



EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

August 19, 2013

Board of Trustees
El Camino Community College District

Dear Members of the Board:

Summer is over!

I trust you are ready for the start of the fall 2013 semester, which officially begins on Saturday, August 24. However, most of the students will arrive on Monday and Tuesday of the following week. Please know that you are invited to the Flex Day presentation on Thursday, August 22, at 9:00 a.m. in the Marsee Auditorium with breakfast served at 7:30 a.m. on the south patio.

The August 19 Board agenda is routine.

The 2013-14 budget presentation presents the most recent information from the State Chancellor's Office in anticipation of our next Board meeting, September 3, where the final budget is presented for adoption.

In the next agenda item, the Board of Trustees holds a public hearing in anticipation of certifying the Environmental Impact Report for the 2012 Facilities Master Plan (item C of Administrative Services). Please contact my office should you wish to receive a hard copy of the report, although it can be viewed online:

<http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/board/agendas/2013/Environmental%20Impact%20Report%20of%20the%202012%20Facilities%20Master%20Plan.pdf> .

The remaining agenda is highlighted as follows:

- A. Academic Affairs presentation of new transfer degrees (See Attachment A).
- B. Student and Community Advancement grant acceptance of a \$500,000 Deputy Sector Navigator for Advanced Manufacturing, another example of our excellent community development activities.

Also included is a recommendation for student expulsion. Attachment B is confidential and contains an update on the student expulsion. Should you desire to

Letter to the Board
August 19, 2013

discuss this issue, a closed session has been scheduled. If not, you may vote on the action at the Board meeting.

- C. Administrative Services recommendation to establish the public hearing for the 2013-14 final budget. This Board agenda typically presents the number of purchase orders and blanket purchase orders for the initiation of the academic year. If you have any questions, comments or concerns about these, please call Ms. Cindy Constantino or me prior to the Board meeting so we can research your concerns.
- D. Human Resources naturally presents the final approved hires for the initiation of our 2013-14 academic year.

The following items are presented for your information:

1. Letter from LA County Registrar--Recorder's Office – Notice of Election
2. El Camino Community College District – Candidate Filings
3. Letter from LA County Registrar--Recorder's Office with Estimated Cost of Candidate Statements
4. Letter from Continental Development Corporation dated 7/18/13
5. Home Schooling
6. Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) Projections and Goals
7. Chronicle of Higher Education article, 7/7/13 – “Stunned by Accreditor, City College of San Francisco Suddenly Faces Hard Choices”
8. Steve Butler on “Pension Benefits Weigh Heavy on Detroit”

Please note that the next Board meeting is scheduled in two weeks on September 3, 2013. The budget will be submitted for adoption at this meeting. You should receive the budget on August 29.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the content of the Board packet, please do not hesitate to call Ms. Cindy Constantino or me prior to the Board meeting or please join me in my office at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, August 19.

Sincerely,



Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President



EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Office of Academic Affairs
August 15, 2013

TO: President Thomas Fallo
FROM: Francisco Arce
SUBJECT: Associate Degrees for Transfer AA-T/AS-T (Revised)

The College has 8 approved AA-T degrees. Four additional AA-T degrees were submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval in spring 2013.

The following transfer degrees are approved by the Chancellor's Office and will appear in the 2013-2014 college catalog.

1. Communication Studies AA-T
2. Geology AS-T
3. Mathematics AS-T
4. Physics AS-T
5. Psychology AA-T
6. Sociology AA-T
7. Administration of Justice AS-T
8. Geography

The following transfer degrees were submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval. The review process is taking approximately 90 days.

1. English AA-T
2. History AA-T
3. Early Childhood Education AS-T
4. Elementary Teacher Education AA-T

The College Curriculum Committee approved 7 transfer degrees that are being prepared for submission to the Chancellor's Office for approval. The submission process will be completed in Summer 2013. Anticipate approval will take 60-90 days from submission date.

1. Art History AA-T
2. Business Administration AS-T
3. Computer Science AS-T
4. Journalism AA-T
5. Political Science AA-T
6. Studio Art AA-T
7. Theatre Arts AA-T

There are four transfer degrees at various stages of review. These degrees will be reviewed by the College Curriculum Committee in Fall 2013.

1. Anthropology AA-T
2. Music AA-T
3. Philosophy AA-T
4. Spanish AA-T

The Chancellor's Office recently applied a new requirement to the AA-T/AS-T review process. All core courses in the transfer degrees must have an approved course identification number (C-ID). Some El Camino courses originally planned for inclusion as core courses do not have a C-ID and will require revision in the transfer degrees under review, thus slowing down the approval process. Nevertheless, Fall 2013 remains the target term for completion of all transfer degrees approved for development.



Los Angeles County REGISTRAR-RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK

DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

RECEIVED JUL 29 2013

July 8, 2013

Dr. Thomas M. Fallo, Superintendent/President
El Camino Community College District
16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, California 90506

Dear Dr. Fallo:

Enclosed is a Notice of Election for the school district election scheduled to be held with the November 5, 2013 Consolidated Elections. Pursuant to Elections Code Section 12113 you are required to post this notice in the district office. The notice has also been forwarded to the designated newspaper(s) for publication.

Also enclosed for your reference is a calendar of events for the election. This office has prepared a Candidate Handbook and Resource Guide which will be available on the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's web site at www.lavote.net.

Please call the Election Coordination Unit at (562) 462-2912 if you have any questions pertaining to this notice.

Sincerely,

DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

ERIKA MONTGOMERY, Administrative Assistant II
Election Coordination Unit

Enclosure

NOTICE OF ELECTION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN TO ALL QUALIFIED VOTERS in the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, that an election will be held on TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2013 for the purpose of electing officers for each of the following districts:

3 Members of CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
TRUSTEE AREAS 1, 2 and 5

2 Members of EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT,
TRUSTEE AREAS 2 and 5

3 Members of EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of HAWTHORNE SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of HERMOSA BEACH CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of LAWDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of MANHATTAN BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

3 Members of WISEBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Candidates for the above offices must be registered voters residing within the district or trustee area, if applicable, at the time the declaration of candidacy is issued pursuant to Section 5030, 35107, 72022 and 72103 of the Education Code and Section 201 of the Elections Code.

Declaration of Candidacy forms for the election are available no earlier than JULY 14, and no later than AUGUST 9, at the REGISTRAR-RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE, 12400 Imperial Highway, Norwalk, Ca. 90650, 2nd Floor, Room 2013, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Appointment to each elective office will be made as prescribed by Section 5328 of the Education Code and Section 10515 of the Elections Code in the event:

- a. There are no nominees or there is an insufficient number of nominees for such office(s) and
- b. A petition signed by 10% or 50 voters in the district or trustee area, if applicable, whichever is the smaller number, requesting that an election be held, has not been presented by 5:00 p.m., AUGUST 14, 2013.

Polling places shall be open between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

Persons requiring multilingual assistance in Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog/Filipino, Thai or Vietnamese regarding information in the notice may call (800) 481-8683.

DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
County of Los Angeles

PUBLISH IN: SOUTH BAY DAILY BREEZE
REQUISITION #: 14000021
PUBLICATION DATE: AUGUST 8, 2013 (THURS)

EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
CANDIDATE FILINGS
As of August 9, 2013

EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT Governing Board Member,
Trustee Area No. 2

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Inc	Sil Issue Date	Sil File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
NILO MICHELIN Teacher/City Councilmember 4439 W 138TH ST B HAWTHORNE, CA 90250 Phone: (310) 435-7472 Email: nilomichelin@juno.com Web Site: www.nilomichelin.com	NP						7/18/2013	7/18/2013
JOHN VARGAS Governing Board Member, Hawthorne School District 11963 RAMONA AVE UNIT C HAWTHORNE, CA 90250 Phone: (424) 703-4528 Email: john@johnvargas.org Web Site: www.johnvargas.org	NP						7/19/2013	8/9/2013

EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT Governing Board Member,
Trustee Area No. 5

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Inc	Sil Issue Date	Sil File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
G. RICK MARSHALL University Technology Administrator 2065 W 235TH ST TORRANCE, CA 90501 Phone: (310) 346-7425 Email: gmarshall@sbcglobe.net	NP						7/15/2013	8/9/2013
CLIFF NUMARK Torrance Councilman/Businessman 118 CAMINO DE LAS COLINAS REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277 Phone: (310) 367-9193 Email: cliff@cliffnumark.com Web Site: www.cliffnumark.com	NP						7/23/2013	8/8/2013
ARIA SHAFIEE Businessowner/Auditor/Educator 221 AVENUE B REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277 Phone: (310) 722-2708 Email: ariamohamds@aol.com	NP						7/25/2013	7/29/2013

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CANDIDATE FILINGS

As of August 9, 2013

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT Governing Board Member, Trustee Area No. 1

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Inc	SiI Issue Date	SiI File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
ARTURO RAMOS 3076 REDWOOD AVE LYNWOOD, CA 90282 Phone: (562) 445-5082 Email: aramgar3076@gmail.com	NP						8/2/2013	
ANDRES RAMOS Governing Board Member, Compton Community College District 12737 WALDORF DR LYNWOOD, CA 90282 Phone: (662) 537-1732	NP						8/8/2013	8/8/2013

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT SPECIAL ELECTION Governing Board Member, Trustee Area No. 2 UNEXPIRED TERM ENDING 12/03/15

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Inc	SiI Issue Date	SiI File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
D. LYNN BOONE 819 W STOCKWELL ST COMPTON, CA 90222 Phone: (310) 650-4301 Email: lynnboone11@yahoo.com	NP						8/9/2013	8/9/2013
LESLIE A. IRVING Teacher 1205 N ROSE AVE COMPTON, CA 90221 Phone: (310) 505-0089 Email: l Irving84@aol.com Web Site: www.leslieirving.com	NP						8/7/2013	8/7/2013

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT SPECIAL ELECTION Governing Board Member, Trustee Area No. 3 UNEXPIRED TERM ENDING 12/03/15

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Inc	SiI Issue Date	SiI File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
MARVIN ACEVES Lynwood Planning Commissioner 3901 PLATT AVE LYNWOOD, CA 90282 Phone: (310) 350-8040 Email: marvinaceves@gmail.com	NP						7/29/2013	8/5/2013
SONIA LOPEZ Legislative Field Representative Phone: (310) 919-9593 Email: mssonislopez@yahoo.com	NP						8/8/2013	8/8/2013

**COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT Governing Board Member,
Trustee Area No. 4**

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Ino	Sil Issue Date	Sil File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
DEBORAH SIMS LE BLANC Incumbent 16211 DOWNEY AVE 48 PARAMOUNT, CA 90723 Phone: (310) 867-3418 Email: deborah7770@sbcglobsl.net	NP	E					7/15/2013	7/15/2013

**COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT Governing Board Member,
Trustee Area No. 5**

Candidate Name	Party/Party Preference	Ino	Sil Issue Date	Sil File Date	DOI Issue Date	DOI File Date	NOM Issue Date	NOM File Date
LORRAINE J. CERVANTES Incumbent 425 S OLEANDER AVE 507 COMPTON, CA 90220 Phone: (310) 635-0777	NP	E					8/8/2013	8/8/2013
JANET MELBA EARL Technician II 1513 S CALIFORNIA AVE COMPTON, CA 90221 Phone: (562) 981-5651 Email: jl_90221@yahoo.com	NP						8/9/2013	8/9/2013
LOWANDA GREEN Educator/Entrepreneur 448 W CALDWELL ST COMPTON, CA 90220 Phone: (310) 293-8007 Email: lowandsgreen@gmsil.com	NP						8/9/2013	8/9/2013

RECEIVED JUL 23 2013



Los Angeles County REGISTRAR-RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK

DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

July 18, 2013

Dr. Thomas M. Fallo, Superintendent/President
El Camino Community College District
16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, California 90506

Dear Dr. Fallo:

Enclosed is a chart indicating the estimated cost for the translation, printing and mailing of a candidate statement for jurisdictions participating in the upcoming election. The chart includes the word limitation and whether the candidate is required to pay a deposit in advance. A copy of the Candidate Handbook and Resource Guide for the November 5, 2013 Local and Municipal Consolidated Elections is available on our website at www.lavote.net.

All of the information necessary to determine the actual cost of the statements is not available at the time the estimates are developed. After the election, you will receive an invoice. If the actual cost exceeds the estimate, it will be necessary that you bill the candidate for the difference. If the actual cost is less than the estimate, a refund for the excess amount will be made to each candidate by this office.

Please call the Financial Services Section at (562) 462-2645, if you have any questions regarding the estimated costs.

Sincerely,

DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

Francis Guijaro

FRANCIS GUIJARO, Head
Election Planning Section

Enclosures
J:Wn76:EstCostSchl.Nov2013

12400 Imperial Highway, Norwalk, California 90650 - www.lavote.net



ESTIMATED COST OF CANDIDATE STATEMENTS
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL CONSOLIDATED ELECTIONS – NOVEMBER 5, 2013
(SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTIONS)

JURISDICTIONS	APPROXIMATE REGISTRATION [^]	ESTIMATED COST				WORD LIMIT	WHO PAYS?
		ENGLISH ONLY		ENGLISH AND SPANISH			
		1 PAGE	2 PAGES	2 PAGES	4 PAGES		
ELEMENTARY, UNIFIED, HIGH AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS							
ABC Unified	56,030	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00	\$4,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Acton-Agua Dulce Unified	8,183	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	District will bear the cost
Antelope Valley Community College (Shared with Kern County)	178,072	\$3,500.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$14,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Antelope Valley Joint Union High (Shared with Kern County)	169,876	\$3,300.00	\$6,600.00	\$6,600.00	\$13,200.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Azusa Unified	27,308	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Baldwin Park Unified	29,324	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Bassett Unified	11,560	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Bellflower Unified	39,325	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Beverly Hills Unified	22,547	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Bonita Unified	40,099	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Castaic Union	12,909	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	400	Candidate – Advance

[^] As of 3/1/2013

Local and Municipal Consolidated Elections – School Districts (Continued)

JURISDICTIONS	APPROXIMATE REGISTRATION [^]	ESTIMATED COST				WORD LIMIT	WHO PAYS?
		ENGLISH ONLY		ENGLISH AND SPANISH			
		1 PAGE	2 PAGES	2 PAGES	4 PAGES		
ELEMENTARY, UNIFIED, HIGH AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS							
Centinela Valley Union High	65,997	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00	\$5,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Charter Oak Unified	21,385	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Citrus Community College							
Trustee Area 1	18,015	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 3	19,943	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Claremont Unified	26,314	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Compton Community College							
Trustee Area 1	22,030	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 2	26,947	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 3	21,323	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 4	23,933	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 5	33,424	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	\$1,600.00	\$3,200.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Compton Unified	72,265	\$1,500.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$6,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Covina-Valley Unified	40,412	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Culver City Unified	26,989	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Downey Unified							
Trustee Area 1	8,997	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 5	8,439	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 7	8,897	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Duarte Unified	14,915	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	400	Candidate – Advance
East Whittier City	41,173	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Eastside Union	10,371	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance

[^] As of 3/1/2013

Local and Municipal Consolidated Elections – School Districts (Continued)

JURISDICTIONS	APPROXIMATE REGISTRATION [^]	ESTIMATED COST				WORD LIMIT	WHO PAYS?
		ENGLISH ONLY		ENGLISH AND SPANISH			
		1 PAGE	2 PAGES	2 PAGES	4 PAGES		
ELEMENTARY, UNIFIED, HIGH AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS							
El Camino Community College							
Trustee Area 2	42,968	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 5	70,441	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00	\$5,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
El Monte City	30,604	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	400	Candidate – Advance
El Monte Union High	60,882	\$1,300.00	\$2,600.00	\$2,600.00	\$5,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
El Rancho Unified	31,256	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	400	Candidate – Advance
El Segundo Unified	11,429	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Garvey	19,343	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Glendora Unified	24,885	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Gorman Joint (Shared with Kern County)	60	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Hacienda La Puente Unified	56,489	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00	\$4,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Hawthorne	29,088	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Hermosa Beach City	13,710	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union	2,184	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$800.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Keppel Union	9,091	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	400	Candidate – Advance
La Canada Unified	13,309	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Lancaster	52,294	\$1,100.00	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00	\$4,400.00	400	Candidate – Advance

[^] As of 3/1/13

Local and Municipal Consolidated Elections – School Districts (Continued)

JURISDICTIONS	APPROXIMATE REGISTRATION ^A	ESTIMATED COST				WORD LIMIT	WHO PAYS?
		ENGLISH ONLY		ENGLISH AND SPANISH			
		1 PAGE	2 PAGES	2 PAGES	4 PAGES		
ELEMENTARY, UNIFIED, HIGH AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS							
Las Virgenes Unified (Shared with Ventura County)	43,305	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Lawndale	20,634	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Lennox	8,287	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Little Lake City	18,419	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Los Nietos	7,577	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	District will bear the cost
Lynwood Unified	24,440	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Manhattan Beach Unified	25,236	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	400	District will bear the cost
Monrovia Unified	24,525	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Montebello Unified	68,265	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00	\$5,600.00	400	Candidate – Advance
Mountain View	15,913	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Mt. San Antonio Community College (Shared with Orange County)							
Trustee Area 2	63,621	\$1,300	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$5,200	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 3	48,105	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$4,000	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 4	51,411	\$1,100	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$4,400	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 6	56,469	\$1,200	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$4,800	200	Candidate – Advance
Newhall	40,057	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	60,124	\$1,300.00	\$2,600.00	\$2,600.00	\$5,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance

^A As of 3/1/13

Local and Municipal Consolidated Elections – School Districts (Continued)

JURISDICTIONS	APPROXIMATE REGISTRATION [^]	ESTIMATED COST				WORD LIMIT	WHO PAYS?
		ENGLISH ONLY		ENGLISH AND SPANISH			
		1 PAGE	2 PAGES	2 PAGES	4 PAGES		
ELEMENTARY, UNIFIED, HIGH AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS							
Palmdale	53,186	\$1,100.00	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00	\$4,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified	43,521	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Paramount Unified	30,938	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Pasadena Area Community College							
Trustee Area 1	42,540	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 3	27,272	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 5	35,309	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	\$1,600.00	\$3,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Trustee Area 7	29,551	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Pomona Unified	68,743	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00	\$5,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Rio Hondo Community College							
Trustee Area 1	25,765	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	200	District will bear the cost
Trustee Area 3	31,253	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	District will bear the cost
Trustee Area 5	46,583	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$4,000.00	200	District will bear the cost
Rosemead	11,104	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Rowland Unified (Shared with Orange County)	47,427	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$4,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
San Gabriel Unified	18,733	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
San Marino Unified	9,846	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Santa Clarita Community College ** Office Nos. 1, 3 and 5	143,045	\$2,800.00	\$5,600.00	\$5,600.00	\$11,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Saugus Union	58,676	\$1,200.00	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00	\$4,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance

[^] As of 3/1/13

** Nominated By Office – Elected at Large

Local and Municipal Consolidated Elections -- School Districts (Continued)

JURISDICTIONS	APPROXIMATE REGISTRATION [^]	ESTIMATED COST				WORD LIMIT	WHO PAYS?
		ENGLISH ONLY		ENGLISH AND SPANISH			
		1 PAGE	2 PAGES	2 PAGES	4 PAGES		
ELEMENTARY, UNIFIED, HIGH AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS							
South Pasadena Unified	16,402	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
South Whittier	12,029	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Sulphur Springs Union	31,426	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	District will bill the candidate
Temple City Unified	17,487	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Torrance Unified	84,206	\$1,700.00	\$3,400.00	\$3,400.00	\$6,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Valle Lindo	3,261	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Walnut Valley Unified	33,581	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	\$1,600.00	\$3,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
West Covina Unified	30,302	\$700.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$2,800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Westside Union	38,571	\$900.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	\$3,600.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Whittier City	34,303	\$800.00	\$1,600.00	\$1,600.00	\$3,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Whittier Union High	113,501	\$2,300.00	\$4,600.00	\$4,600.00	\$9,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
William S. Hart Union High	143,068	\$2,800.00	\$5,600.00	\$5,600.00	\$11,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Wilsona	4,119	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$800.00	200	Candidate – Advance
Wiseburn	7,988	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00	200	Candidate – Advance

[^] As of 3/1/13



CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

RICHARD C. LUNDQVIST
PRESIDENT

VIA EMAIL & US MAIL

July 18, 2013

Dr. Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President
El Camino College
16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90506

Re: Development Opportunity Assessment / South Surface Parking Lots (Lot L)

Dear Tom:

Thank you for sharing the 2012 Facilities Master Plan Update (July 2012) and Draft Subsequent EIR (March 2013) documentation with us, along with several tours of the El Camino College campus. It appears that the El Camino College ("EC") and its various stakeholders have been very thoughtful and forward-looking in planning for the needs of EC through 2020 and beyond.

As we have previously discussed, it appears that there may be an opportunity, through development, to monetize the triangular shaped, nearly 1,200 stall South Surface Parking Lot which is bounded by Redondo Beach Boulevard on the north, the Dominguez Channel to the South and Crenshaw Boulevard to the east (collectively, "Lot L"). However, at this time there are several broad categories of unknowns relative to such potential opportunities. These unknowns would fall generally into the following:

- EC Vision – what is EC leadership and stakeholders' vision for how this important piece of property might ultimately be developed in a way that is most compatible with and supportive of the mission and vision for EC's own future and physical campus.
- EC Financial Objectives – beyond the previously stated long term hold/perpetual revenue stream objectives, are there other financial objectives, tools, options that EC would like to seek and/or consider? Participatory role in the upside of development of the site? Participatory role in the development itself (e.g. contribution of land in exchange for an equity share in the development



CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Dr. Thomas M. Fallo

July 18, 2013

Page 2 of 4

program)? Financial guarantor participation to facilitate bond and other favorable financing vehicles? Some combination of all of these and others?

- Land Use Entitlements – what will the jurisdictions with land use controls and authority over Lot L permit to be developed on the site (at a minimum the City of Torrance, but other municipalities, County and State agencies may have a say as well) and what conditions will be attached to such development? This is one of two indispensable components to ultimately determining potential value (Required Processes, below, being the other).
- Due Diligence – normal due diligence inquiries and studies typically associated with any site (e.g. title, geotechnical, environmental, legal, etc.) need to be conducted, assembled and reviewed.
- Community, Political and Other Stakeholder Outreach – typically part of due diligence, development of a site of this size within this type of a community setting, will attract a wide and varied amount of interest, comment, hopefully support and potentially opposition. Determining the interests and positions of all key stakeholders and working with those to craft the “right” development program is as essential to a successful project as any other component of due diligence.
- Parking and Circulation – as clearly stated in the the CEQA and Master Plan documentation, parking and circulation will continue to be critical elements in facilitating EC’s growth as planned. Assessing and determining the optimal efficiency of current and planned parking and circulation facilities will be a necessary component of determining how much of Lot L can be freed up for other development. Additionally, to the extent that a fresh look at the parking and circulation studies and plans yields additional efficiency opportunities, there may be additional hidden on-campus site and facilities planning opportunities not previously identified.
- Required Processes – since this is publicly owned property, it is our understanding that absent compliance with a statutorily mandated process, there may be limitations on sole-sourced and/or pre-selected entity participation in any development process. Understanding those requirements and how best to satisfy them is essential. From a developer’s perspective, certainty of process is as critical as entitlements in order to attract viable developer interest and optimize the value of the asset.



CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Dr. Thomas M. Fallo

July 18, 2013

Page 3 of 4

- Highest and Best Use – as with any other development opportunity, developers take the information developed in response to these uncertainties, combine them with their own knowledge of market conditions (e.g. rental rates, supply/demand considerations, construction and financing costs, etc.), draw up various alternative development plans, all in order to formulate the most viable and financially valuable development plan for the site. In this instance, “viable” must also take into account the proximity to and the needs of EC, as articulated in its own vision and financial objectives for the site.

Tom, as a matter of course, developers can usually and quickly conceptualize a plan and resulting value for a property. At the same time, before any developer is going to put substantial time and dollars at risk pursuing an opportunity, the developer is going to need information to make that yes/no pursuit decision. Thus, the process articulated above and the information/answers that it yields, is typical of what developers of all types would undertake in considering any potential capital investment and real estate development opportunity. While, the public entity nature of EC and the adjacency, programmatic and/or physical connections to the campus are unique to this site, the process of ascertaining their impact on the development opportunity are not.

What we would propose to assist you, EC leadership, and EC stakeholders is the following:

Continental Development Corporation (“CDC”) would assemble and lead a Development Opportunity Assessment Team tasked with ascertaining the answers to the various questions posed and assembly of the information articulated above. The findings of that effort would be presented to you and EC leadership for review and next steps decision-making. We have not yet spoken with any potential team members about this assignment. However, CDC’s nearly fifty year history of acquiring, entitling, developing, owning and operating commercial property in the South Bay has produced a tightly knit cadre of the top architects, planners and consultants in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, each with decades of experience working with CDC and working on these very types of tasks.

We would anticipate developing a scope of work for a planner, parking/traffic/circulation consultant, legal/process and community/political outreach team members. In addition to being tasked with ascertaining the answers to the questions and securing the needed information articulated above, each of the team members would also be charged with reviewing, understanding and providing feedback on the existing EC Facilities Master Plan and CEQA documentation as it relates to the potential Lot L development opportunity. We would want to discuss the specifics of the task in greater detail with you



CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Dr. Thomas M. Fallo
July 18, 2013
Page 4 of 4

and your team before beginning the process (to ensure that we have the right team members and that they are focusing on what is important to EC as well as the assessment of the project itself).

We would anticipate that this effort would take about eight weeks to complete – a couple of weeks to assemble and task the right team, three-to-four weeks of study and assessment on the various matters of inquiry articulated above, two weeks or so to prepare a written and presentation version of the team's findings and recommendations for consideration by you and EC leadership. Depending upon the ultimate scope of work agreed to by EC and CDC, we would estimate the assessment would cost between \$180,000 and \$250,000.00. In all cases, the selected firms would have demonstrated academic campus and collateral/ground up development experience throughout the metropolitan Los Angeles area.

Depending upon scope, we would expect the team to include an architect/planner (\$75,000-\$100,000), a traffic engineer also skilled in parking design/operations (\$30,000-\$50,000), legal/process review and analysis, including public/private RFQ/RFP and public-private-partnerships (\$20,000-\$30,000), community/political outreach (\$15,000-\$25,000), and \$25,000 in various out-of-pocket reimbursable expenses. A 10%-15% markup on the consultant team fees and expenses would help to partially cover CDC's time leading the project on EC's behalf.

Tom, we believe this is an appropriate first step forward for EC leadership to fully understand and optimize the opportunities that may be available to it through the development of Lot L. We look forward to sitting down with you and your team on July 31 (2:00 pm, your offices) to discuss and formalize this effort and to getting to work as quickly as possible. In the meantime, please feel free to call me if you have any questions or wish to discuss in advance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Lundquist

cc: Alex Rose
Bob Tarnofsky

Home Schooling Options

State law requires all children between the ages of 6 and 18 to be enrolled in a public school, unless they are attending a "full-time, private day school" or being instructed by a private tutor who holds a valid California teaching certificate. (*California Education Code §48222*)

This allows homeschooling parents four options:

1. Establish a home-based private school
2. Enroll in a private school that offers independent study or PSP
3. Enroll in a public school that offers independent study or charter school
4. Utilize a credentialed tutor - or the parent, if so qualified

Option 1: Private School Affidavit (PSA, formerly known as R-4)

Pros:

- Great scope of independence and freedom to share your child's education.
- Financial outlays are controlled by you.

Cons:

- You bear responsibility to adhere to all private school laws and maintain records.
- Support systems are not automatically at hand, but must be sought out or created.

Option 2: Private School Satellite Programs (PSP)

Pros:

- Administrative matters are handled by the private school.
- Family anonymity is protected.
- Support systems are offered to varying degrees, depending on the school.

Cons:

- Tuition fees.
- Some measure of restriction through compliance with curriculum guidelines, administrative supervision, and/or record-keeping, depending on the school.

Option 3: Public School ISP or Charter Schools

Pros:

- Materials are available on loan, and consumables are offered free of charge.
- Support systems are offered to varying degrees, depending on the school.

Cons:

- Subject to the dictates of state and local authorities.
- Moderate to heavy restrictions through compliance with curriculum guidelines, administrative supervision, and/or record-keeping, depending on the school.
- Public programs may not offer religious materials.

Option 4: Credentialed Teacher/Tutor

A parent with a current California teacher's credential may teach his/her child under the private tutorial exemption. The parent can use this option only for the grades their credential covers.

Parents may also hire a credentialed tutor for their child. No notification is required, but tutors are required to teach for a minimum of three hours each day, 175 days per school year, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:00 pm.

These minimums do not apply to private schools.



Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) Projections and Goals

The FTES goal for 2013–2014 is 18,470 FTES, a 1.67 percent increase over last year’s 18,160 goal. Due to an initial reduction of 50 courses in fall 2012 and subsequent and unexpected increases in apportionment funding, the 50 sections were later added into the spring 2013 semester. Despite the increases in apportionment, both fall 2012 and spring 2013 enrollments were down 2 percent. The State’s initial cuts to the apportionment budget were expected; the two increases, totaling a 1.67 percent increase, came as a surprise. This seesaw approach to budgeting made it difficult to plan the appropriate number of sections. The College was able to add sections in 2012-2013, but enrollment was 4 percent lower than expected. Consequently, the College missed the 2012-2013 FTES goal by 2.5 percent, or 465 FTES. To make up the deficit, 465 FTES were shifted from this year (2013-2014) to last year (2012-2013) in order to make the 18,160 funded apportionment cap for 2012-2013. We can only hope this year will be more stable and allow for the College to restore lost enrollment. In Table 1 we can see the FTES earned in each term.

Table 1 2012-2013 FTES and Section Counts (all terms)

Term	Number of Sections Offered	FTES
Summer 2012	325	1,399.23
Fall 2012	1,945	8,175.57
Winter 2013	51	205.86
Spring 2013	1,932	7,914.19
Summer 2013 (“borrowed” FTES Shift)		465.15
2012-2013 Total FTES	4,253	18,160.00

The funded FTES cap for the 2013-2014 academic year is 18,470 FTES, an increase of 1.67 percent over last year. The course schedule is designed to reach the funded cap and **restore** the 465 FTES shifted into last academic year for a total 18,773 FTES goal. Table 2 shows how many sections it will take to achieve the new FTES goal. The number of sections offered **was** increased 7.3 percent to achieve the higher FTES goal.

Table 2 2013-2014 FTES and Proposed Section Counts (all terms)

Term	Projected Section Count	Projected FTES*
Summer 2013	405	1601.28
Fall 2013	2,100	8,631.00
Spring 2014	2,080	8,548.80
2013-2014 Projected Totals	4,585	18,781.08

*Actual generated FTES used for Summer 2013; fall and spring values projected using 4.11FTES/section index.

Stunned by Accreditor, City College of San Francisco Suddenly Faces Hard Choices

The Chronicle of Higher Education

July 7, 2013

By Paul Basken

For the past year, the City College of San Francisco worked hard to meet accreditation rules—cutting its staff, retooling its management, and winning critical new taxpayer support. A core part of its community, the institution appeared to many to have done just enough to save its life.

Instead, last week the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges slammed the door, saying the college simply isn't making ends meet and declaring the end of its accreditation as of July 2014.

The federally recognized accrediting agency's decision was unexpected and "outrageous," said Alisa Messer, president of the American Federation of Teachers Local 2121, which represents City College faculty members. That's because the City College was making progress on governance and budgetary issues, all while showing no signs of poor or declining student performance, Ms. Messer said.

But the financial issues—the college is projected to be losing money by the 2014-15 academic year, even with new infusions of state and local tax revenue—apparently loomed too large for the accreditor to ignore.

The president of the accrediting agency, Barbara A. Beno, said in a letter announcing its decision that the City College "and many of its staff have worked very hard to move the institution forward." Still, Ms. Beno said, the college "would need more time and more cohesive institution wide effort" to meet accrediting standards.

The decision leaves the college, its 85,000 students, its 2,600 faculty members, and their surrounding city and state in a sudden and difficult bind. Regaining accreditation on its own through appeals or further reform looms as a long shot. Merging with an accredited institution is fraught with improbabilities. And the college appears to be too large to just shut down entirely.

The first step was announced on Wednesday, right after the accreditor's decision was revealed, when the California Community Colleges system outlined plans to appeal the decision, and to appoint a new and more powerful trustee to run the institution.

"A bold plan of action is needed to rescue City College," said San Francisco's mayor, Edwin M. Lee, backing the state's response.

In the longer term, however, the choices get less clear. Operating without accreditation is not an option. Accreditation is necessary for students to remain eligible for federal

student-loan and grant money, and for academic credits they have earned to transfer to other institutions. And seeking recognition from another accrediting agency is forbidden by state and federal rules.

'San Francisco Values'

In the only similar instance in state history, Compton Community College was absorbed into El Camino College after Compton lost its accreditation in 2005. The City College does have some candidates among neighboring community colleges, but none of a comparable size, making such an acquisition risky for the accreditation and survival of any institutions that might attempt it.

Another option could be a "creative alliance" with a different type of institution, such as a state college or even a private college, said Robert M. Shireman, director of California Competes, a nonprofit group of business and civic leaders.

A first step, however, regardless of who or what ends up running the City College of San Francisco, may have to involve some major bridge building. As Ms. Beno's agency made clear, the financial troubles have a story behind them: The City College has a diverse but ultimately unwieldy governance structure, in which faculty members play an unusually powerful role, according to the accrediting agency.

With the power of their shared-governance system, faculty members helped ensure their priorities as the City College coped with sharp reductions in state financial assistance during the recession. In particular, said Ms. Messer, an English instructor, the institution put a priority on cuts "outside the classroom."

Such decisions included protecting an abundance of noncredit courses, which employ faculty members but generate less revenue, said Raymond R. White, an instructor in biology at the City College who is critical of the union.

Ms. Messer said the college's choices "were not typical of the other" California community colleges. "They were a reflection of our 'San Francisco values.'"

But those haven't proved to be the values of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, part of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In announcing its decision last week, the commission cited a "lack of financial accountability, as well as institutional deficiencies in the area of leadership and governance," as the main reasons for its decision.

Mr. Shireman, a former top official in the U.S. Education Department, said the City College's broad course catalog in part reflects its unusual role as a designated provider of adult education in San Francisco, a function handled in most cities by the elementary and secondary schools.

But over all, he said, the union has been part of a divisive leadership structure at City College, in which faculty members have been overly fearful of community colleges' focusing too tightly on job training. Some faculty members have suggested that is Ms. Beno's real agenda, with the commission part of a conservative strategy to narrow the mission of publicly financed education.

A key grievance, in that regard, was Ms. Beno's public support of a new California law—opposed by City College faculty members—that sets conditions favoring more-traditional students who either transfer to a four-year college or get vocational training.

The City College educates students from a wide range of backgrounds, including prison and violent homes, and society benefits from their educational successes, said Wendy S. Kaufmyn, an engineering instructor at the college.

"A lot of our students don't fit that narrow path, that narrow definition of what a lot of people think students are," Ms. Kaufmyn said, referring to the California law backed by Ms. Beno.

But the pursuit of such wider missions, Mr. Shireman said, needs to be properly financed. "There are broader discussions about the extent to which community colleges can do just whatever they want whenever they want, with taxpayer money, versus having some method of prioritizing what to fund and what not to fund," he said.

Student Achievements

On educational achievement, City College leaders cite state data showing that their students perform better than the California Community Colleges system's averages in important categories, including retention and graduation rates. The degree completion rate at the City College among students who arrive unprepared is almost 12 percentage points higher than the state average, according to figures compiled by Margaret C. Hanzimanolis, an adjunct English instructor at the City College and two other nearby community colleges.

But on fiscal issues, the situation is more dire. State support for California's community colleges has fallen 12 percent since the 2008-9 academic year. The City College got some help in November, when voters at both the state and city levels approved ballot measures setting aside more money for community colleges. But even with those twin infusions of cash, the City College is expected to fall back into deficit as early as the 2014-15 year, with red ink totaling \$2.5-million, according to a report last year by the state's Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team.

Union members have disputed that projection, distributing an analysis suggesting the state assessment was riddled with exaggerations and factual errors. Also, any future projections are heavily influenced by highly controversial decisions about how much money the City College should put into retirement reserves, said Richard H. Baum, who teaches social sciences.

And either way, the City College is far from the only struggling institution. Twenty-seven of California's 112 community colleges have been given sanctions or warnings by their regional accreditor.

In the past year, since Ms. Beno's agency first put the City College on warning status, the college has taken steps that include laying off faculty members, closing some campuses, reorganizing departments, and revising a mission statement that emphasizes a diverse mission reaching to cultural enrichment and lifelong learning.

The college's faculty has also fought back. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges faces its own renewal hearing this December by the U.S. Education Department, and Ms. Messer's union has filed with the department over the commission's behavior.

In a 280-page filing in April, the union questioned the commission's motives in penalizing the City College, suggesting potential conflicts of interest that include the presence of Ms. Beno's husband on a review panel that makes site visits for the commission. The union also suggested that the commission, through its power to influence budgetary reforms, was improperly suggesting the use of a retirement-fund investment structure in which two commission members have a financial interest.

And by threatening the City College with drastic consequences for its failure to meet commission standards, Ms. Beno is further scaring away students from the college, which once had as many as 120,000 students, Ms. Kaufmyn said.

Ms. Beno has rejected such talk. The retirement-fund investments are voluntary, a spousal relationship is not a conflict, and City College management is responsible for the situation it faces, she said. "Leadership, understood at a broad level, has been the problem," Ms. Beno said.

The U.S. Education Department wrote last month to Ms. Beno saying it wanted a comprehensive response to the allegations made by the union. But department officials, questioned after last week's decision to revoke the City College's accreditation, said Congress had made it clear that institutions must meet standards in areas that include financial solvency, and that student achievement alone is not a sufficient means of retaining accreditation.

From: Steve Butler mr401k@pensiondynamics.com
Subject: CORRECTED VERSION: Pension benefits weigh heavy on Detroit
Date: July 29, 2013, 1:15 PM
To: Thomas Fallo tfallo@elcamino.edu

I remember Gerald Ford's comment back in 1975 when New York City was peering into the abyss. The headlines at the time screamed, "FORD TO CITY: "DROP DEAD" My former college roommate, Roger Pyle, worked with Felix Rohatyn to put Humpty Dumpty back together, and they were referred to at the time as "Batman and Robin."

But now, Detroit has bitten the bullet along with Stockton and Vallejo. They obviously missed the secret sauce that worked for New York -- which in the end turned out to be a multipronged exercise of cooperation between banks, unions, city management and, finally, a U.S. government guarantee of the city's debt.

How many other cities can possibly be close behind? Oakland immediately comes to mind as it refuses to even discuss the pension and health benefits as part of any restructuring of the city's obligations. The reason the cost of future promises doesn't make it to the negotiating table is because it is too complicated for the average person to understand. The average person doesn't have to feel too bad about this, however, because even the pension professionals, known as actuaries, are squabbling among themselves to determine some guidelines for how well pension plans are funded in the light of future payment obligations.

I can clear this up once and for all. If a city (or BART) worker happens to be earning close to \$100,000 in salary and benefits at the time they retire after 30 years, the expectation is that they will receive roughly that amount of money for the rest of their expected lifespan, which would be age 87, or 25 years after retiring at age 62. Since the retirement income, plus the benefits, will rise at the rate of inflation, this will compound to be a huge number, but it's bad enough if we just assume \$100,000 per year for 25 years for a total of \$2.5 million.

There is a concept called "present value," which allows us to value that stream of income and benefits in today's dollars. Since we don't have to pay the \$2.5 million out today, we get to invest what we don't pay out. Somewhere in a vast pool of retirement plan money, there are dollars earning income for us -- income that will be part of what we will be paying out in benefits as long as 25 years from now.

The present value of that 25-year stream of \$100,000 yearly income is \$1,067,500 if we assume that we earn an 8 percent rate of return on what we don't pay out. In other words, about \$1.5 million of the total we will pay will be provided by the income we earn on the \$1,067,500 that we earmark today for that retiree and slowly disburse over time at \$100,000 per year.

If we assume that we will only earn 6 percent on the money we set aside, then the present value of the amount we have to earmark for the new retiree jumps to \$1,278,300. This change in the expected rate of return (known as the "discount rate") just happened in Detroit. As part of the bankruptcy proceeding, a new actuarial firm using different assumptions proclaimed that the retirement fund was underwater by an additional \$3.5 billion.

It gets worse. The examples above assume no inflationary increases in either the income or the benefits. If we assume inflation of the current 2.5 percent, our \$100,000 rises slowly to more than \$200,000 in 25 years. Imagine what this does to the present value calculations. Someone can argue that when the average government employee walks out the door, they are given effectively a check for roughly \$2 million. In fact, this is what the fund should have accumulated for that specific employee over their 30 years of employment. In fact, they are far short of the number they should have accumulated for each retiring employee.

This explains why pension benefits don't come up in negotiations. Elected officials need the support of unions and city employees, and this is one compensation component so shrouded in mystery that the "IBG" (I'll be gone") school of management offers the path of minimum regret for any official who hopes to be re-elected. The rest of us will still be here, however, and so will former city employees, like those in Rhode Island, who have nowhere to turn for their money.

Perhaps it's time to scrap these pension plans and government-paid benefits forever. Negotiate strictly over paid salary, which is easy to see, and all parties may come to the realization that 50 percent of something is better than 100 percent of nothing.



EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

August 14, 2013

Ms. Aria Shafiee
221 Avenue B
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dear Ms. Shafiee:

Thank you for your interest in serving on the El Camino Community College District Board of Trustees. I trust the election experience will be positive as you examine the issues and opportunities facing El Camino College, its community and its students.

You are invited, as are all candidates, to meet with me during the last week of August or early part of September. Please call Ms. Cynthia Constantino, Assistant to the President, in my office at (310) 660-3111, to arrange for a personal one-hour appointment. I will be pleased to present you with various College publications and attempt to answer any questions you might have regarding El Camino College.

I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President



EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

August 14, 2013

Mr. Cliff Numark
116 Camino de las Colinas
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dear Mr. Numark:

Thank you for your interest in serving on the El Camino Community College District Board of Trustees. I trust the election experience will be positive as you examine the issues and opportunities facing El Camino College, its community and its students.

You are invited, as are all candidates, to meet with me during the last week of August or early part of September. Please call Ms. Cynthia Constantino, Assistant to the President, in my office at (310) 660-3111, to arrange for a personal one-hour appointment. I will be pleased to present you with various College publications and attempt to answer any questions you might have regarding El Camino College.

I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President



EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

August 14, 2013

Mr. G. Rick Marshall
2065 W. 235th Street
Torrance, CA 90501

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for your interest in serving on the El Camino Community College District Board of Trustees. I trust the election experience will be positive as you examine the issues and opportunities facing El Camino College, its community and its students.

You are invited, as are all candidates, to meet with me during the last week of August or early part of September. Please call Ms. Cynthia Constantino, Assistant to the President, in my office at (310) 660-3111, to arrange for a personal one-hour appointment. I will be pleased to present you with various College publications and attempt to answer any questions you might have regarding El Camino College.

I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President



EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

August 14, 2013

Mr. John Vargas
11963 Ramona Avenue Unit C
Hawthorne, CA 90250

Dear Mr. Vargas:

Thank you for your interest in serving on the El Camino Community College District Board of Trustees. I trust the election experience will be positive as you examine the issues and opportunities facing El Camino College, its community and its students.

You are invited, as are all candidates, to meet with me during the last week of August or early part of September. Please call Ms. Cynthia Constantino, Assistant to the President, in my office at (310) 660-3111, to arrange for a personal one-hour appointment. I will be pleased to present you with various College publications and attempt to answer any questions you might have regarding El Camino College.

I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President



EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

August 14, 2013

Mr. Nilo Michelin
4439 W. 138th Street #B
Hawthorne, CA 90250

Dear Mr. Michelin:

Thank you for your interest in serving on the El Camino Community College District Board of Trustees. I trust the election experience will be positive as you examine the issues and opportunities facing El Camino College, its community and its students.

You are invited, as are all candidates, to meet with me during the last week of August or early part of September. Please call Ms. Cynthia Constantino, Assistant to the President, in my office at (310) 660-3111, to arrange for a personal one-hour appointment. I will be pleased to present you with various College publications and attempt to answer any questions you might have regarding El Camino College.

I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President