Any individual or group may address the Personnel Commission during the Comments—Public Forum segment of the meeting regarding any item that is within the Commission’s subject matter jurisdiction. However, the Commission will not take action on any item that is not on this agenda.

Any individual may appear at the Commission meeting to respectfully testify in support of or opposition to any item being presented to the Commissioners for consideration. Individuals wishing to address items to the Commissioners should complete a Request to Address the Personnel Commission card (green form) prior to the start of the meeting.

PUBLIC SESSION: 10:00 a.m.

I. ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

A. Call to Order  
Meeting called to order -10:20 A.M.

B. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bancroft</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Press</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Metoyer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. COMMENTS—PUBLIC FORUM (non-actionable comments from those in attendance)

III. AGENDA REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEMS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Review and Approval of Classification Descriptions – Instructional Support Family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENDA REPORT NO. 1

SUBJECT:  Review and Approval of Classification Descriptions – Instructional Support Family

DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ann Mirsky: Good morning everyone. I work in the Modern Language Lab – I’m the Night Supervisor there, and I’m here because I had put in a request for reclassification oh, so many years ago, and was put on hold. This is now going on for years. I find that very disconcerting because I have been working in the Modern Language Lab in a new capacity with computers whereas before I hadn’t, and I’ve been
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doing it for over 3 years, and it was my understanding from the Merit Rules that when you’ve been in a job position where you’ve had the increased duties and change of duties that you can then be “grandfathered” in, and I was looking forward to becoming an Instructional Assistant like the other people in Academic Computing, which is the department that I’m in. So, my title had been Media Resources Assistant II, and I was looking forward to being bumped up to Instructional Specialist, and that’s why I asked for the reclass and felt that I was entitled to be grandfathered into that after having been doing that kind of work for over 3 years in the Modern Language Lab, which is a computer language lab, where a lot of my duties have changed from certain more clerical duties to more technological duties. So that’s why I’m here today, because the head of my department decided to, in the Hay study, piggyback on to it and dumb down my position. That’s the only way I can describe it. If it’s not palatable to anybody, I’m sorry, but that’s what it feels like. I’m being reduced to what I would call a student worker position. Now if you want me to do that as my job description, then that would mean that the head of my department would have to make all the decisions on the supervisory work that I do with students and certain other duties that I do, and I would only be responsible for reporting on the payroll that the student worker worked 5 hours and whatever their salary time frame would be. But all the technological stuff that I’ve done, that I’ve put into the Hay study questionnaire, got all dumbed down. So I’m here to question why I have been denied a reclass, why my job duties were dumbed down. I didn’t realize I was in the instructional support category, especially being in Academic Computing and being in charge of the lab and running it the way that I do every night and on Saturdays.

Commissioner Bancroft: I’m not sure what comments Sue has already provided you, but we announced at our first roll-out meeting that we’re waiving that requirement that you have to, before you can request a reclassification once you’ve been classified. We basically have to get the Hay study implemented and have a baseline. That two years or whatever that you have to be in a position before you can ask for a reclass? We are waiving that, because we recognize the fact that that study has taken way too long. So if you believe that you are functioning at a higher level and are deserving of a reclass, once we’ve got this baseline study implemented effective January 1, we will then be studying reclassification requests and there won’t be that time limit.

Ann Mirsky: Because Kathy Becker, when she was called back to work here in a consultant capacity, did send me the notice saying that we are going to look at the reclassification again. And then this got all juggled around again with the Hay study. So I feel like I’ve been a duck in a shooting gallery

Commissioner Bancroft: Well, Kathy was brought in to help us try to bring the Hay study to closure, and it didn’t happen. And so now we have to have a starting point. So we’re starting with what Hay has recommended based on follow-up by Sue and Donna Peter, and there’s not going to be any restriction – you can immediately put in, after January 1, a request for a reclassification based on what you’re now doing.

Ann Mirsky: OK, but I had put that in even before the Hay study, and I felt I was entitled by the Merit Rules because it had been more than 3 years that I’d been in the position, since 1999, I have been in this new position. And in 2002, which would be the three years that I would have been in the position, I felt that I was entitled to be reclassified as an Instructional Specialist.

Commissioner Bancroft: OK, you need to put in that request.

Ann Mirsky: So I need to re-request it?
Commissioner Bancroft: What you need to do ... is we’re going to look at anyone that tends to be a problem in that situation ... but we have to get everything else in place first, and then on a case-by-case basis we’re going to back and look at the ones where there are questions.

Ann Mirsky: And my salary would be retroactive to when it was requested originally?

Commissioner Bancroft: No. It would be January 1 of this coming year.

Ann Mirsky: So I’ve gone without a salary increase as a result of being reclassified for 6 years now – 7 years now, when I could have been getting ...

Commissioner Bancroft: Ann, what you need to do is to bring all these issues up with Donna and Sue once we get this thing rolled out. We’re trying to roll out the Hay study. And yours is a special case. And so all the special cases are being held in abeyance until we can get everything else out. Because if we stop for each special case, we’d never get this thing done ... it’d be a moving target. So, please just bring your concerns to the attention of Sue and Donna, and we will be looking into it.

Ann Mirsky: I’m officially doing that right now on the record here. And do you need any kind of special paperwork? Do I need to get forms from you?

Sue Tsuda: If you call me, I will give you what you need to fill out for it.

Ann Mirsky: That will be retroactive or not?

Commissioner Bancroft: We will need to look into it. We have to review it. We can’t make a decision here without full information, and we don’t have that at this point.

Ann Mirsky: Thank you very much. Everybody’s on notice.

Commissioner Bancroft: Bernie?

Bernie Rosenloecher: Good morning. Bernie Rosenloecher, for the record. I want to make the same statement that I’ve been making at all of the roll-out meetings for the benefit of the people that are here. The negotiating team and myself have had continuous communication with Donna and Sue and, at the negotiations table, we have brought up the implementation of the Hay and we maintain, of course, as Sue has said, that the salaries are negotiable. And CSEA also maintains that the effects of the implementation are negotiable. We strongly recommend that if anybody has any concerns, that they be submitted in writing to Sue and Donna with copies to the negotiating team.

Commissioner Bancroft: Basically, we have nothing to do with salaries.

Commissioner Press: Well, I have a question about that. What impact will the change in the Board of Trustees have on negotiations in terms of how quickly they will move forward?

Bernie Rosenloecher: The whole environment has changed. *** I’m very positive ... from just the first meeting. I think it’s both sides’ intent to settle relatively quickly. I think the new board – I got two phone calls last night from the prospective new board members, and they called me, so I think that’s a very positive development. And all of the new members were endorsed by CSEA Chapter 36. So I think it’s a good sign.
Commissioner Bancroft: You know, we’ve met with Dr. Tsang, and I believe that ... with the new board members that this thing will move fairly quickly. I don’t think we’ll end up with the road blocks that we’ve had in the past.

Peggy Rose: I’m also on the negotiating team. I just wanted to inform you that the board will be presenting its proposal to us in January, after the new board is sworn in. Then we will have what we expect to be some very quick, intensive meetings. And, of course, the Hay study will be part of those. We have some setups already for meetings that are going to extend for three days at a time.

Commissioner Bancroft: I know that Dr. Tsang has indicated that they’ve brought somebody else in to handle negotiations, and I was pleased to hear that. I think I am fairly optimistic at this point. I have no say in it, but I am optimistic.

Commissioner Press: I would like to request that we be specially notified when there is any report given in a public meeting of the Board of Trustees about the progress of the negotiations, most particularly what may involve Hay study. I’d be very interested to know how that intersects with the negotiations.

Commissioner Bancroft: That can be done as an “information only” item because we really have no purview in that arena ...

Commissioner Press: I know, I’m talking about “information only.” But I’d like to know about it – while it’s being discussed, I’d like to hear people’s input.

Steve Levine: My name is Steve Levine, I’m Media Services Coordinator, I’ve been so for 12-1/2 years. When the Hay study started and the forms were pushed out for us to fill out and then our supervisors, managers, directors were asked for their input on that, things were set a certain way because of the length of time that it has been – which has been four years – things have changed drastically all over campus, especially, I feel, in my position, and I feel that there are many, many things that are written in the description that was sent to me by the Personnel Commission that need to be changed, need to be upgraded and need to be taken into consideration because of the length of time that has passed. Job duties have changed, supervisory duties have changed, and I just wanted this on notice because I think it’s really unfair to myself and to many of the hard-working classified employees on this campus to have to wait, through no fault of yours, four years to see this rolled out when changes are happening yearly.

Commissioner Bancroft: OK. Let me explain something to you. These studies normally take 12-18 months to complete. If we had gotten it rolled out within 18-24 months, you would have had to wait two years under our current rules, which would have brought us up to the 4-year mark, before you could have put in for a reclassification. We are waiving that 2-year waiting period. So we really are keeping it on track by waiving that 2-year waiting period. So, the study would have taken up to two years to get implemented, and then you could have immediately put in for a reclassification after two years, and so we are right where we are now, January 1, 2007. So there really isn’t any delay if you look at it in those terms. Because you would have been waiting until January to ask for a reclassification if we had implemented the study within the two years after we started it.

Steve Levine: So any time in those two years if there are major changes in what you do ...?

Commissioner Bancroft: According to our rules, you can’t ask for a reclassification, I think, unless you have been in those duties for two years. And we are waiving those. And by waiving those, we
have not put it to where it would have been in effect where you could have asked for a reclassification if the study had been implemented when it should have been implemented. Because it usually takes up to 18 months to two years to get one of those studies done. You would have had to then wait two years under our rules to ask for a reclassification, so that would have been January 1, 2007. By waiving that 2-year waiting period, we have taken that penalty away from you. And that's why we did that.

Commissioner Metoyer: I have a question too. Do you understand, Mr. Levine, that now you will be able to apply for the reclassification for your position because of the extra duties that you have, that you're now performing, in January? In other words ... and I think the good part of this, is that you’d still be perhaps doing those duties and could have applied for reclassification, but if there had been no Hay study done at all, there would be no basis to work from. And without this ... this college has gone years without this type of study – years – not just four years – you’ve waited a lifetime of working here for a job classification study to be done so that we’d have some legitimate something that everyone, both the union and district, could both look at and say, “OK, this is where we are.” And hopefully it won’t be another 25 years before one is done.

Steve Levine: I’m concerned that putting in for a reclass, I’ll be retired by that time.

Commissioner Metoyer: My point is this, and you’ve made my point clear, because there are people that have retired already that didn’t have the benefit of a Hay study to move them along to the next level. I realize that it has taken forever to get it done, but my point is that we needed to start some place. And because it is done, it is going to give you that privilege.

Commissioner Bancroft: And by waiving that 2-year requirement, you can apply for a reclassification as of January 1.

Edgar Montgomery: I’m Instructional Assistant, English Department. This might be more of a question. I beginning to get the drift of your strategy here, where you have to roll it out in order to get it started and then have everybody go through the reclass. Following up a bit on what Steven had said, the description for Instructional Assistant – English was formulated in ’89 and since then we’ve ... which mentions nothing about computers ... involvement with computers. My question is – we put that into our current job description hoping that perhaps that would be considered in terms of a new job description – which it was on the new one that you handed out. After January, would that be a legitimate thing to base a request for salary increase on?

Commissioner Bancroft: Let me give you an example. We have what we call Staff Assistants at the City [of Santa Monica]. Years ago they were using typewriters. And then they transitioned to computers and it was just considered a change in technology, not a change in duties or responsibilities. They were using a different mechanism to do their work. So I’m not sure if it would qualify for a reclass or not. That is something that you would have to put in a request and they would look at it. When technology changes, that’s a “how you do your job.” Often times that isn’t a reclass, because when we changed from typewriters to computers, that was not considered a reclassification justification. It will be looked at. Our interest is getting something current on file, because when we first came here we discovered it had been like 25 years since these positions had been looked at. When you do a study like this, you look at all of them at the same time rather than one here and one there and then people feel like some got preferential treatment and others didn’t. That’s why you do a bargaining unit-wide study – to make sure everybody gets surveyed at the same time.

Commissioner Press: I just have a question, and that is about the information that you just told us about the waiving of the 2-year requirement because of the long time that it has taken to get to this
point. Is there any kind of general information that has been extended to the employees to understand that? So you won’t have to keep explaining?

**Commissioner Bancroft:** I think it might be a good idea to put something out there when you invite each group – that you would have had to have done the new duties for two years before you could have been considered for a reclassification, so the study could have taken two years, which it probably would have ... we are now two years later, which is four years ...be eligible for us look at a reclassification. So that’s why we’ve waived that 2-year waiting period, so that everything would be brought back into sync. We did that on purpose. Because we didn’t want anyone to be penalized. I think it would be very good if we could get some kind of general announcement on all this stuff about the salaries, and why we’re waiving the two years so people aren’t being penalized and, as Dolores indicated, we don’t need to answer this at every one of these roll-out meetings or we’ll spend a lot of time saying the same thing over and over but to different people. So I’d like to get it out now to everybody so we don’t end of doing this.

**Sue Tsuda:** We included that in the original memo, but we will reiterate it and also specify what sections of the Merit Rules are being waived so that people can look at those.

**Richard Yancey:** I’m a Reprographics Operator II in the Media Center. The question I have is in regards to your saying that after January 1 you would have the ability to apply for a reclass. Four years ago I had applied for a reclass because of what existed either in our contract or in the Merit Rules – I was told that, yes, your job duties had increased but there was no position for you to reclass to. Consequently, there was nothing that could be done for my situation. So I was wondering how that would apply, since I don’t know if there’s going to be a salary increase from the Hay study. There are increases in the job duties, recognizing no changes that I had in a job title change. But in the event that there is no salary increase, does that still change the fact that there’s no place to reclass to, even though my duties have changed in that 4-year period, being looked upon not only as a lead person but also an increase in duties, from an administrative standpoint.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** Once you get a study like this implemented, if a reclassification is justified, we would establish new job classifications. You have your base point where you start, and just because there isn’t already something on the books, with the Hay study the good thing is that you can then establish new job classifications based on a reclass study.

**Donna Peter:** We did that. We created a Senior Reprographics – and also we’re recommending that there be a salary separate from ...

**Commissioner Bancroft:** Anybody else have any questions or comments before we take action on Agenda Report No. 1, our only agenda item for today?

**Kerry Dawson:** I’m the Athletic Activities Assistant in the Men’s Athletic Department. I’m just curious, do our questions have to concern reclassification at this time, or can they be of a more general nature?

**Commissioner Bancroft:** More general is fine. You can ask me anything you like, and we’ll try to answer it.

**Kerry Dawson:** In regard to the new job descriptions that came out, I was just concerned about the job in my class. I was wondering – are the jobs delineated by gender or are there parameters set up around gender that would differentiate one employee in that class from another employee?
Commissioner Bancroft: No.

Kerry Dawson: So employees in that job class should and shall do the same job as required by the job description?

Commissioner Bancroft: That’s correct. That’s why when you do a study like this and Hay looks at PDQs, they don’t know who filled them out and what race, gender – they know nothing about the incumbent, and they know nothing about the incumbent’s performance. That’s why I like to do a study that’s totally anonymous, and what people may or may not know about an individual employee is never taken into account.

Paul Williams: I was hired as the Math Lab Coordinator, not even two years ago, so I’m just now hearing about the Hay study. I was looking at the Coordinator’s essential duties that are laid out in ... basically it was not laid out like this for me when I was hired. Now that it’s laid out like this, I was thinking about reclassification ... so what does this mean as far as what I was hired to do, and now what they’re telling me that I’m supposed to do?

Commissioner Bancroft: Well, I believe what you were hired to do is based on an old job description that was being studied, and what is now in effect is what was determined was really the job.

Donna Peter: You’re the Coordinator, Math, right? I don’t think there were any real significant changes in the job duties.

Paul Williams: I mean like the web site, there was nothing about a web site, and I built a web site for the lab because it was old and no one was using it, there was no attention to it, so I built a web site, there was no maintaining it, I built it. It wasn’t in the description. I was looking at it myself as taking the initiative to do these things, because my job description was not laid out like this but I saw it as necessary for my job.

Commissioner Bancroft: We can have them look at it, but you need to know that when you establish a job classification, you don't list every single duty because you can't. Things are ... you list the major, primary ...

Paul Williams: There was nothing about a web site ... the skills that I was doing ... I was trying to apply to the job that I was doing. ***

Sue Tsuda: Could I make a comment? There are other tutoring coordinators. Not every tutoring coordinator does everything that’s included in the job description. When you were hired, I don’t know whether that was part of the job description or not, but if you have had significant changes in what you do from when you were hired, then you need to submit for a reclassification. But you don’t have to do everything that’s listed in the job description. And there may be some things not listed in the job description that you do, because there is a phrase that says, “Other related duties as requested or assigned.” And that can cover a lot of other responsibilities. If there’s a significant responsibility and you spend a great deal of your time doing it, then you need to come talk to us.

Commissioner Bancroft: I think the key to a reclassification is, there has to be a substantive change in the level of the duties and responsibilities of the position to warrant the reclassification. The key word is “substantive” or “significant” change.

***
Martha Jimenez: I work in Human Resources. I want to piggy-back on Ann Mirsky. There’s like three people here … my question to you is why are people being penalized … I submitted an appeal. If everyone’s being looked at,, I know this has to be implemented, but if they’ve submitted something, why do they have to re-submit, and why wasn’t it looked at when they appealed? I’m one of the appealees, and why should we be penalized?

Donna Peter: My understanding is that in fact your appeal was looked at, and a determination was made that – and this may not have been communicated to you very clearly – the determination was made that the only substantive changes were changes in the job spec. And those, I believe, were incorporated in there. So, what is happening is, we aren’t looking at anybody … basically what your asking for is a reclassification ahead of January 1. And the answer to that is the same answer that we’ve given to everybody, which is that we will … if you believe that, after the review and after the adoption of your job description, if you still believe that your duties are not adequately covered in your job … that you are doing significant duties that are different from what is outlined in your job description, then you submit for a reclassification.

Martha Jimenez: And we did that. I’ve done that twice. Prior to the roll-out.

Donna Peter: Right. I understand that. And there are other people who have done that as well.

Martha Jimenez: Right. But I feel at this time that you’re penalizing the rest of us because you want to move forward and those classifications are easier so … move with it, but what about the rest of us? I’ve re-submitted and re-submitted, to different directors and different consultants, and no, it was not addressed, and no, it was not communicated to us.

Commissioner Bancroft: I think what Donna said is that they did review it, and perhaps it wasn’t communicated to you, but it was looked at. So you need to bring this up with them. Well, have you talked to Donna and Sue about it?

Martha Jimenez: I’ve submitted already.

Commissioner Bancroft: OK. Then they will be looking into it. After January 1.

Martha Jimenez: And one question, too, on the split on the secretaries. As I understood it, because our roll-out was only 20 minutes because you had a prior commission meeting, it wasn’t as long as the regular roll-out – on the split on the Department Secretary II – the reasoning behind administrative and academic was that the secretaries worked under either an administrative department or an academic department?

Donna Peter: That wasn’t Department Secretary II, that was Department Secretary I.

Martha Jimenez: My question was, why wasn’t that done across the board? Because Administrative Assistants work in both departments and why wasn’t that done in that pool across the board so that they can be identified academic assistant and administrative assistant?

Donna Peter: That wasn’t a recommendation by Hay that it be split up that way.

Martha Jimenez: But you did that for the secretaries.
Donna Peter: No, Hay recommended that they be split up that way because they felt that in terms of the department secretaries that there was a difference between what an academic department secretary did and what an administrative secretary did in terms of dealing with students and not dealing with students. And they felt, apparently, that an administrative assistant – mostly what you were doing was providing support to an administrator. Therefore, you weren’t necessarily as much in contact with students. It was a philosophical decision, and I can’t tell you exactly why the decision was made. That’s my understanding of why the decision was made. I can’t sit up here and justify it.

Martha Jimenez: OK. Then the Department Secretary II that works in an academic department that was reclassified to an AA I, doesn’t report to an administrator. They report to Department Chairs if it’s an academic department. So the reason behind that doesn’t apply.

Donna Peter: What is your issue with their having done that? Do you just want to know why, or ...?

Martha Jimenez: Well, it’s not consistent.

Commissioner Bancroft: Well, you know what, Hay looks at ... and it has to be a significant differentiation before they differentiate ... they do not like to have differentiated class sets. They try to get things to be as generic as possible. In this case they felt there was a significant differentiation to substantiate what recommendation has been made. In the other cases, they did believe that significant differentiation was there. You don’t do it just because you do at one place somewhere else. There has to be a significant differentiation.

Martha Jimenez: I understand that, but it wasn’t applied. If you use the reasoning then you would differentiate the other classes as well.

Commissioner Bancroft: Hay did not believe that that was the case.

Commissioner Metoyer: I hope that everybody understands that we did not tell Hay what to do. Hay does this. That’s what they do. And when they came in and told us, “This is what we’re doing and this is how we do it,” it’s to our advantage to go along with what they do and how they do it. I think if anybody wants to know any more information than that, I think we can make available how Hay arrived at their decisions. We could ask Hay to provide that history.

Commissioner Bancroft: They’re the experts – that’s what they do for a living. We do not do reclassification studies for a living. We’re not experts. They do these internationally, not just nationally, and they’re recognized for doing probably the most objective type of studies that you can have done. But they don’t take into account the individual person, the person’s performance, their gender or any of those issues. There has to be a significant reason to differentiate, as they did in that one case, and didn’t in others. It doesn’t have to be the same across the board. That may have been the old way they did things here, but that is not the way things are supposed to be done.

Donna Peter: We can certainly talk to Hay and find out what their rationale was. I have no problem doing that, and then I can disseminate that information to the union and the individuals.

Commissioner Bancroft: That would be great. I would recommend that you do that. Any other comments or questions?

Commissioner Press: It goes pretty far back, and several people have pointed out today that it’s been four years – in looking over this today, I did come up with one question that sort of eludes me, and I’m
kind of thinking that probably the employees are not too up to date on it. If the answer is available, fine; if it’s not, I’ll renew is another time. It seems like if I was – I try to put myself, when I’m looking at these job descriptions and duties, in the shoes of someone who is a worker here. I think it’s difficult for me, and probably for a lot of people who are observing this process, about how the families were determined. What relationship connects the job evaluation of people who are artists, like Accompanist – Performance Artist and Lab Techs and English Instructor Assistant, Athletic Trainer, etc. What is the common ground? How is that determined? Because it sounds like very different jobs, to me. Does anybody know that? This particular category, calling it a “family” ...

Sue Tsuda: They support the instructors in the classroom. They support the teaching function. And whether it’s someone learning how to dance or someone learning music or computers -- what they’re learning is not essential. It’s that the role of all of these classified employees is to aid the instructor and what kinds of things are being taught by those instructors.


DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Motion to approve agenda item as presented

Motion made by: Joseph Metoyer  Seconded by: Dolores Press

Ayes: 3  Nays:  Abstain:

Amendments/Comments: Motion carried

IV. NOTE: THE NEXT SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PERSONNEL COMMISSION IS SCHEDULED FOR 11:15 A.M. ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2006 IN THE ADMINISTRATION COMPLEX, 2714 PICO BOULEVARD – 2ND FLOOR

V. ADJOURN MEETING NO LATER THAN 11:30 am

DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Motion to adjourn the Meeting

Motion made by: Joseph Metoyer  Seconded by: Dolores Press

Ayes: 3  Nays:  Abstain:

Amendments/Comments: Meeting adjourned

Adjourned: 11:30 a.m.
Submitted By:                  Date:  
Sue Tsuda, Acting Director of Classified Personnel & Secretary to the Personnel Commission

The Santa Monica College Personnel Commission does not discriminate against individuals or groups on the basis of disability in the admission or access to, or treatment in, its public meetings, programs, or activities. Requests for assistance or accommodation can be arranged by contacting the Personnel Commission Office in writing to the address below or via phone to (310) 434-4410 or fax to (310) 434-4612 with a minimum 72-hour advance notice.
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1900 Pico Blvd.
Santa Monica, CA  90405