



City College of San Francisco

50 FRIDA KAHLO WAY • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112 • (415) 239-3000

MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT CITIZENS' BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE PROP A 2001 / PROP A 2005 / PROP A 2020

Friday, August 5, 2022, 3:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Via Zoom Conference Call

Zoom Recording: https://ccsf-edu.zoom.us/rec/share/TKZOLUewMA4iivJEVe4_mtw_nJB4QteE0zC7UKD5zP-wHtLi9ELIL9IK6aP_idQ.zajSDZXFvoBEEUVP

1. Call to Order – AJ Thomas (chair) 3:03 PM
 - a. Chair Thomas is not in attendance due to personal matters. Vice Chair Kelly presided over the meeting.

2. Roll Call
 - Peter Gallegos – present
 - Dennis Kelly – present
 - A.J. Thomas – Excused. Vote by proxy – Dennis Kelly
 - Orlando Galvez – not present
 - Christine Hanson – present
 - Thomas Havey – not present
 - Shanon Lampkins-Jones- Excused. Vote by proxy – Han Zou
 - Rafael Musni – present
 - Linda Fadeke Richardson – present
 - Steven Tang – present
 - Han Zou – present
 - There is a quorum.

3. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Motion to approve by Member Fadeke Richardson. Second by Member Zou.
 - b. Vice Chair Kelly requested removal of item #10, “Appointment of working group” for the next year stating this should fall under the authority of the next board.
 - c. Roll Call Vote:
 - Ayes: Kelly, Fadeke Richardson, Hanson, Zou, Gallegos, Musni, Tang, Thomas, Lampkins-Jones
 - Nays: 0
 - Abstentions:0
 - Motion passed

4. Resolution Permitting Online Meeting (AB 361)
 - a. Vice Chair Kelly asked if anyone needed to review this before the vote. No committee members requested review.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

DR. BRIGITTE DAVILA, PRESIDENT • JOHN RIZZO, VICE PRESIDENT
ALIYA CHISTI • SHANELL WILLIAMS • THEA SELBY • MURRELL GREEN • ALAN WONG • MALINALLI VILLALOBOS, STUDENT TRUSTEE
DAVID MARTIN EdD, CHANCELLOR

b. Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Kelly, Fadeke Richardson, Hanson, Zou, Gallegos, Musni, Tang, Thomas, Lampkins-Jones

Nays: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion passed

5. Approval of the Meeting Minutes for May 13, 2022

a. Motion to approve by Member Fadeke Richardson, second by Member Tang.

b. Member Hanson made comments re: conversation page 7 paragraph 2: She expressed having issues with the presentation of Dr. al-Amin's statements. Member Hanson stated there is quite a bit of Dr. al-Amin's statement that is not included, including remarks about Gough Street, the project list, and related expenditures.

c. Member Hanson requested to lift verbatim text from Zoom and replace the third paragraph in the minutes.

d. Per Vice Chair Kelly, this change will be considered an amendment to the minutes. A roll-call vote to approve was conducted.

e. Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Kelly, Fadeke Richardson, Hanson, Zou, Gallegos, Musni, Tang, Thomas, Lampkins-Jones (9)

Nays: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion passed

6. Updates from the Chair (5 min) – Chair not present, report was skipped.

a. Communications Received via Website Portal:

i. The committee received an email from Harry Bernstein. Vice Chair Kelly requested it be put into the chat as a matter of record. The document is provided in Agenda Addendum A.

ii. The committee received a comment via email from Tomasita Medál. Vice Chair directed that it be posted to chat. The document is provided in Agenda Addendum B.

7. Public Comment on Items not on the agenda (1 min per speaker, for a total of 15 minutes)

a. There were no verbal comments for items not on the agenda.

8. 2001/2005 & 2020 Financial & Performance Audits Fiscal – Alicia Herrera

a. Ms. Herrera thanked the committee for having her to review the 2021 bond audit report. Ms. Herrera proceeded to review the Bond Audit document as provided in the meeting package and provided commentary as follows:

b. Ms. Herrera reminded the committee that the purpose of the audit is to provide an opinion on the financial statement, which was done for both bond measures, as well as in this case the compliance with Proposition 39.

- c. Starting with the financials, they gave an unmodified opinion. This is what we call a “clean opinion” which is the highest level of assurance we can give and states that the financials prepared by management were free of material misstatement and of material non-compliance.
- d. There were \$28.5 million in bond expenses in the 2021 fiscal year. We also see the issuance of the \$300 million 2020 bonds.
- e. Compliance Audit page 18: The district is required to get a compliance audit every year under proposition 39. We verify that the funds are spent in accordance with Proposition 39 state requirements as well as in accordance with the ballot language the voters approved.
- f. Testing and sampling: Of the \$28 million the district spent we tested \$19.5 million (71.5%) non-payroll-related expenses. In addition, there were \$875k payroll costs. We audited 100% of those dollars.
- g. In testing for the 2021 fiscal year, no instances of non-compliance were noted. The auditors were able to give another unmodified or clean opinion of both bond measures 2005 and 2020.
- h. Those are required elements of the audit. The auditors did additional testing unique to City College of bids and changes orders.
- i. The last 2 pages list the findings and question costs. For this audit report there are none to report.
- j. The last page is a summary of prior findings and notes whether they have been resolved. This is verbatim of the finding in the 2020 report related to payroll. The current status is “implemented” so when we did follow up and tested 100% of those payroll costs, we know the district had addressed the issue noted in the 2020 report and have no further findings to report.
- k. The other document is the governance letter, which is required to send to the Board of Trustees and the Oversight Committee. This is required to be sent in accordance with our professional standards. We disclose the responsibilities of the auditor and of the management and whether we had any disagreement or difficulties in completing the audit. We are happy to report we did not.
- l. A question/answer and discussion period followed:
 - i. Vice Chair Kelly asked about another document in the packet, which Ann Kennedy noted is the 2019-2020 bond performance audit.
 - ii. Member Hanson inquired about checking Gough St. spending for its compliance with the project list. Ms. Herrera responded that she was requested by management to look at that and will certainly look at its expenses that have been incurred as part of the 2022 year. The scope of our audit report is to verify that the monies that are spent out of the bonds are allowable under state regulations and the bond measure.
 - iii. Member Hanson questioned change orders and board approvals vs. original contract amounts pertaining to the Kitchell item which she believed did not agree with the recent upgrade to \$2 million. The previous amount was listed as \$8 million and requested resolution number. Ms. Herrera responded that the audit wouldn't have documented a resolution number because they only look to see if it occurred. Management could provide that information.
 - iv. Member Fadeke Richardson thanked Ms. Herrera, stating that the report was well done. She also noted that the purpose of the report is to rule out any deficiency in internal control, and this report did that. Member Fadeke Richardson reiterated the importance of the Facilities Master Plan, which

is the basis and justification for the bond measure and any monitoring or oversight must always reference that document.

- v. Member Fadeke Richardson asked questions pertaining to the separation of expenditures between the different year bond measures in relation to the various projects. Ms. Herrera responded that the district is required to maintain each individual bond measure separately, which they do. They are tracked in separate accounts so we can identify costs associated with each bond measure. Project lists are really a budgetary tool that are incorporated in the general ledger but are not actual costs to the district; they are just plans on what the district is going to do. In the event there is a project that would be allowable under both bond measures based on the ballot language, in theory you could joint fund a project out of both if allowed by the language.
- vi. Member Fadeke Richardson questioned a 20% variation between the original and final budget for the Chinatown campus as seeming excessive when the rest of the projects were within an approximate 5% margin. Ms. Herrera replied that they look at the budget as a tool, but the scope of our audit is the actual expenses. Another thing to keep in mind is that you are looking year to year and construction projects are multi-year endeavors. Member Hanson stated that at the regular board meeting of 12/10/20 there is no approval for the Kitchell change order in that meeting. In a later meeting in June there was an item brought to the board to add to the Kitchell contract quoting the existing amount as the \$8.1 million and boosting it to add another \$2.9 million, but that was after the audit. Ms. Herrera replied that some change orders are made individually by a specific resolution, some are made along with the approval of other contracts, POs and amended items. So, it may not be on the face of the minutes, a lot of them are in attachments the district prepares. She stated that she reviewed all of these and is confident in what was reported.
- vii. Member Tang asked for clarification if we were only discussing the 2020 audit and not the 2021 audit. Ms. Herrera responded that everything we have been discussing so far is related to the 2021 audit. The 2020 audit was previously presented to the committee some time last year.
- viii. Member Tang asked questions regarding Page 5 in the 2021 audit pertaining to the expenditure of \$142k on salaries for administrators. He asked for explanation on what corrections have been done and whether in the auditor's opinion those corrections have cured the non-compliance. Ms. Herrera responded that page 25 is a summary of the finding that was recorded in the audit. The audit noted \$142k in payroll costs related to district administrators that were charged to the bond fund that is not allowable under proposition 39, so we reported a finding. The district during the 2021 year repaid those funds to the bond programs thus making it whole again. They've backfilled those allowed costs so from a dollar standpoint the bond has been addressed for those costs. In addition to that, there is review at the Associate Vice Chancellor and Vice Chancellor level of the payroll costs being charged to the bond to make sure that there are no positions that would be not allowable based on the Proposition 39 language. That's why the audit looked at 100% of the payroll costs. We did not sample them because we wanted to follow up on this finding and make sure that it was in fact implemented. We did not find any additional non-compliant payroll in the 2021 year. The district paid back the funds into the bond program, and they instituted some more review

controls, as well as a review of all the payroll being charged to the bond in their system to ensure that this finding does not go forward.

- ix. Member Tang asked for confirmation that there are now controls in place and that this same issue would not happen moving forward. Ms. Herrera Ms. Herrera responded to the affirmative.
- x. Member Tang asked Ms. Herrera if she had any reservations about this committee finding that the 2019-2020 is in compliance with Proposition 39 in view of paying back the previous amounts and the controls that have been put in place. Ms. Herrera responded that our 2019-2020 audit opinion was that the district was in compliance with Proposition 39 other than the amounts that we noted in our finding. There's no State guidance on what to do in this situation. The district voluntarily backfilled that money into the bond fund just to make sure that the bond program was whole. That's really a legal question, but in my opinion, it remedied the situation, and I think that the additional review going forward should mitigate that problem in the future. Vice Chair Kelly raised a question regarding language in the previous report that the salaries were "inadvertently" coded to the bond program and how it was determined to be inadvertent. Ms. Herrera responded that this portion of the audit, Management's Response and Corrective Plan, is prepared by the district and is not edited by the auditors. That would be a question for management.
- xi. Vice Chair Kelly asked if there was a motion to accept the audit as presented. Ann Kennedy stated that this is an information item, the Board of Trustees is the governing body that accepts them.
- xii. Vice Chair Kelly asked for a roll call vote that the committee is simply accepting the audit.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kelly, Fadeke Richardson, Hanson, Zou, Gallegos, Musni, Tang, Thomas, Lampkins-Jones (9)

Nays: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion passed

9. Review & Approval of the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Annual Report – *Han Zou*

- a. Member Zou reviewed the written report submitted in the committee meeting packet.
 - i. The Letter from the Chair was updated to include a reference to the audit finding and corrective action.
 - ii. An audit finding section was also added with a description of the finding and the district's corrective actions that were taken.
 - iii. There was an update to the bond project list table.
- b. Member Fadeke Richardson thanked Member Zou for a great report. This had been previously reviewed, and the needed changes have been made. Motion to approve by Member Fadeke Richardson, second by Member Gallegos.
- c. Discussion:
 - i. Member Tang introduced a motion to table the discussion of this item in light of the auditor's report that during that time the expenditure was technically not in compliance and it's more or a legal question whether placing the money back and placing the controls were curative and if that's in compliance. He stated that he would be more comfortable if we delayed one more meeting and

had bond council provide a legal opinion as to whether the actions after the fact resolve the compliance matter.

- ii. Vice Chair Kelly stated that this motion interrupts the discussion. We must determine if we want to continue to discuss or table this for a subsequent meeting. Member Hanson seconded the motion.

d. Public Comment

- i. Call in user David Pilpel stated that regardless of the auditor's findings it is up to this committee to determine if the district was in compliance with the bond measures via vote and report this to the public in the annual report.
- ii. Member Hanson stated that there was not a vote recommending that the committee determined if the school was in compliance. To state that and explain it is shorting the public, and we have not taken a vote if the members individually voted if the school was in compliance.
- iii. Public comment by E. Simon Hanson: Now you have taken 2 actions as a committee. You have voted to accept a report in which you had no action. By doing so you have put into record for the board that the committee has reviewed last year's audit report. That is not normal if there is no action item. On the year in which the infraction took place you are now contemplating tabling the item. I encourage the committee to table the item because public trust is tantamount importance. He also suggested the committee develop a recommendation to the board with that report explaining the correction and elucidating the implementation of controls.

e. Roll call to table discussion: *(note: There was no motion or second prior to this roll call vote)*

Ayes: Kelly, Fadeke Richardson, Hanson, Zou, Musni, Tang, Thomas, Lampkins-Jones (8)

Nays: Gallegos

Abstentions: 0

Motion passed

10. Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Annual Report Appointment of Working Group

- a. *Item removed from the agenda at the top of the meeting when voting to approve the agenda.*

11. Prop A 2001/2005 & 2020 Current Project Update – Associate Vice Chancellor Alberto Vasquez

- i. AVC Vasquez presented a slide deck and provided updates on current project and recent accomplishments.
- ii. Member Fadeke Richardson asked if there was any determination on 1550 Evans Campus project. AVC Vasquez replied that right now we don't have an update. It is a legal issue and is currently with the legal department and he will get an update for the next meeting.

12. Review of Member Term Chart – Ann Kennedy

- a. Ms. Kennedy presented / reviewed this item from page 38 of the packet, stating that it is helpful for the committee to keep their membership and terms in front of them as well as when things switch per the bylaws. We have put together a term chart which we can include this item at the end of agenda for every meeting as reminder at the discretion of the Chair and Vice Chair. The committee does not need to address it other than when it is time for change elections. There are also committee by-laws and election links. When the previous two committees were combined it created a new committee and restarted the clock, which is

why Term 1 is the first one populated. Member Fadeke Richardson requested that her full name be spelled out on the chart. Ann also noted a misspelling of Member Musni's last name which will be corrected.

13. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

- a. Member Fadeke Richardson nominated Member Zou for Chair and Vice Chair Kelly for Vice Chair.
- b. Member Hanson nominated Vice Chair Kelly as Chair, which he declined due to previous nomination for Vice Chair.
- c. Motion to approve nomination of Member Zou for Chair and Vice Chair Kelly for Vice Chair made by Member Fadeke Richardson, seconded by Member Tang.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Fadeke Richardson, Zou, Gallegos, Musni, Tang, Thomas, Lampkins-Jones (7)

Nays: 0

Abstentions: Kelly, Hansen (2)

Motion passed

14. Next Meeting's Agenda Topics

- a. Review & Approval of the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Annual Report
 - i. Member Fadeke Richardson stated that she wants to make sure when we bring back the tabled audit report item, we are very sure of what we are discussing. The report indicated that the minor deficiency was corrected. I would like the total expenditure for the targeted period so people can have a perspective of what we are talking about in relationship to the deficiency. And for the record to indicate that the previous Chancellor and Vice Chancellor made this error and controls have been put in place.
 - ii. Member Hanson stated that what she was hoping the committee would do was to discuss whether the school was in compliance, take a vote and make a statement as to compliance. If we find that they were out of compliance at the time it would also be a time we can explain that the measures taken after were in keeping with what we would recommend. Member Fadeke Richardson spoke to clarify her request. What she is looking for is the total expenditure for the time period in relation to the deficiency, i.e. for the extent of the deficiency against total expenditures amount. It should be stated that the previous Vice Chancellor and Deputy Vice Chancellor made this error, and it should be stated specifically that this was mitigated and corrected and that the trustees have plans in place to make sure it is so.
 - iii. Member Tang requested that for the next agenda there be two information items regarding the review and approval of the 2019-2020 Annual Report. One, to provide bond council's legal opinion as to whether the actions taken to replace the funds and implement new controls are curative and could be considered compliant. Two, an information item to provide additional information around the controls that were put in place, so we are doing our due diligence that these changes were made. He also requested that the committee members take time before the next meeting to draft potential language that might be appropriate for a compliance statement, so we are not trying to draft during the meeting.

- iv. Member Hanson reminded the committee that the bond council represents the district not the committee. It is a conflict of interest, if for example, he approved the spending that the auditor found to be in non-compliance. He is probably not the best resource. She also requested to see a follow-up on the change order to Kitchell and the information the auditor agreed to provide.
- v. Member Fadeke Richardson requested that Dr. al-Amin work with staff to write the language that should be in the minutes. Things should not be verbatim language in the minutes.
- vi. Member Hanson stated that Member Richardson's item was approved by the committee at top of meeting to put in the verbatim, so if Dr. al-Amin works with staff to come up with something else it would need come to the committee again before approval because that's not what we voted for.
- vii. Vice Chair Kelly requested that the items that referred to the 2019-2020 Annual Report be referred to the working committee working on that.

Motion to adjourn by Vice Chair Kelly. Meeting adjourned at 4:33 PM

Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 10:36 AM

Subject: written comments for the August 5, 2022 meeting of the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee (CBOC), including items not on the agenda and corrections of minutes

Hello

I have seen two suggestions for reaching the CBOC and I am using both of them today.

1) Write to CBOC c/o Senior Vice-Chancellor of Administrative and Student Affairs =

studentaffairsdiv@ccsf.edu

Dr. Lisa Cooper-Wilkins

Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

2) For this purpose, one should also contact facilities@ccsf.edu

Contacting the CBOC. Additional questions can be addressed to the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee in care of City College of San Francisco's Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor of Administrative and Student Affairs

studentaffairsdiv@ccsf.edu

|||||

CBOC--

*August 5 meeting, agenda, p. 1)

Consider this first section as a comment on items not on the agenda.

There are additional written comments below that.

(To comment on items not on the agenda, please use the raise hand option described above, and it will be addressed under the agenda item titled "Public Comment on items not on the Agenda."

No response on behalf of the Committee will be given at this time.)

This is disturbing. There is a flat statement about responses from the committee to public comment on topics that are not on the agenda--none will be forthcoming at CBOC meetings. There is no authority cited for this and I believe this is not addressed in the CBOC bylaws. But it's not only that the Committee is thereby shown to be uninterested in public comment. It is also that Ed. code has something to say about the matter-- something very different. Read on.

According to §54954.2(b)

...In addition to these exceptions, there are several limited exceptions to the no discussion on non-agenda items rule. Those exceptions are:

- Members of the legislative body or staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons during public comment periods; [The Chair's preference runs counter to this!]
- Members or staff may ask questions for clarification and provide a reference to staff or other resources for factual information;
- Members or staff may make a brief announcement, ask a question or make a brief report on his or her own activities;
- Members may, subject to the procedural rules of the legislative body, request staff to report back to the legislative body at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter; and
- The legislative body may itself as a body, subject to the rules of procedures of the legislative body, take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.

I feel that the expressed policy noted above should be modified in light of the above citation.

May 13 meeting – minutes

(p. 5) 7 -- items not on the agenda

>. Harry Bernstein – Suggested the committee meet more often since they often run out of time and *suggested looking at current expenses at least quarterly, not just after the audit comes out*

The italicized suggestion came directly from David Casnocha.

However, the statement, as it appears in the minutes, makes it appear that it is Harry Bernstein, out of the blue, who is suggesting that the CBOC look at current expenses at least quarterly, not just after the audit comes out.

This is not true. I refer you to the CBOC meeting of August 2, 2021 with the following comment from David Casnocha—as a response to a question from the public:

(01:50:02)

... The factual statement that he [Harry Bernstein] made is that the committee doesn't review expenditures until after they're audited. That's not true. **If things are being done**

updated information on the expenditures of bond funds that have been made in that quarter. So you see expenditures in real time. The audit comes much later down the road and [the auditor] is auditing expenditures long after you have reviewed them...

[speaker then continues with a slightly different topic.]

I hope this is the last time I have to ask why the CBOC is ignoring this advice? Following it would allow the Committee to do its job. (As noted on p. 24, the CBOC is a collection of community members that are tasked to review the spending of general obligation bonds.)

And again, I would like to know why this suggestion from your oft-invited professional is not discussed, or even considered. It makes a lot of sense to me (as a cost-saving measure, the possibility of heading off some problems before they might reach the audit stage.)

Minutes, top of p. 8--correction

Vice Chair Kelly stated that [he?] was not interested in individual names until the Committee were told they couldn't have them.

ALSO, 5 paragraphs further on

Member Hanson stated that she remembered a past discussion between Vice Chancellor Sond [*it should be Sohn*] and Mr. Casnocha,...

on p. 8 of minutes: it says—

Harry Bernstein addressed Ms. [Leslie] Simon's concern about the project list, that ballot language is so broad that almost anything qualifies

This summary of the comment omits some key points. The actual comment (taken from the recording of the meeting) said,

(1:03:09) Leslie Simon was talking about money that might have been inappropriately spent from the bond **because** [those] **things were not on the bond project list. Because of the De Anza decision of 2006** I think, the language is so broad that a lot of stuff—almost anything qualifies.

on p. 9 Member Hanson stated that shewould [write this as two words] try and send out a sample of what [insert *she*] was saying

=====

2019-2020 Annual Report

p. 18

2020-001 Salaries Expended from General Obligation Bond Proceeds

Shouldn't this be 2020-2021?

p. 19

COMPLETED PROJECTS FUNDED BY 2001/2005 BOND MEASURES

Joint Use Facility (Multi-Use Building) – 2012

Question. This building was open for classes as early as 2010. Was it really not considered completed until 2012?

p. 20, Bond Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2019-2020,

What does it mean that there is a negative balance of \$76,222 for Proposition A 2001 as of June 30, 2020?

p. 21,

Bond Project List for Fiscal Year 2019-2020

Evans Center Renovation, Planning Costs came to \$68,086

It has been reported that, due to uncertainties about the objectives for this project, and a desire to be prepared for any of multiple possible outcomes, there were as many as eight different plans commissioned/executed for this renovation project. Where is this decision explained or even mentioned in this report? [this situation was pointed out by a faculty member from the Evans Center at a public meeting.]

p. 22

What is the ultimate goal of the Bookstore renovation? Will it ultimately be used as a facility by the College or torn down so that the space currently occupied by the facility can be used to satisfy other project needs? If this is so, how legitimate are these construction expenditures?

The leasing of Gough Street was meant to bring a great deal of revenue to the District, but the initial lease from years ago ended up being scrapped. Then, the District was not ready to move personnel to the Ocean campus after the second lease went into effect and the District ended up having to spend some of what it had received in lease payments to rent back the facility in order to allow additional time to prepare for the move. Yet the Gough Street location is included within a highly valuable transit-oriented, high-density, mixed-use project area.

Are all of these Gough Street relocation expenses justifiable as bond expenses?

p. 26 Quarterly Bond Program & Project Update Report (August 5, 2022)

p. 27 I have several comments and questions about the **Accomplishments to Date**

2 Design Build Projects totaling over \$250M submitted to DSA (STEAM and Student Success Center)

But the contract for the Design Build team on a third Design Build Project—the Diego Rivera Theater--was abruptly terminated without adequate justification in November, 2020, which resulted in a 14-month delay before the current architect was eventually appointed through a new RFP. Current projects are facing significant construction inflation, which may lead to higher costs and fewer completed projects. How are such matters being addressed in this report since there are District expenses involved?

p. 30 Student Success Center

A challenge that was eventually overcome was a flawed process this past year occurred when faculty were told that they would have to leave their offices in Batmale Hall in order to accommodate the staff being moved from Conlan Hall for this particular project. The faculty were eventually able to remain in place, with staff being directed elsewhere, but the confusion and anxiety lasted for months. What can be done when such conflicts are anticipated through better consultation among the stakeholders so that better outcomes can be achieved with less chaos. This sort of issue may not be seen on the balance sheet, but it is reflected in something more subjective known as campus climate.

p. 34, Evans Center Renovation

The highly popular workforce development program, the Aircraft Maintenance Technology program, was suspended for three years by the Board of Trustees at their meeting in June. There are currently no faculty or staff for this program. But the future of the Evans Center is unclear since it is not known whether a place can be found for the AMT Program at SFO or if an attempt will be made to have it relocated to the Evans Center (if it is determined that there is no alternative possibilities, and the objections from the Bayview-Hunters Point community can be overcome).

p. 38 Someone should have noticed that the name of Rafael Musni, a long-serving committee member, and former Chair of the CBOC, has been misspelled (as Munsni).

Thank you for bringing forth my comments/questions/corrections so that they can be appropriately evaluated and discussed. I have another meeting at the same time as today's CBOC meeting.

Harry Bernstein

(P.S. I am not aware of any formatting suggestions for written comments through the CBOC portal. I am not sure why an address can't be provided to reach the CBOC directly.)

CBOC MEETING 8/5/22 - PUBLIC COMMENT MINUTES ADDENDUM B

Subject: CCSF Bond Oversight Committee Report for August 5, 2022
Date: Friday, August 5, 2022 3:07:35 PM

Dear Facilities Secretary: please enter the following letter into the official record of today's Bond Oversight Committee meeting.

Dear Members of the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee for CCSF:

First, thank you for your service on this committee.

Second, please prioritize the construction of the CCSF Performing Arts Education Center.

The voters of San Francisco approved and funded the construction of the Performing Arts Education Center, now also called the Diego Rivera Theater (DRT Project) in 2001, 2005, and again in 2020.

It is critical to complete the campus. The main campus is required to have a performing arts facility. The college is incomplete according to accreditation standards.

An auditorium space is much needed for the entire South, West, and East of San Francisco. Without such a facility, performing arts majors cannot receive their certifications.

Please prioritize the PAEC. Please review what exactly was \$34 million already spent on for the PAEC, and please move it up to be the first project worked on.

3. Please stop allowing huge expenses such as the move from Gough Street to be covered by Bond Money.

Bond money is supposed to be used for capital projects such as the construction of new facilities, not moving expenses.

Please scrutinize the exorbitant expense for renovating the bookstore. Please scrutinize the entire report; do not accept it as presented and allow misuse of funds to continue.

Respectfully,

Tomasita Medál