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CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Good afternoon, everyone.
I'd like to call to order today's meeting of the State Allocation Board and if you could call the roll, please.

MS. JONES: Senator Hancock.

Senator Liu.

Senator Runner.

SENATOR RUNNER: Here.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Present.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Bonilla.

Assemblymember Chavez.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CHAVEZ: Here.

MS. JONES: Nick Schweizer.

MR. SCHWEIZER: Here.

MS. JONES: Thank you, Nick. Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Here.

MS. JONES: Esteban Almanza.

MR. ALMANZA: Here.

MS. JONES: Eraina Ortega.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Here.

MS. JONES: We have a quorum.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Great. So the first item of business we have today is the Minutes from the June 30th
meeting. Are there any comments from the Board members on the Minutes? Seeing none, is there a motion?

    MR. ALMANZA: So move.

    MR. DIAZ: Second.

    CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: So I think there's been a motion by Mr. Almanza, second by Mr. Diaz, if that's what I heard. All in favor.

    (Ayes)

    CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any abstentions or opposed?

    No. So the Minutes are adopted. And the next item will be Lisa.

    MS. SILVERMAN: Yes. So we have a few items to report tonight in the Executive Officer's Statement. One of them is the -- we announced the close in charter school funding round.

    The Board took action to provide preliminary apportionments in November 2014. With that, as of today, we'll have 13 projects for nine schools approved for $157 million. There's still a half million dollars that remains and so we've -- staff have been actively reaching out to those projects that were filed within that filing round to see if they want to take the remaining bond authority.

    If they choose not, then we will keep that bond authority available for projects that already have existing
preliminary apportionments that have -- that are sitting on the unfunded list.

So with that, once that happens, then we will return all the applications back.

The second item is to update the Board. They took action on the apportionments in April of this year for $113 million. That deadline passed July 14th. So there was 41 projects that had the ability to access the cash.

There were a few projects that didn't make that mark, and so they received a new date, and so they didn't lose their bond authority, and so with that, we just wanted to share that.

Plus there's actually 12 career tech education projects that have a 12-month timeline. Even though they did come in for an apportionment, they didn't activate it, but it doesn't mean that they're penalized. They still have until April 14th of 2016 to activate that cash and come in with the proper Division of State Architect's approvals and Department of Education approvals as well.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

MS. SILVERMAN: And just want to highlight regulation update. The Board took action and we have some regulations related to charter schools on general site to amend that regulation. And so October 1st, 2015, they'll be active.
We have a bond sale that's started today in the Treasurer's office, and so they're actively hitting the market, trying to sell those bonds for this program. So we're going to have a consent only agenda in a couple weeks. So September 8th, we'll have a 9:30 meeting to bring those apportionments or those awards for a consent only agenda. And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any questions or comments? Mr. Chavez.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CHAVEZ: Just I asked a question in preparation about the impact on the bond sale in light of all the things going on the market and I got a response, but I -- would you like to share that what you sent back to me?

MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. The member had asked whether or not there was going to be implications or any delays as a result of the turmoil on the market in the last few days, and the Treasurer had conveyed there could be no changes into the sale today.

However, I know the member was interested on whether or not the cost of the bonds would be different. They'll still trying to sum that up to see if the cost of the bonds which fluctuate a little bit. So we don't have any answers for that today.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Maybe that's something at a later meeting you could confirm with the Treasurer's office
whether they saw any change in the rate that they expected versus what was achieved.

MS. SILVERMAN: Yes. We could certainly do that.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: That'd be great. Thanks.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CHAVEZ: That was it.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. One housekeeping note, we have the item under Tab 10, the -- it was an action item related to the use of developer fees in financial hardship reviews. That item was removed from the agenda. So if you're here for only that item, you are excused.

Under Tab 4 is the Consent Agenda.

MS. SILVERMAN: It is ready for your approval.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. There's no additional items for the Consent Agenda. Any questions or comments from Board members on the Consent Agenda?

MR. DIAZ: Move to approve.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Moved by Mr. Diaz.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Second.


(Ayes)

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any objections, abstentions?

None. It passes.

I'm going to not call the final vote. I'm going
to leave it open in case the members who come later would like to add on. So the Consent Agenda has enough votes to pass, any of you were following that, but we'll leave it open so the other members can join in in the vote.

Let's see. Tab 5 is the Status of Fund Releases.

MS. SILVERMAN: Yes. So the financials on page 89, we just wanted to highlight which we have been on a regular basis. We did have a spur of projects come in from June 14th deadline. So we released $50 million in the month of July.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

MS. SILVERMAN: And so as far as the progress of projects that are moving through our bond authority currently, on page 93, we did introduce the consent agenda, those Emergency Repair Program projects, they were part of the consent agenda and also that was over 600 projects. So the Williams' settlement to that extent has been satisfied.

We still have $3 million that we want to identify for future projects, but just to highlight to the Board those items were part of the consent agenda.

There's a few seismic projects that actually were part of the consent agenda as well. So with that, there's $17.3 million of unfunded approvals in the agenda.

Likewise, staff did close out -- $300,000 in closeouts for the month as well.
CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any questions from the Board members? Any public comment on funds? Seeing none, we'll move to -- did we cover Tab 6 as well there, Lisa? Should we move onto 7 or --

MS. SILVERMAN: Yes. That's with Sausalito.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

MS. SILVERMAN: We wanted to highlight to the Board, we have a similar issue as we did present in June. We had a labor code issue where Sausalito Marin City School District did receive a seismic mitigation project approval and that approval was provided by the Board in May of 2014.

The district was approved for rehab of full classrooms at the Martin Luther King, Jr., Academy in Marin. However, the district opted to actually do more than just a renovation work. They actually demo'd the project -- the site -- those classrooms and rebuilt the classrooms.

And so the district came in and the Board took action in April for an apportionment. Come July 14th, they had a 90-day timeline associated with that project, and at the time, we were notified that the district had two contracts in place related to that project. One contract was awarded in June of 2013.

They did properly notify Department of Industrial Relations. However, it was 13 days late. They were out of compliance. So they had a five-day notification to the
Department of Industrial Relations.

They also had a second contract. It was for an earlier date, April 9th of 2013. However, they did not notify Department of Industrial Relations until the day prior to them submitting the fund release request to our office, which was July 13th of 2015.

Staff does understand that the projects that they were moving forward with was a much larger project, which is way beyond what the State grant was going to cover. However, they did not comply with the labor code.

And so with that, staff cannot release the funds. So we're -- we have some challenges before us, so we'll present to you with the recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any questions or comments from Board members?

Some of you will recall this is nearly identical to the issues we faced at the last meeting with some of the other projects. I don't think -- staff tells me there aren't any representatives of the district here today, so we don't have anyone here to talk about the project.

I would note one thing that I found curious in the information that we were provided is the -- that they seem to know to report to DIR in one of the applications but not in the other.

So I had hoped that someone would be here to kind
of explain what their process is for not -- you know, to
make sure that that did not happen in the future because it
seemed like maybe some staff knew what they were supposed to
do and others didn't and they needed to have a better
process.

So I -- but nevertheless, we do not have a
representative here. So any -- Mr. Nazarian.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Did we get any feedback
on what the justification was for that?

MS. SILVERMAN: Other than they just missed it.
So there's no formal justification provided.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: All right. So options before
the Board are to approve it notwithstanding the errors that
were made, to not take action in which case the funds would
not be released by staff, or take some alternative action.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: The alternative would
be?

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Go ahead, Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I would say that based on the current
Board action -- or the previous Board action, we're trying
to be fair and trying to provide the grant to these
districts that are coming in for applications when they make
these mistakes, but is putting other districts at a
disadvantage when they're complying with all the
requirements under the program and some aren't.

So at the last Board, we took the position with
certain districts that weren't in compliance to lessen the
impact by reducing the grant by 5 percent. So in that
spirit of fairness to those districts as well that were hit
by that 5 percent reduction, I think that that's an option
we should be looking at as well.

SENATOR RUNNER: Is that a motion?

MR. DIAZ: I will make it a motion.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CHAVEZ: So approved.

SENATOR RUNNER: I was just going to say I’ll make
that motion.

MR. DIAZ: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. It's been moved and
seconded. Any additional public comment on this item?
Seeing none -- are there any objections? All in favor?

(Ayes)

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any abstentions? Seeing
none, it passes unanimously. Minus 5 percent, yes, to be
clear, the motion was -- by the maker of the motion, it was
minus the 5 percent.

We're -- that's a little reverse than maybe the
staff report. I think the printed information might be a
little different. So we're going to the Alpaugh item now.
So that's my Tab 7. I'm not sure where it is for other
people, the Alpaugh appeal. Barbara?

MS. KAMPMEINERT: So the Alpaugh Unified is the first appeal we have on the agenda today, and this is an appeal related to prior facility hardship projects that the Board approved to replace some facilities on the school site due to some health and safety issues with the structure of the building.

The district is financial hardship, and what that means is that the State in this application provided grant funding as well as a financial hardship matching share. And the original design for this project was to replace 24 classrooms in a multistory facility.

The district has determined that in order to stay within the budget of the grant amount plus the financial hardship share, they need to change the scope of the project, and what they would like to do is reduce the classrooms to 21 classrooms, and rather than build a multistory facility, do a single-story facility. They're doing this in order to stay within the scope.

The difference in classrooms from the 21 to the 24 -- the other three classrooms are going to be part of a future new construction project, but that is outside of bond authority.

To do this, this requires Board approval because it is a change to a previously approved project and the
district would be required to get new DSA approved plans and CDE approvals. It's our understanding that they have done that.

Staff has evaluated the request to make sure that it is in line with regulations and then past practice in change of scope items and it appears consistent with other change of scope requests that the Board has approved in the past. It doesn't appear that there's any sort of advantage by requesting the change of scope.

The district did receive a grant increase for multilevel construction. If they receive this change of scope approval and they reduce it to a single-story facility as they plan, we would need to reduce that grant from their apportionment in order to keep it in line with the School Facility Program regulations.

So staff -- on page 112 of the agenda, there are four bullet points that we would recommend adding as requirements in order to comply with statute and SFP regulations if the Board does decide to approve this appeal.

And those requirements would be that the district submit the DSA-approved plans and specifications to OPSC, that they provide progress updates until they do so.

The third would be that we would come back with an amended apportionment item to reduce the multilevel story grant and make a few other grant adjustments due to the
change of scope request; and also to note that this does not extend any of the deadlines for the original project approval.

Staff does recommend approval of the district's request.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any questions from Board members? Any public comment on this item?

MR. HUDSON: We’d like to thank you very much for -- the SAB for considering this and we’d also like to thank OPSC who -- in order to help the students and the community. For Alpaugh, this is a really big deal, and we appreciate all of your support.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Could you identify yourself for the reporter?

MR. HUDSON: I’m Rob Hudson, Superintendent of Alpaugh.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Thank you. Any other public comment?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: All right. During the briefing, I asked if there was an opportunity for us to have some of our attorneys engaged in the exchange process so that --

MS. KAMPMEINERT: I think that might have been the Riverside.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Is that Riverside?
MS. KAMPMEINERT: This is Alpaugh, yes.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Thank you. I'm trying to follow which one this was, so thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Anything else on this item? I would just say that whoever's interested in making a motion --

SENATOR LIU: So move.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. I'm going to assume your motion includes the recommended four items on page 112.

SENATOR LIU: It does.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Great. So moved by Senator Liu.

MR. DIAZ: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Second by Mr. Diaz. All in favor.

(Ayes)

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any objections or abstentions? No.

Let's go back -- Lisa, if you don't mind, we'll go back to Item 4 which was the Consent Agenda. I think we have Senators Liu and Hancock and Assemblymember Bonilla who were not here during the consent item. So if you could call those folks.

MS. JONES: I certainly can. Senator Hancock, how do you vote on the Consent Calendar?
SENATOR HANCOCK: Aye.

MS. JONES: Thank you. Senator Liu?

SENATOR LIU: Aye.

MS. JONES: Thank you. And Assemblymember Bonilla?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BONILLA: Aye.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Let's move to Riverside.

MS. KAMPMEINERT: So Riverside is our second appeal on this agenda and this is also related to a prior facility hardship apportionment that the district received back in 2007.

And the district received approval from the Board to abandon and replace a school site. One of the conditions of the Board approval was that the district be required to sell the abandoned site and remit 50 percent of the proceeds back to the program.

The district's appeal today is requesting an alternative to satisfy that requirement, and what they would like to do is obtain an appraisal for that abandoned site and remit 50 percent of the appraised value to the Board to satisfy that obligation.

What they would like to do with the site is later trade it with a private party that has parcel that's
adjacent to the existing high school that the district feels
would be more beneficial, and they would be -- the parcel
that they would be trading for is -- has a higher value. So
they would be paying the private party some additional
funding plus trading the abandoned school site for the other
parcel.

There are no regulations or guidelines in the
program that address a site exchange in lieu of a site sale,
but there has been past Board precedent in a prior item with
Fairfield where a similar situation occurred.

And what staff has done is we’ve taken a look at
that Fairfield item and there were some requirements that
you'll see on page 117 of the agenda, page 3 of the item.

There are some requirements that came out of that
Fairfield item that seem to still apply in this case, if the
Board were to consider allowing the district to do this.

The requirements are to make certain that
something does result out of this that provides some funding
back to the program. One requirement would be to set a
timeline of 12 months to make sure that this occurs.

It is our understanding the district is ready to
move on this fairly quickly if the Board approves the item.

Also the second requirement relates to if the
district receives any cash basically for the exchange of
this site. It's not expected that this will happen because
the current appraised value for the other parcel is higher than the site that the district is trading.

But in the event that things take a little bit longer and values change, staff wanted to make sure that we had that requirement in there just to protect the program in the event that something unexpected came up.

And also some other timing issues -- or not issues, but some timing requirements to provide progress updates and to have a Board resolution from the school district board that acknowledges these terms within 90 days.

And then also in the event that they do not complete the site exchange and remit the appraised value within 12 months that they would still be required as part of the original approval to go ahead and sell the site.

If the Board does approve allowing the district to remit 50 percent of the appraisal amount, it results in $542,000 coming back into the program in cash that could be used for projects that are currently on the unfunded approval list and we could provide cash apportionments moving down the list.

As there is no regulation or statute on this, we are seeking Board direction.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any questions or comments?

SENATOR HANCOCK: I would move approval of the
item and the conditions.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BONILLA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Moved by Senator Hancock, second by Assemblymember Bonilla. Any public comment on this item?

MS. CALHOUN: Hayley Calhoun with Riverside Unified School District, just wanting to thank you for listening to our appeal today and to assure you that the district is ready to move forward with meeting the requirements --


ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: I just wanted to make sure that there was at least some component of involvement on the State maybe through our legal team while the transaction was taking place to just ensure, given the investment we're making, everything is done according to the standards that I think we'd want to see and follow through with the closure of the transaction and then be done move the project. That was the main point I just wanted to raise.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: And if I need to clarify, I'd be happy to.

MS. BANZON: Can you please clarify if you want
the legal team to be part of the negotiation after they have
paid the 500,000 to the State.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: I just wanted to know
there is an opportunity for us to be engaged in the process
given that it’s our funds and just to ensure that we're
following through and the district is following through
according to the standards that we would want to be making
the investment.

MS. BANZON: My understanding of this transaction
is that this was way back in '07 when we funded them and
when we have the condition that when they sell, you know,
they're going to return the funds to the State.

In this case where they're not selling, they are
exchanging, we have some parameters. Maybe we can do an
alternative, say get some more appraisal just to make sure
that the price is within -- is kind of the same as
comparable.

The problem I may have is in the trying to put a
legal team there is that where they've paid the State the
funds, they may have -- we have no vested interest in the
actual exchange. If they paid the state, there’s no more
interest there.

The condition was they need to pay us the funds.
So they pay -- we don't have any more interest and the other
issue is the Board jurisdiction may not allow us to actually
put legal teams negotiating where we have no vested interest.

And there may be liability issues for the State where we have no vested interest, and I would strongly advise against doing that. But, again, you know, this is maybe something the Board may want to discuss.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Well, and I think, Barbara, you -- part of what you talked about was the status updates, and so the staff would be hearing on a regular basis from the district where things are and making sure that it is in fact going to happen so that the issue can be closed.

So I don't know, you know, if that gets us any closer to addressing your concerns, but staff would be working with the district.

Senator.

SENATOR RUNNER: I was just saying I think in our discussion, you said there’s already been a situation like this where they did a land exchange with someone. So we have set precedent and we have done this in the past.

MS. KAMPMEINERT: Right. There was another district, Fairfield, that has done this and they did agree to the requirements and provided the updates as well.

The updates as written do end when the district remits the compensation to the Board. So if we wanted to extend that until the site exchange is finished, we need to
amend that as part of the motion because it is my understanding that they’ll be submitting 50 percent of the appraised value fairly quickly if the Board approves the request.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: The only reason why I was bringing this up is I just -- in many occasions, we will take a certain action and there might be something that we read about in the news press a year or two later that suggests that even though we made the appropriate investment and we did everything appropriately during the time of the decision-making process, something may go wrong later on. I don't want to accuse any district of doing that, but it was just a safeguard that I felt was somewhat missing in the process.

So I thought it might not be a bad idea to have some of our attorneys just involved in the process, but I -- if anything, I just wanted to know -- I don’t know of the liability that you’re talking about. I’d be interested to know what liability there would be that we are exposing the State to.

I would assume that we’re actually probably prohibiting liability or future public relations maybe mishaps if we're better engaged and involved in the process.

MS. BANZON: I'm not prepared to discuss the
liability issues. What I said was there may be liabilities attached to actually the State participating in something where the State may not have -- or the State has no vested interest.

Also the jurisdiction of the State Allocation Board is limited to apportionments eligibility. So you have -- Education Code 17075.3 -- 70.35 has the specific parameters of the Allocation Board's rights and responsibilities and authority.

So it may be difficult to kind of incorporate this legal team going out there -- the State legal team going out there and participating in negotiation of the exchange where we have -- where the State has no title to any of the properties.

I mean it's my opinion on this one, but again this may be something the Board would want to look at.

SENATOR RUNNER: It seems to me that we just want to get our money back is the key and it looks like if we have that appraisal and are able to get the money back that they owe us, then they are free to do what they want with the property, exchange it or whatever, and that’s not our involvement. So I would move the bill.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: I think we had a motion from Senator Hancock, so -- I don't remember if we had a second. So we'll count Senator Runner as the second.
Any additional public comment on this item?

Anything else, Mr. Nazarian?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: I will just abstain.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. So all in favor.

(Ayes)

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: And abstention, Mr. Nazarian.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Anyone else? Any objections?

Okay. Seeing none, the motion passes.

And we will move onto number 11, the Seismic Mitigation Program.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you. Good evening. Brian LaPask with the Office of Public School Construction.

In February, the Board asked staff to go and take a look at the feasibility of having a one agency review for Seismic Mitigation Program projects.

Currently, DGS, the Department, is charged with implementing the program, and there's two offices currently that process those projects. DSA has the technical staff for construction oversight and plan approval, and OPSC has more analytical and financial type staff for the funding portion of that.

These unique skills, we've kind of been evolving the way that we work together for these projects and trying
to work more as one unit. And what we've been doing is
we've been going out in the field, meeting with districts.
These meetings have typically involved the school district
and both OPSC and DSA personnel.

We found these meetings to be very beneficial to
the process and they give the districts more clear
understanding and expectation of what is going to happen
when they go to DSA and then when they come to OPSC for
funding.

Another thing that has helped -- that will help
into the future and especially in the past year, we've seen
these meetings, but other things too.

DSA's process is now requiring that seismic
projects have an incremental plan submittal. A lot of times
when a seismic project is being conducted, the district will
elect to do other work that's required in the same
buildings. They might do modernization work or even some
new construction type work because they're doing other
things.

If they are doing those types of things, a lot of
them aren't able to be funded under the seismic program.
The new DSA procedure, though, requires that any extra work
other than the required seismic work is separated into two
increments or more.

This allows for OPSC to be able to better
delineate the fundable, eligible items when it comes into our office.

Also we have been -- we will be releasing updated resource materials that we’ve worked with DSA very closely and they're really going to complement each other and will work as a joint resource for districts to utilize during their design process.

So while we do have two separate offices, we're really endeavoring to work as one, and in the last year, we've really seen an uptick in the frequency of seismic applications and the amount of money going out. And so we feel like we're going to continue down this path and it should help the program quite a bit.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any questions?

Senator Hancock.

SENATOR HANCOCK: I'm disappointed that we can't do a little to streamline, but it's probably asking a lot of any agency to streamline, so -- I guess I'll move to accept the report.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any other comments? I would say that I think that amount of dollars that have been drawn down since we kind of first talking about this a couple years ago has been -- it's substantial. I mean at this point, I think, if the numbers are right, there's $94 million left in this program.
I think at one point we were talking about 240 or something closer to that. So I think with the -- all the things that are causing schools to be able to come in with projects and the changes that the staff are making, I think we're going to see an even faster drawdown of those funds. So I think that that is good news, notwithstanding any other changes that might be made to the program.

So I think the staff have some applications that have just come in, and I think we'll see how that goes over the next several months.

SENATOR HANCOCK: Yeah -- increased awareness too.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Yeah.

SENATOR HANCOCK: -- with what happened in Napa and some of the recent scientific reports--

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Right.

SENATOR HANCOCK: -- we could really -- this is the time to do it right and to do it as quickly as we can.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Any other comments from Board members? Any public comment on this item?

Okay. Seeing none, with that, unless there's an objection, we will accept the report from the staff.

And the three-month workload.

MS. SILVERMAN: The three-month workload report and just to highlight, we have a consent only agenda in a
few weeks, September 8th.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: September 8th. We'll see everybody at 9:30 for a very fast meeting.

Is there any public comment on any of the items or on anything that is not on the agenda?

Okay. Seeing none, anything else from the members? No. We will be adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 4:38 p.m., the proceedings were adjourned.)
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