Assistant Secretary-Clark  
Douglas C. White, Assistant Superintendent  
Dr. Charles A. Woodfin, Assistant Superintendent-Elect, Business Services  
R. V. Jackson, Assistant Business Manager  
Gleeola M. Brun, Executive Secretary  
Barkey Brantingham, News-Press Reporter  
Several representatives of the City Teachers' Association, including  
Robert Christian, Alice Boettner, Don Bennett  
Several representatives of American Federation of Teachers (Local 1081), including Frank Dobyns, Thomas Martin  
Selmer O. Wake, Spencer Blickenstaff, Alma R. Ritchie, Evelyn Stafford, and several other members of the Adult Division staff  
Several members of the Adult Education Advisory Council, including  
Eric Maurer, Mrs. Aaron B. Nadel, Mrs. Harry W. Heap, Mrs. Malcolm Hoffman, Mrs. Silvio C. Varni  
Mrs. F. W. Nordhoff, League of Women Voters  
Mr. Roy T. Gustafson, legal counsel, and Mr. John Mitchell, Chief Estimator, for Viola, Inc.  
Mr. David M. Yager of Schauer, Ryon & McIntyre, legal counsel for Pacific Plastering Corporation  
Mr. Robert Grant of Arendt/Mosher/Grant, Architects  
Mrs. Charles McCasland, Mrs. M. Leslie Grant, Mrs. Robert E. Kallman, and several other citizens  
A number of school principals, teachers, and central office staff members

Minutes: None

Welcome to Guests and Staff Members  

Mrs. Henderson welcomed those present at the Board Meeting, saying she was pleased to have so many people in attendance.
She called attention to the new physical arrangement of chairs and tables and expressed the hope it would prove satisfactory.

Hearing of Citizens and Petitions: None

Communications: None

The Superintendent called attention to the fact that Mr. Brantingham, News-Press reporter, was being transferred from his position as Educational Reporter to other assignments. Dr. Scharer expressed appreciation to Mr. Brantingham on behalf of the Board and the administration for his very fine services on articles concerning education.

Personnel

Following brief discussion, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried to approve certificated personnel assignments in accordance with details of Attachment #1 to these Minutes; and further, to authorize Mrs. Ruth A. Little, Librarian at City College, to attend a conference of the California Library Association in San Francisco and to visit college libraries in the Bay Area during the week of December 8 - 15, with actual and necessary expenses of not to exceed $75.00.

The Superintendent reviewed studies by the Professional Relations Committee of the City Teachers' Association last year that resulted in a recommendation to the Board in July for adoption of a proposed statement on certificated personnel organizations. He also reviewed the "recognition policy" that the American Federation of Teachers presented to the Board for consideration on August 1. Dr. Scharer
stated that both policies were continued for further consideration at this Board meeting. The Superintendent presented copies of the counter-proposals by the CTA and the AFT and made the following points concerning them:

1. The Board of Education should operate under written policies, and all of the policies should be developed as rapidly as possible.

2. A statement concerning employee organizations should be applicable to all classes of employees. Both of the proposals now before the Board concern certificated employee organizations only.

3. The Superintendent recommends that both proposals be referred to the administration for further study and for recommendations to the Board at a subsequent meeting. Recommendations will be developed democratically.

Mr. Licker stated that consideration should be given to how far the ramifications of the proposed policies will extend. He recalled some of the provisions of the original proposal submitted to the Board, and stated the Board of Education should not in any way abdicate its right to make final decisions. He requested that this point be kept firmly in mind in developing revised recommendations.

Dr. Scharck suggested that representatives of the CTA and/or AFT might wish to comment at this time. Mr. Robert Christian, President of the CTA, stated the CTA has long felt the need for a written policy on the matter of employee organizations and that the Superintendent concurred with this need last year. He said the proposed statement had been developed very carefully and with the concurrence of most of the CTA members, and that CTA still felt it was worthy of adoption.
by the Board of Education as it now is worded. He referred
to the Superintendent's recommendation concerning administrative
study of the problem and said the CTA was pleased with the
assurance that it would be consulted on any changes in wording.
Mr. Christian also concurred with the advisability that all
policies be in written form, and with the need for consulting
with the staff prior to the time recommendations are submitted
to the Board. He said that if policies of direct concern to
teachers are evolved without their approval and cooperation,
the potential effectiveness of such policies would be greatly
impaired.

Mr. Frank Dobyns, spokesman for the AFT, concurred with
Dr. Scharer and Mr. Christian on the advisability of having
a recognition policy. He said that the policies suggested by
the AFT covered the appropriate areas of wording and referred
to the CTA viewpoint that its policy proposal was most appropriate.
He said that any policy which the CTA would feel was proper
would probably discriminate against the AFT and result in
something less than fair and equal treatment before the Board.
He stressed the need for fair and equal treatment and provision
for opposing points of view by various employee organizations.

It was moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mr. Licker,
and unanimously carried to refer both of the subject proposals
to the Superintendent for further study and final recommendations
to the Board at a later meeting.

The Superintendent called attention to Education Code
Section 1536, concerning the Board's notice to the Superin-
tendent regarding renewal of his contract. Dr. Scharer stated
that his present four-year contract will expire June 30, 1964, and that it would be desirable for the Board to take action at this meeting regarding the Superintendent's contract for the four-year period beginning July 1, 1964.

Mr. Licker stated he felt that Dr. Scharer had done an excellent job as Superintendent and that the Board ought to renew his contract for another 4 years. Mr. Licker moved that the Board retain Dr. Norman B. Scharer as Superintendent of the Santa Barbara City Schools for a term of four years, beginning July 1, 1964, at a minimum salary of $22,000 a year, subject to the usual adjustment from year to year as mutually agreed upon and in accordance with other prevailing terms and conditions of his current contract, said action to be taken in conjunction with the Santa Barbara School District.

Mr. Licker said that a minimum salary of $22,000 a year in this position was not excessive in view of the salaries being paid to superintendents in other comparable school districts, and that in fact this salary was inclined to be on the low side. Mr. Licker said that Dr. Scharer was not overpaid, that he was eminently satisfactory, and that his services in the Santa Barbara City Schools should be continued.

Mr. Sovine said he was honored to second the motion since Dr. Scharer had been a very satisfactory Superintendent. Mr. Sovine observed that he was a member of the Board of Education that selected Dr. Scharer in the first place.

Mr. Jacquemain said that he had observed many superintendents throughout the country and that he felt Santa Barbara
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was exceptionally fortunate to have a man such as Dr. Scharer as its Superintendent. He said he wished to support the motion.

Mr. Kallman said he felt Dr. Scharer was a very competent person and had the situation very well in hand. Mr. Kallman said, however, that he had one question regarding possible changes in the size of the district. He asked whether the Board would be able to adjust Dr. Scharer's salary accordingly if the district were changed by reorganization.

Mr. Licker commented that the present Board of Education would continue to act as the governing body for the Junior College District for at least a year. Mr. Kallman said that his comments had referred to the possible withdrawal of the Goleta area from the Santa Barbara High School District. Mr. Licker commented that the Board should plan in the light of the circumstances prevailing at the present time, one of the circumstances being that the Santa Barbara superintendent is underpaid now in comparison with superintendents' salaries paid in other districts comparable in size, scope, and/or educational standing. Mr. Licker also commented on the competitive factor, stating he knew Dr. Scharer had had other opportunities and more money offered him in other school systems but that he had preferred to stay in Santa Barbara. Mr. Kallman said he had raised his question for a point of clarification.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Dr. Scharer expressed his pleasure at the comments by the Board members at this meeting. He commented on his
enjoyment in working with the Board, community, and staff, and said he was happy to accept a contract for another four years on the basis of terms and conditions expressed at this meeting.

It was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Jacquemin, and unanimously carried, to approve classified personnel assignments in accordance with details of Attachment #2 to these Minutes.

The Superintendent recalled comments at the Board Meeting of July 5, 1963, on the question of raising fees for adult education classes. He said that Mr. Selmer O. Wake, Director of the Adult Division, was present at this meeting to report on the following subjects: financial aspects of the adult program; the experience of other school districts that have increased adult education fees materially; and other information pertinent to the adult education program.

Mr. Wake called attention to an eight-page written report, distributed at this meeting, that was prepared by the Adult Division staff with the assistance of the Adult Education Advisory Council. He reviewed said report, page by page, calling attention to the following information contained therein: the total school district budgets in comparison with the adult education budgets for the past three years; the total number of adult education programs in California, including those conducted by junior colleges and their fee practices by percentages; the average cost per unit of ADA during a three-year period for high school, city college and
adult students in Santa Barbara; the findings of specific questionnaires distributed to local adult education students; the number of individual students served by local adult classes in comparison with the total number of students enrolled in other city school classes for the four-year period 1959-1960 to 1962-1963; information on experiences in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Baltimore with reference to adult education fees; quotations by well-known individuals and organizations regarding adult education.

Mr. Wake concluded his report with the following recommendation on behalf of the Adult Education Division staff:

"Believing as we do that increasing the present fee system would not only increase the cost of the local program to the individual who is already a taxpayer, but would increase the cost of the program to the local district, as well as restricting our effectiveness in providing varied educational opportunities for all, we urge that the adult education fee structure be left at its present level."

Mr. Eric Maurer, President of the Adult Education Advisory Council, stated that a similar report had been made to the Council at its meeting on November 5 and that the Council had voted unanimously to concur with the recommendation that the adult fee schedule be left at its present level.

There was discussion, primarily between Mr. Wake and Mr. Kallman, regarding various aspects of the report, during which Mr. Kallman questioned the interpretation and/or validity of
certain statements in the written report, such as:

(1) Variations in application of the present fee schedule.
(2) Computing the cost per ADA for local educational program on a 3-year average rather than current year figures.
(3) The manner of counting the number of students enrolled in local adult classes.
(4) The inappropriateness of comparing Santa Barbara with San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Baltimore.
(5) References to reductions in State apportionments as a "loss."

Mr. Kallman noted Mr. Wake's verbal references to statements by adult education administrators elsewhere regarding fee schedules and observed that these sources would naturally be biased in favor of adult education. He said that many other people feel adult education should be more self-supporting, and he referred to conclusions by a subcommittee of the 1961-1962 Citizens Advisory Committee to the Board of Education that larger fees for adult education should be charged. Mr. Kallman said he felt the question of adult education fees had not been solved by the report submitted at this meeting, and he voiced the opinion that further study should be made on such factors as drop-outs in Adult classes.

Mr. Wake said that the report on adult education by a study group under the chairmanship of Dr. Crawford several years ago had been studied for over three months by the Adult Education Advisory Council, which had in turn reported its findings to the Superintendent and the Board. Mr. Kallman said he would like to see a copy of this report.

Mr. Kallman said he did not feel the questions submitted to adult students in a recent survey were fair and impartial, and that an objective questionnaire should be developed to
get their reactions on whether the fee schedule should be increased.
Mr. Licker questioned what would be objective about asking a man if he wanted to pay more fees. Mr. Kallman referred to a particular course in connection with which some people wanted to pay the schools more money, and he said the school system should not close its eyes to this desire. He asked several questions about the $12,000, reported as the approximate annual income for local adult education fees, and he suggested the possibility that fees be doubled. Mr. Kallman said he would like to have further study made by the Board of Education on this matter before the amount of fees for adult classes is determined for next year, and that he felt seriously about this point.

Mrs. M. Leslie Grant asked several questions about the reported cost of approximately $275,000, for the adult program this year. She said money provided by the State is not "free money" since it comes from taxpayers, and she suggested the whole matter be studied on the State level. Mrs. Grant said she would prefer to have better textbooks for her children than to have so much money spent for adult education.

Mr. Wake referred to a State Board of Education report which had just been released concerning adult education in California, calling particular attention to the introduction by Dr. Max Rafferty, who endorsed the program, and to publicity concerning the Santa Barbara program. He distributed copies of this report to Board members.
Mrs. Henderson commented that a great many people pay school taxes in California and those who do not have children in schools have as much right to benefit from their investment as those who have children. She said a great many people wanted both better textbooks and adult classes.

Mrs. Mallock Hoffman said no fees should be charged and that all adult classes should be free. She said the problems of our society demand the further education of adults and that adult education should be compulsory. She said the idea of an increase in fees that would make it more difficult for adults to improve themselves was "simply shocking," particularly in Santa Barbara which she described as one of the most advanced communities in the United States.

Mrs. Aaron B. Nadel, member of the Adult Council, spoke of the many hours of time the Council had spent in studying all aspects of the adult program, and she supported conclusions set forth in the report now under discussion.

Mrs. Charles McCauley said she knew the information in Mr. Wake’s report could be relied upon. She spoke at length about problems of older people in Santa Barbara, particularly those with physical or financial handicaps. She said that citizens of every age should be encouraged in every way to take part in educational offerings. She spoke of the dynamic force and influence the adult program carries in the community and said the value of the adult education program to people of all ages would be crippled by an increase in adult education fees.
Following further brief exchange of comments among several of those present at the meeting, Mr. Wake thanked the Board and Superintendent for their continued interest and support.

Mr. Browne briefly summarized discussion and actions at the Board Meeting on November 7 regarding changes in named subcontractors requested by Viola, Inc., General Contractor on Phase I Building Projects at the City College. He said that the requested changes in masonry and lathing-plastering subcontracts were continued for the Board's decision at this meeting. Mr. Browne reported that Viola, Inc., had subsequently entered into contract with Lutts Brothers of Santa Paula, the named subcontractor for masonry, and this fact cancelled the earlier request that the general contractor be substituted for the named subcontractor on this phase of the work.

Mr. Browne said that the remaining problem before the Board at this time was the matter of the subcontract for lathing-plastering, and that the Board had no legal authority to approve the substitution of United Specialties Contractors, Inc., for Pacific Plastering Corp. under the terms of Government Code Section 4107 as adopted by the 1963 State Legislature. He said the County Counsel had advised that the Board may now: (1) take no action on Mr. Viola's request, or (2) deny the request. Mr. Browne recommended that:

(1) The Board deny the request of Viola, Inc., for the aforementioned substitution of the named subcontractor for lathing and plastering.
(2) The Board consider whether it wished to assess a penalty against Viola, Inc., in accordance with Section 4110 of the Government Code.

Mr. Browne presented a letter dated November 15, 1963, from Oren G. Greene, President of the United Specialties Contractors, Inc. (hereinafter sometimes referred to as United Specialties), concerning the matter before the Board at this time.

Mr. David M. Yager, legal counsel for Pacific Plastering Corporation (hereinafter sometimes referred to as Pacific Plastering), concurred with the first recommendation to deny Mr. Viola's request. With reference to the second recommendation, he said that consideration of any penalty to be assessed would be inappropriate until a subcontractor other than the named subcontractor was actually on the job.

Mr. Roy T. Gustafson, legal counsel for Viola, Inc., concurred that the Board of Education should deny Mr. Viola's request for substitution for the reason previously set forth. He said the Board of Education should also determine at this time whether and what penalty should be assessed against the general contractor.

Mr. Mitchell, Estimator for Viola, Inc., said United Specialties was actually on the job, had performed some services, and had been paid in September for a portion of the amount due them for work performed two months ago. Mr. Sovine asked whether there were a contract between Viola and United Specialties, and Mr. Mitchell replied the contract had been signed prior to the last Board meeting. Mr. Sovine objected to the fact that the Board had not been informed that contract...
documents had been signed, and he asked whether representatives of the architect were in the audience. Mr. Browne said the architect had not been notified to attend this meeting.

Mr. Gustafson said that substitution of a subcontractor without the Board's approval is a violation of the Government Code and that the Board has no authority to grant such approval in the present case, since it did not act before September 20, 1963. He said the substitution of United Specialties for Pacific Plastering was confirmed when Mr. Viola entered into contract with United Specialties, and that a contractual relationship between them was reported and discussed as an accomplished fact at the last Board meeting. Mr. Gustafson said the question now remaining was what should be done about the substitution having been made without the Board's approval. He said the Board may either decide against levying a penalty since none is required, or decide to assess a penalty. He stated it would be advisable for practical reasons for the Board to stipulate a monetary amount of penalty rather than to cancel the contract, and he suggested a nominal amount of $100, or $200.

Mr. Gustafson said the question might be asked why the Board should decide this time on the amount of penalty to be assessed. He said the contract between Viola, Inc., and the Board requires a large amount of work extending over a long period of time, and that if questions on entirely unrelated matters to develop at some future time between the two parties, the matter of the penalty to be assessed
because of the present situation might be a "pretty heavy axe to hang over the contractor's head." He emphasized that as of this date, November 21, the Board knows about the violation and the circumstances connected with it and should make its decision on the matter at this time.

Mr. Kallman said the architect-engineer on the project should be represented at this meeting to help the Board with information on the status of the contract that now exists, the work done on it, and other details. Mr. Browne said the architect representatives had given the Board information on the matter at the last meeting. He said the architect could not advise the Board on the amount of any penalty to be assessed since this was not the function or responsibility of an architect to make such a recommendation. Mr. Licker concurred that the absence of the architect from this meeting was not a factor in the decision before the Board at this time. He said the questions the Board must decide are whether a penalty should be assessed, and if so, how much.

Mr. Yager requested that the Board continue its decision for a longer period of time.

In response to questions by Mr. Jacquemain, there was brief discussion on the amount of the subcontract bid by Pacific Plastering (reported as $101,600.) and the maximum dollar amount of penalty that could be assessed ($10,160.).

Mr. Gustafson reviewed the law prevailing prior to September 20, 1963, pointing out that if the Board had taken action on Mr. Viola's request when it was first presented,
the present problem would not exist. He suggested that only a nominal penalty of about $100, be levied.

Mr. Yager objected to this suggested amount of penalty. He reviewed earlier statements by the Chief Estimator for Viola, Inc., that United Specialties had submitted combination bids on a number of specialty subcontracts. He also called attention to Mr. Mitchell's statements on the confusion that had developed in comparing and totaling out combination bids against individual subcontract bids in the specialty categories. Mr. Yager said it was claimed that a mistake had been made. He submitted that this could not have been the case and that United Specialties was being substituted for his client for some reason other than a mistake. He said the conclusion would have to be drawn that there had been negotiations between Viola, Inc., and United Specialties after submission of general contract bids to the Board and that there was evidence that this was "bid shopping in its most classic form." He said it was the Board members' primary function to obtain the most value for the least amount of school dollars and that assessment of the full amount of penalty would accomplish this. Mr. Yager also said it had been the Board's policy to obtain releases from named subcontractors before approving the substitution of other subcontractors and that the Board's own policy had also been violated since no release was obtained from Pacific Plastering. He stressed that bid shopping was wrong when it was done, that it is wrong now, that the law is clear, and that it is the responsibility of the Board to enforce the expressed policy
Mr. Yager said the Board could assess the full amount of the penalty at some future date but that now is not the time to make that decision. He also said that the Board should take every means to insure that the general contractor complies with the law by assessment at some future date of the maximum amount of penalty.

Mr. Jacquemain said the Board could act on the matter at any time during the contract period. Mr. Licker said he agreed with Mr. Yager's statement regarding bid shopping, and that the purpose of the new law was to correct some common practices in this regard. He said he believed, however, that Viola, Inc., did not know the new law was in effect when it took the actions it did. He said the local practice of obtaining releases from named subcontractors had been put into effect to protect subcontractors but that for various reasons a release had not been obtained in the present case. Mr. Licker called attention to the general contractor's claim that an error was made at the time the bids were calculated and to the subcontractor's claim that this was not the case. He said the law did in effect change during the period between the award of the contract and Board's action on the request for substitution. He stated that whatever the reasons, the general contractor appears to feel he was right in making the change, even though the Board did not approve of it. Mr. Licker said that in view of all the circumstances he did not feel
the Board should assess the full penalty but that some penalty should be assessed and that he thought the decision should be made now. He said the amount of the penalty should not be a token amount, but rather, a substantial amount. Mr. Licker commented that what might have been done in other cases should not be the determining factor but that the decision should be made on the basis of what was done in this case, and what the circumstances were in this case.

Mr. Licker moved that the Board take no action on the request of Viola, Inc., for substitution of United Specialties Contractors, Inc., for Pacific Plastering Corporation as sub-contractor for lathing-plastering on the City College building contract; and that the Board assess a penalty of $1,000 against Viola, Inc., in accordance with Section 4110 of the Government Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sovine.

Mr. Ralph Vernon, City College instructor, asked whether this were an ex post facto situation due to the fact that the Board did not take action on the request until after the law was revised. Mr. Gustafson replied that the substitution was in fact made prior to September 20 but it had not been put in writing prior to that time. He said Mr. Viola had made his request to the Board long before but that Board action had not been taken prior to the September date. He said that in view of these circumstances, he felt a penalty of $1,000 was "pretty steep" for this type of infraction. Mr. Jacquemain recalled that a payment of about $1,000 was what Mr. Gustafson
had suggested at the last Board meeting.

Following a question by Mr. Kallman, Mr. Licker affirmed
his motion that the Board take no action on Mr. Viola's
request to substitute United Specialties for Pacific Plastering
since the general contractor will have a problem with the
Contractors' License Board, and he did not feel the Board of Education
should prejudice him by its action.

Mr. Yager commented that the amount of the penalty stip-
ulated in the motion was grossly inadequate and that the
Board of Education was "giving away $9,000 of the taxpayers'
money." He called attention to the sequence of events in
which his client was unaware that a substitution was under
consideration until October 21, and that negotiations between
the general contractor and the other subcontractor took place
behind Mr. Johnson's back. He said that even without the
Board's permission another subcontractor was on the job and
rendering services. He called the proposed assessment
"preposterous."

Mr. Jacquemain said he would be inclined to agree with
Mr. Yager if the new law had been in effect during the entire
sequence of events, and that the situation Mr. Yager outlined
might possibly be the type of evil practice the new law was
created to correct. He said that in view of the circumstances, however,
whereby the law did change shortly before the Board's action
in October, he could not see why the larger amount of penalty
should be assessed. Mr. Yager pointed out that both the
new and old laws required the Board's approval in advance as a check and balance against evil practices. He said that perhaps under the old law the Board could make substitutions "for any reason" but that the Board's action was not under the old law.

Mr. Kallman said he understood the subcontractor had been informed earlier that a substitution was going to be made, and he asked if this could be borne out. Mr. Browne said a lot of dates had been mentioned that might confuse a clear picture of the basic situation. He said that when the general contract bids were opened on June 26, Mr. Viola listed Pacific Plastering as subcontractor on lathing and plastering. He said that on Viola's subcontractor list of July 8, he named United Specialties for this subcontract. He stated that at that point the architect took over to work with Mr. Viola in obtaining releases from the named subcontractors and that these efforts continued until October 1. Mr. Browne pointed out the actual obtaining of the releases was not the function of the Board or the administration, and that the County Counsel had advised that they were not required legally under the old law. He said the Board approved one of the changes several months ago and approved the three remaining changes on October 17, not knowing the law had been changed in September.

Mr. Browne asked that the Board give particular attention to the letter dated November 15 from Oren G. Greene, President of United Specialties, and also President of the Tri-County Chapter of the California Lathing and Plastering Contractors
Association. He quoted portions of said letter, stating that Mr. Greene had assured the Board that if there had been any attempt on the part of Viola to evade the spirit of the law, he would not have been a party to the evasion. He said the Board should pay some attention to Mr. Greene's testimony.

Mr. Kallman said there was no reason to take Mr. Greene's word since his opinion would not be completely unbiased.

Following a further exchange of comments, Mr. Jacquemain noted that the Board had spent quite a bit of time on this entire matter during the past two weeks. He called for a vote on the motion, and the motion was carried with one dissenting vote by Mr. Kallman. Mr. Kallman said he voted against the motion since he felt he did not know all the facts of the matter. He said he wished representatives of Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall had been present to resolve questions bearing on the case and that he felt the Board had voted for a penalty before it was fully aware of all the facts in the matter.

Mr. Sovine said he felt enough information had been presented to the Board to warrant its taking the action it had taken.

Mr. Browne presented two letters, dated November 5, 1963, from Donn B. Tatum, owner-trustee of the Willard Property at Hollister Avenue and Old San Marcos Road. Mr. Browne reviewed the terms and conditions outlined by Mr. Tatum concerning the alternative site he had proposed for a junior high school adjacent to the railroad tracks and
Highway 101.

Mr. Robert Grant of Arendt/Hosher/Grant, Architects, presented a written report on the estimated cost of site improvements for the rear portion. He also presented drawings of the two locations and reported on various aspects of the work and expense required to develop the alternative site in comparison with those for development of the parcel fronting on Hollister Avenue on which the Board had initiated condemnation proceedings. He summarized his report by stating that it would cost an estimated $900, an acre more to develop the alternative site than it would to develop the original site.

Mr. Browne stated that Mr. Tatum had refused $10,000 an acre for the "front piece" and had offered the back portion for $7500 an acre. There was discussion concerning details of approval by the County Planning Commission on the alternative site; the present status of interest by the Goleta Union School District in acquiring a portion of Mr. Tatum's property for an elementary school site; the terms and conditions outlined by Mr. Tatum; the amount of noise expected from the railroad tracks and Highway 101, and ways of counteracting it through architectural planning.

Mr. Browne said he would not under any circumstances recommend agreement to Mr. Tatum's proposal that the District provide permanent drainage across the balance of his property if the Board takes the back site. He reported that this condition was contrary to the arrangements with which Mr. Tatum agreed verbally earlier in the negotiations concerning the
alternative site.

There was discussion on a question by Mr. Licker regarding possible subsidence of the school site through exploration of the mineral rights the owner wishes to retain, and he suggested that a condition counteracting this possibility be stipulated on the part of the District.

It was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, that the above generally-described alternative site suggested by Mr. Tatum be declared to be generally acceptable for school purposes.

It was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Jacquemain, and unanimously carried, to authorize the Associate Superintendent to proceed, in consultation with the County Counsel's Office, with preparation of a sales contract agreeable to both the owner and the Board, with dismissal of present condemnation proceedings to be contingent upon approval of such a sales contract.

Dr. Woodfin reported on the present status of negotiations with Jean Paul Wolff and related contacts with Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall regarding the District's acquisition of a portion of the Wolff property on Leadbetter Road for City College purposes. He said that if the present proposal now under study is agreeable to all parties, the appraiser can proceed with completion of his report to the Board. In response to a question by Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Browne expressed the hope that a formal recommendation on the matter can be submitted to the Board at its next meeting.
Mr. Browne reviewed the present problem with reference to lease of the avocado orchard on the San Ysidro Road junior high school site. He said he had discussed the problem with Robert Rich of the Calavo Association, and the former lessee, Grant Garland. He presented a revised resolution of intent to lease said orchard, said resolution providing for a rental fee of $300, for the lease period of approximately 2 years, with the lessee to pay all expenses including water. Mr. Licker said that any further actions by the Board to lease said property should be subject to receiving a qualified bid, and he suggested that Mr. Browne obtain a firm offer in writing before the lease is re-advertised, acceptance of said offer to be subject to customary legal procedures.

There was discussion, following which it was moved by Mr. Jacquemain and seconded by Mr. Sovine to take the necessary action to re-advertise the Board’s intention to lease said property on the basis of conditions discussed at this meeting.

Mr. Licker questioned wording of the motion, following which Mr. Jacquemain amended his motion, with the concurrence of Mr. Sovine, to provide that the Board adopt the revised resolution of intent to lease the subject avocado orchard, said resolution providing for a rental fee of $300, for the lease period of approximately two years, with the lessee to pay all expenses including water.
Mr. Browne said he would discuss the suggestions outlined at this meeting with the former lessee prior to proceeding with advertising of the new resolution.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. Kallman, Mr. Licker, Mr. Sovine, Mrs. Henderson
Nays: None
Absent: None
Not Voting: None

On the recommendation of the Superintendent and following brief discussion, it was moved by Mr. Licker and seconded by Mr. Kallman to adopt the prescribed resolution of intent to convey an easement for a water line on the Goleta Valley Junior High School site to the Goleta County Water District in accordance with details outlined at this meeting; and to schedule public hearing thereon for Thursday, December 12, on or about the hour of 4:00 p.m. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. Kallman, Mr. Licker, Mr. Sovine, Mrs. Henderson
Nays: None
Absent: None
Not Voting: None

It was moved by Mr. Licker and seconded by Mr. Sovine to adopt the prescribed resolution of intent to convey an easement for a sewer line on the Goleta Valley Junior High School site to the Goleta Sanitary District in accordance with details outlined at this meeting; and to schedule public hearing thereon for Thursday, December 12, on or about the hour of 4:00 p.m. Roll call
on the motion was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. Kallman, Mr. Licker,  
Mr. Sovine, Mrs. Henderson  
Nays: None  
Absent: None  
Not Voting: None

Mr. Jacquemain left the meeting.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and following discussion on information presented by Mr. Browne and Mr. Soake, it was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried, to approve plans and specifications on the following generally described paving at La Cumbre Junior High School, and to authorize advertisement for bids thereon on Tuesday, December 10, at 2:00 p.m.: new asphalt paving west of shower building, and surface coat on existing paving of area south of present buildings.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and following a review of details by Mr. Browne, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried, to approve Change Order #15 to the general contract with Don Greene-Kenneth C. Urton, Joint Venture, on rehabilitation of the main building at La Cumbre Junior High School at an additional cost of $3227.00 (total contract to date = $352,320.21).

There was discussion concerning the recommendation that a girls' athletic field be developed at San Marcos High School. Mr. Doettner reported on the current en-
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rollment at said school and the number of students expected next year and verified the need for development of such a facility.

It was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, to approve development of said athletic field; to authorize the Business Office to secure quotations on grading the area described; and to approve plans and specifications as outlined on a sprinkler system for the area at an estimated cost of $5000., said bids to be opened Tuesday, December 10, at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Browne reported that the total development was estimated to cost approximately $7000., and that an appropriation in this amount was included in the Bond Fund Budget for the current year.

Upon recommendation of the Superintendent, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried, to accept with appreciation the following gifts for use at the City College:

(a) Donor: Associated Students, Santa Barbara City College
Item: Portable public address system for use in Student Activities Office (specifications as outlined on Gift Acceptance Form)
Cost: $157.35 plus $5.67 express charges — total $163.02

(b) Donor: Phi Lambda Club, Santa Barbara City College
Item: NCR adding machine (specifications as outlined on Gift Acceptance Form)
Cost: $251.94
Business and Finance

Mr. Jackson reported on past procedures for annual purchases of warehouse stock; and recommended that this year a portion be purchased in the fall and the balance in the spring to eliminate problems in checking in all of the items purchased at the same time the annual inventory is being taken.

Following discussion, it was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried, to authorize the Business Office to advertise for bids on warehouse paper stock as recommended at a total estimated cost of $41,000, payable from the Warehouse Revolving Fund, said bids to be opened Tuesday, December 10, at 10:00 a.m.

Following a review of details by Mr. Brown and discussion thereon, it was moved by Mr. Licker and seconded by Mr. Sovine to adopt the necessary resolution prescribed by Education Code Section 21051, requesting the County Board of Supervisors to make a temporary loan in the amount of $200,000, from the County General Fund to the High School District as of December 2, 1963. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ayes: Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Kallman, Mr. Licker, Mr. Sovine

Nays: None

Absent: Mr. Jacquemain

Not Voting: None

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Licker, and
unanimously carried to authorize and/or ratify the purchase of supplies, equipment, and services on purchase orders numbers 660 through 839, in conjunction with the Santa Barbara School District.

Following reports by administration members on several questions, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Kallman, and unanimously carried, to authorize and/or ratify payments of claims on warrants numbers B-2648 through B-2780, in conjunction with the Santa Barbara School District, with correction of the payment to Colombo Construction Company (Bond Building Fund) to $36,204.09 (instead of $37,204.09 as listed); and further, to approve the following additional payments from the Bond Building Fund in accordance with details presented at this meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buena Engineering Services</td>
<td>$1,706.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeRoy Crandall &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$2,239.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel-Henderson, Architects</td>
<td>$59.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial statements as of October 31, 1968, for the following High School District Funds were presented:

- General Fund, 1957 and 1962 Bond Fund Cash, Cafeteria Fund. Mr. Browne withdrew the statement on the 1962 Bond Building Fund for correction and subsequent submission to the Board.

The Superintendent reported on the present status of the District's petition for formation of the Santa Barbara Junior College District. He said that the
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County Committee on School District Organization had approved said petition at its meeting on November 11, 1963, and had recommended that the State Board of Education also approve it.

Adjournment

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

Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent and Secretary-Clerk to Board of Education

Attest:

Mrs. Elisabetta P. Henderson, President

Approved by Board of Education on ______________________, 1964.