

**NEWPORT-MESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
MEASURE F CITIZENS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES AND REPORT OF THE MEETING OF  
February 6, 2018**

The Citizens Oversight Committee met on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at the Roderick H. MacMillian Board Room, Education Center, 2985-A Bear Street, Costa Mesa, CA 92626

**Members Present:**

Robert Ooten, Chairperson, Member at Large  
Suzanne Gauntlett, Member at Large, HCPTA Vice President of Legislation  
Lee Ramos, City of Costa Mesa Senior Commission  
Richard Rutledge, Estancia Parent & PTA Member  
Mitch Vance, TGV Partners

**Members Absent:**

Julio Zunzunegui, Mariners Parent  
Tom Johnson, Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce Vice President

**Also Present:**

Andrew Park, CPA, Partner, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP  
Tim Marsh, Administrative Director, Facilities Support Services  
Tim Holcomb, Assistant Superintendent and Chief Operating Officer, Business Services  
Jeff Trader, Executive Director, Chief Financial Officer  
Lori Horrell, Administrative Assistant to Tim Marsh

**Project Management Team:**

None Present

**Handouts:**

Meeting Agenda for February 6, 2018  
Meeting Minutes from November 6, 2017  
Measure F Budget Summary Report through December 31, 2017  
Expenditure Report May 1, 2016 through December 31, 2017  
Building Fund (Measure F) Financial and Performance Audit – June 30, 2016  
Building Fund (Measure F) Financial and Performance Audit – June 30, 2017

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

Administrative Director Tim Marsh opened the meeting at 6:05 pm.

**SELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON**

Tim Marsh went over the responsibility of the chairperson. Robert Ooten nominated Mitch Vance for Chairperson for the 2018 calendar year. The vote was accepted 4-0. Tim Marsh suggested a second Chairperson might be a good idea moving forward. It was agreed, and Richard Rutledge volunteered, and was nominated 4-0 as a second chairperson.

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Agenda for the February 6, 2018 meeting was adopted as presented.

## **ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES**

Minutes from the November 6, 2017 meeting were adopted as presented.

## **DISTRICT REPORT**

Mr. Marsh introduced Mr. Andrew Park, CPA, Partner, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP, who performed the Measure F 2015-16 and 2016-17 audits.

### 2016-17 Audit Report

Mr. Park described that the primary responsibility of the auditor with respect to the bond report is issuing an opinion on the financial statements and compliance. In essence, the audit report, as it relates to Measure F is a two-part audit, with three separate opinions.

The primary opinion pertains to the financial statement itself. The auditor issues a set of opinions on various circumstances, in this case, the Measure F financial statements, and determines whether the statements as of June 30, 2017 are materially correct. Within the scope of the school district, even if the financial statement is off a few dollars, it is still materially correct. As far as the opinion is concerned, we have varying levels of assurances: the highest level being an unmodified opinion, followed by a qualified opinion, and lastly, disclaimer or adverse opinion.

Unmodified means deviating from our standard opinion and saying we are okay with this or not okay with this because of these reasons. For a qualified opinion, we would deviate from our prescribed opinion when financial statements in the audit report we believe are wrong but we still present it based on what district wants (i.e., off 1 million but present what district wants, still believing we are off by a million) as a result, I would qualify the opinion. For a disclaimer, or adverse opinion example, we would get a set of financial statements but have no idea if the numbers are correct because there is no back up to the figures, or no objective approach.

For a clean opinion, the statement you would be looking for is:

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the Building Fund (Measure F) of the Newport-Mesa Unified School District at June 30, 2017, and the changes in the financial position for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

This opinion is specifically regarding where the bond monies are housed. Within school district accounting there are multiple pockets. Bond funds are housed in what we call building fund, or fund 21. In this case, we are issuing a specific opinion on the building fund.

As a general overview as to how we approach this, as of 6/30/17 the balance sheet shows the numbers we are issuing an opinion on (assets/liabilities). Conversely, the income statement shows revenues/expenditures for the year ending 6/30/17 (cumulative).

We confirm these figures with an outside source, primarily the County Treasurer. We take the balance and trace it back to the general ledger and make sure it coincides. The Accounts receivable component is the earnings generated for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter as a result of the money sitting in County Treasury. So County Treasury is pooled money, but all those monies are invested in a

variety of assets (safe investments). As a result they generate income, and represent the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter earnings that the district has in the County Treasury.

The next item is accounts payable. It represents the District's liability as of June 30, 2017. If services were rendered and goods were delivered as of June 30, 2017, and the district has not paid for it as of June 30, 2017, that is what constitutes accounts payable. The way we test this is, for a governmental agency, you generally pay all your bills. So we go in to 17-18, look at all the payments made within the fund, and based on supporting documents, we identify whether or not the district has paid for services rendered prior to June 30, 2017.

The Measure F funds show close to 7.2 million dollars, and monies spent are 7.2 million dollars. The residual is \$3,753, so it tells you that you have exhausted your bond funds.

A separate opinion is internal controls that govern the reporting of the numbers presented. These controls are in place to make sure there are checks and balances to determine that the district reports the correct numbers presented in the financial statements. Similar to the first opinion, this is basically a report of exceptions. We report what the district did not do correctly.

This district has received a clean opinion. If it were not a clean opinion, or a qualified opinion, there would be additional verbiage of explanation. Both financial statements and internal controls received clean opinions for the 2016-17 fiscal year. No issues found.

#### Independent Auditor's Report on Performance

Did the district spend bond funds according to how they were approved to be spent? We align approved bonds on the ballot measure with the County transactions and give a yes or no to this question.

The last paragraph of the report is the result:

The results of our tests indicated that the District expended Building Fund (Measure F) only for the specific projects approved by the voters, in accordance with Proposition 39 and outlined in Article XIII A, Section 1(b)(3)(C) of the California Constitution.

We tested a total of 11 transactions totaling 6.4 million dollars. This represents 89% of the total expenditures of the 7.2 million dollars.

#### 2015-16 Audit Report

We issued an unmodified opinion (or a clean opinion) when it comes to the financial statements as of June 30, 2016. From an activity standpoint, the district began the 15-16 fiscal year with 10.4 million dollars, and during the year, the district spent 3.2 million dollars, and ended up closing with 7.2 million dollars.

When it came to the internal controls, we also issued an unmodified opinion (or a clean opinion).

The second half of the report regarding compliance received a clean opinion. In terms of the scope covered, we sampled 15 transactions, which means the volume of activity was low. This represents 50% of 3.3 million dollars spend. Based on these transactions, we issued a clean opinion and did not find any exceptions.

Mr. Rutledge stated that the board meeting minutes are very transparent, and that is probably why I am on this committee, because I know how to read them and search them. I know there is a log of Measure F spending at every board meeting; the district has once or twice a month published all this information for the last two years (even though this committee is a little behind). Is this correct? Mr. Parks confirmed that this is correct and that because of all the reports issued, most of the reports are completed in January.

Mr. Vance asked Mr. Parks if there is anything else, as a committee, that we should ask him as our responsibility. Mr. Parks felt everything has been addressed. Mr. Vance asked if Mr. Park's firm has audited for the district in the past. Mr. Parks confirmed that they have been auditing the district for at least 10 years.

Mr. Vance had all members present confirm that they were comfortable voting for approval on both audits at this time. Audit reports for the period of 2015-16 and 2016-17 were approved 4-0. Mr. Ramos arrived late and abstained from voting.

#### Fiscal Report

Mr. Marsh spoke on the fiscal reports. He went over the summary report of the expenditures, noting that there were a few minor expenditures in the closeout of the Corona del Mar HS Enclave & Theater Project, and the Costa Mesa HS Enclave & Theater Project.

Everything else associated with the projects are for Davidson Field. He explained that the fee for additional expenditures, which was Bank of New York, is where the cash is held. There is cash held at the County, but early on in this process, many of the funds were held at Bank of New York.

Ms. Gauntlett pointed out typos on the reports to be corrected. Mr. Rutledge confirmed that some of the 15 million dollar funding, was for potential earthquake damage. The P.O. Query is specifically for Davidson Field and includes all the various vendors involved, and inventory number, warrant number, date and cost.

Ms. Gauntlett questioned errors with dates to be verified. Mr. Marsh explained DSA dates which could be way after the fact. The warrant numbers do not make sense so it will be confirmed. Ms. Gauntlett also mentioned in the minutes from previous meetings, that we are no longer allowed to buy equipment, but she sees furniture on these reports. Mr. Marsh verified that the rules have been changed since then.

Mr. Holcomb commented that we are hoping to get our 21 million dollars from the State. Regarding the projects that we have already completed, all of that money falls under the old rules. We may have had furniture expenditures, but because they all applied under the old rules, we get the reimbursement back. The funds are already earmarked. The list of priorities of things to do is primarily to finish up the air conditioning projects.

Mr. Vance asked what the \$21 million from the state was, and Mr. Marsh explained it was the school construction bond that was passed last year. Mr. Holcomb stated it comes from the office of school construction, which actually is the State Allocation Board (an appointed Board from the Governor), that apportions the dollars. It is actually an appointed board that approves the regulations for it and the actual apportionments to us.

Mr. Rutledge stated that the district's process is to always to apply for potential funds from the State, hope they come through, allowing us to do these special projects like air conditioning, etc.

Mr. Holcomb said we are very fortunate as a district to have had the monies to spend so that we could reimburse ourselves with this. There are other districts who are waiting on the State to receive their monies and it is not a good place to be.

Mr. Rutledge commented that for NHHS Davidson Field the contractor was RC construction, so most of the money went there and the architect was LPA. Who is CEM Lab? Mr. Marsh stated that CEM performed specialty inspections. You have the inspector of record who monitors a number of things, but when you need specialty inspections for things like ground compaction, pull test on bolts, for some of the masonry and steel inspection, you need a specialty inspector. We contracted with a lab that comes out specifically for those items. Mr. Rutledge asked if Wild West Inspections was the secondary firm and Mr. Marsh said that they are the Inspector of Record, the equivalent of the City building inspector. They are licensed by the State to make sure everything is built per plans and specifications. We are considered a State agency and the City is definitely involved, but it tends to be where utility tie-ins are. There are City rules for where an entrance driveway might be if we are relocating driveways. If there is anything where our project may interact with what the City oversees, then we work with the City on those items.

Mr. Vance asked about Davison Field's 10 million dollar budget. The publicity on it has been 15.9 million total expenditures. Did the press get this wrong? Mr. Rutledge commented that it was always Measure F funds along with other funds. You are looking at the Measure F portion, not including the other expenditures. Mr. Vance asked what the other expenditure amount was. Was it correct that the total project was 15.8 or 15.9 million? Mr. Marsh confirmed. How did you decide what portion Measure F dollars would fund? Mr. Marsh said that Measure F funds were used first until we ran out of funds. Mr. Rutledge commented that it was always clear that the project would be requiring additional funds beyond Measure F. The district received funds from the dissolution of redevelopment districts.

Mr. Marsh commented that the board opted to divide the monies up amongst the four high schools' facilities related projects. So far, none of that has cost what that value is, they have all cost more. When the redevelopment is done, they do a cutout and we do not see any tax dollars. All of the tax dollars go to the redevelopment agency. When they dissolve that, they go back and re-calculate what portion should have been our money. So out of what was remaining, we had that money reapportioned to us.

Mr. Vance asked regarding the 15.8 million allotted for a complete re-development of Davidson Field, what was entailed in that re-development. Mr. Marsh explained what the re-development entailed for bleacher ADA compliance, etc. We worked with the DSA on what we could do to make it compliant. There was a lot of funds allotted to compliance, the elevator tower, new field house, restrooms, team room, track & field, lighting, fencing, landscaping etc. Other than some of the bleacher structure, it is practically a new facility. We did lose some seating for widening the stairways, and re-did front of bleachers for ADA seating and appropriate exit/entering areas. While the major seating portion was left intact, it was not left alone.

Mr. Vance asked what the original budget for the project was. Mr. Marsh explained that a couple of issues drove the cost over. Transite piping under the facility that feeds water to the

campus had to be replaced with new copper piping and put down a couple of feet deeper than it was. Some unanticipated items came up, and part of this was due to the original documentation from the 1940's that was not that good. Mr. Vance asked if the scope expanded after we went out to bid. Mr. Marsh said we did not have many change orders related to scope creep, it was much more the 'what did we find?' We put 23 rain days in the project and ended up with 45 rain days. We had a lot of delays related to that. Many of those costs were not ours, they were the contractors, but this did drive some other costs, because the project took longer than anticipated.

Mr. Vance stated that as ambassadors for the district we should be able to defend costs. The issue with Davidson is the total expenditures on something that was renovated as opposed to a brand new stadium. He realizes it is a big stadium, but for instance, When Irvine University stadium was built, they spend 9.7 million for a 3,000-seat stadium (in 2013). Mr. Rutledge stated that Jim Scott Stadium was 9.5 million. Mr. Vance stated that delta between these schools is large and feels that it is his duty to understand why.

Mr. Marsh explained that part of it was inflation; part is also the design of some of those components, because we really wanted the stadium to fit in with the campus. For instance, the exterior finishes on the new building are done very much to tie-in to the rest of the campus. We do the same thing at other schools, to either make them tie-in and look appropriate to the rest of the campus, or like at Costa Mesa HS Theater, we changed the look to stand out from the rest of brick buildings.

Mr. Vance asked about any new technology or lighting that affected costs. Mr. Marsh answered that the products used, for instance Musco lighting, tell you that it is the sports standard. It is the sports premier, not the standard. You are going to pay more for Musco lighting. It is what every coach will tell you they want. The field and the track are Field Turf products, which also is a premier name. We did have a push from campus where there was going to be a donation for the wood on the bleacher seats so they would be the same as the original seats (we planned to go with aluminum seating). The wood was Alaskan yellow cedar, and it ended being expensive. When they found out what the wood cost was, we were already committed, but they found they could not cover the full cost. The district ended up spending a bit more for the wood seating. It has made us much more careful in the future about getting the monies up front. Ms. Gauntlett asked how much the upcharge was on this and Mr. Marsh said it was approximately \$170,000. It was confirmed that the turf at Davidson is the same turf that is at Mustang field, and unless they change the model, it will most likely be the same turf that we will put at Corona del Mar. Jim Scott's turf is old enough (about 3 generations back), so when we replace Jim Scott's turf, it will most likely be the same as we have at Davidson and Mustang field, or the same as what we put at Corona del Mar.

Mr. Marsh reiterated that we spent more on the bleachers than what was originally planned, but had we not been able to cantilever the bleachers, we would have incurred more costs moving other things to accommodate moving the bleachers away from the street.

Mr. Rutledge commented on the time factor on all the projects. As a citizen and community member, we had all this money right away, and had we had the ability to have all these projects right away, we would have been able to build these projects for less money. As constructive input to the district, we know there are only so many people who can manage these projects. We took our time to do the projects, and the costs, due to inflation and the economy, went up materially. I do not know if that is a common practice with bond funds, because it is cheaper

now than later. We had a fixed amount of money, but the cost to construct these projects went up, and I have noticed most of the recent projects, we cannot even close the bids at what we want to close them at, which is illustrative of a stronger economy.

Mr. Marsh said that typically the projects are phased because you are trying not to disrupt the entire organization, and usually we plan to design the first quarter of them, then while they are still in the design process, start planning on the next two quarters. This is so all schools are not disrupted at the same time. Davidson field was a little bit different, because of the cap on how much bond we could sell (the board self-capped on what we could spend). On the second bond, they said we would meet what it says now. They thought it was about \$20 per \$100,000 of assessment. It turned out to be \$18.87 (less than they anticipated). So what happened is that a lot of the bonds got refinanced. By refinancing the old ones at a lower rate: 1. we save the taxpayers money, 2. we created space. There is money left available based on the Measure F bond language, but we are not sure if the district will be able to access it because of that self-cap. In this particular instance, that ability to sell bonds drove part of why it was delayed.

Mr. Holcomb explained that from 2000 until now, we have had two very unusual economic periods. In the early 2000's we had a high upgrade of inflation in construction--too much money and too little construction in the economy which drove prices up higher than the rate of the cost of money. Then we had the downturn in 2008 and all of construction costs went down, and both of these events do not generally happen as that frequently. Generally, there is a pretty good relationship between the cost of money and cost of construction. The cost of construction is less than the cost of money as a general rule; otherwise, developers would always be building with today's dollars because we could buy money cheaper than we could buy construction. We do not typically do that. Typically, money is more expensive. You still try to spend it in a timely matter because, although the money you borrow is more expensive, the amount that you can arbitrage it is less. X percentage to borrow the money, you pay X minus to the contractor, and you earn X minus, minus, in your interest earnings. So that is why you do not want to sit on it too long. Every now and then, the economy gets weird where we are able to actually make more money in interest. It has happened a few times, but the federal government does not like it. We can put bond funds in every three years so we are not doing it just to make money.

The other important thing to put into context is that having certainty about costs and predictions over multiple years is a difficult challenge, and one of the things we've done recently, is the board brought on a cost manager regarding the pool project. You tell a cost estimator what you want and they tell you what it is going to cost. For a cost manager, you tell them what you want in general, and they tell you how much you should budget for it. We did this with the pool, because the bids came in higher and the key question was, is that because of inflation, or is that because we got higher bids and we're not getting our money's worth. So we hired a cost manager/cost estimator who said no we think you can get more for your dollars than what your bids were. We did not have a cost manager. We did have McCarthy there to do cost estimating for us and semantics between the two could be debated. Some could say that McCarthy's job was to be a cost manager/budget manager for us to make sure we were able to deliver what we said we could for the amount. McCarthy might say that is not exactly what their job is. With this consultant in regards to the pool, his job is tell us for a 50-meter pool at Estancia, this is the amount you can buy it for. You can hold us accountable that we will be able to help you to manage through to deliver that project for that much, with the scope.

Mr. Rutledge stated that it does seem that the more recent projects are harder to get done, in terms of budget vs. actual. Davidson, in my opinion got into that conundrum where you bid it out and nobody came in at the bid target, and I think the pool happened the same way.

Mr. Holcomb stated that it is difficult for everyone in the community to know what is going on, and what you should expect. That is why we have hired a firm, so we can be accountable.

Mr. Rutledge explained the tension when projects do not go as planned. When the project goes well you obviously have less problems with the community.

Mr. Holcomb stated that we all want to be careful yet candid and transparent in our conversations. I want to respect that this is a public conversation about our facilities. One of the things that I have heard regarding our CDM fields projects was exact questions of we're looking at this, but shouldn't it really be this and this? How do we match these up? At the same time, the foundation at this school wanted to do some work at the library and support it financially. What is the number and how do we all have confidence in that number and who is going to pay for this? Eventually the district kicked in some money because it was more expensive. The foundation also stepped up and said we will commit more money. I'm really pleased in that case the we've talked about a little different approach with foundations where that foundation has basically committed \$300,000 over the next 3 years, \$100,00 at a time to, in essence, retire a debt that the district is investing in that project. This foundation said no, we want to be the primary contributor for this and we will raise money for this project to finish it before we start another one. I am very pleased with the relationship in working with the CDM foundation. There is a lot of good learning and good communication that is going on.

Mr. Rutledge said he recognized this is a public meeting but the public has a responsibility to also be informed. The particular meeting I was at was for approving funds for the Costa Mesa stadium and there were 50 people still in the room complaining about the scope of that stadium. Somehow, this process is very contentious. There is a lot of contention in building these wonderful facilities for the community. I support all four zones. This is a very difficult process. I am just encouraging you to make it efficient, effective, transparent and on budget, so there is less of this criticism and negativity--because Davidson was X and it became Y. You read about it in the Pilot because they are doing their job by sending their reporters to cover your district and it creates tension. You have the opportunity to learn through these things.

Mr. Holcomb stated we are trying to do that and are happy for the opportunity here. Some folks look for public records of this meeting and the tape recording of the meeting. Mine was only a reminder that while the Daily Pilot might be sitting here right now, planning on an article for tomorrow, or some other outlet, I have to remember I sit with really great people like you. I have to say to let me be as candid as I can with you. The district is learning some very good things through all of this and our bodies like the foundations are learning some great things through all of this.

Mr. Ramos talked about how interesting it was to spend time at the Davidson project. He feels that the stadium is a jewel. Yes, there are some areas that did not get quite to the top but they are okay. There was a gentleman, Stan Morrison, who I spent a lot of time with and was able to give my input. My question is, the contract with RC was for 11 million dollars--we had change orders, but do you happen to know the amount was on the change orders?



Mr. Marsh recalled that the Davidson project change orders were about 8% of the total. He did not have the dollar amount with him. Mr. Vance asked if the 8 million included landscaping. Mr. Marsh confirmed this. Mr. Ramos asked about the \$170,000 seating cost for wood. Did that make you short on any of the other projects? Mr. Marsh answered that it was part of why we increased the value. That drove it up and frankly the fencing was one of the reasons the numbers came in high initially. We had to go back and re-vamp some of the fencing when we went back out again, because the original design was prohibitively expensive. So this was part of that re-design that we got the price back down where it should be.

Mr. Ramos said even before he took part in this committee, he spent time walking every day and saw the everyday building taking place. I understand the pipe issues you had, and it was really amazing to see the finished product.

Ms. Gauntlett asked if there is a document listing all the change orders for all the projects. Yes, there is, and it will be provided to the committee.

Mr. Vance requested a total overview of Davidson Field project costs be sent to the members. Mr. Marsh said he would send those out to the members, and Mr. Vance said if they have any further questions, it can be discussed at the May meeting since the money is spent and there would be no time sensitivity for this.

Mr. Marsh said we structure it all to provide you with the information on Measure F, but are happy to address your questions on other funding.

#### Discussion of Legal Services

Jeff Trader spoke on government policy on Senate Bill 450, effective January 1, 2018. What it essentially requires is that before we go out and issue or authorize bonds, we need to report on the interest cost and the principal, and the cost of issuance to pay advisors, etc. We have to show what the actual true out-the-door cost is for that bond. It is a good thing because the community has all the information up front, and they will know what the cost is. One of the interesting things is you don't know what the cost of the bond is the day that you're selling, so as long as you understand that, it's going to be a very close estimate, but not an exact estimate. We actually make a report after the bonds sell of the actual costs.

Mr. Vance asked if the Senate bill just provides more disclosure, and Mr. Trader confirmed that it does. It is a great public policy.

### **PROJECT REPORT**

#### Estancia HS Theater Complex

Mr. Marsh hoped to have more information for members on the theater, but there will be a meeting next week to talk about the structure of the committee that will be involved in putting together the plans on the project, and start the evaluation of the architectural teams. We reached out to 11 architectural firms, six of them submitted, and we are trying to set up the interviews so we can get the design process going. We will determine what staff members are involved, who is involved at the school, and do we look at a broader theater group than the school. We are looking into all those factors. There will be representatives involved through that design process.

Mr. Rutledge suggested that having community members involved with these projects is always appreciated. Just like this bond committee had too many people on it in the past, and it could not work, the trick is getting the right number and quality like this group. Having that number very small, is not a good way to get community support.

Mr. Marsh confirmed to Mr. Vance that we would be just in the planning stages for the EHS Theater during this COC term. There might be some very small expenditures by the next meeting in May, but most likely after that it will start to ramp up. We have a lot of projects slated for the summer, so unless we have an architect on board and they have some work to do over the course of the summer, staff will not be able to spend any time on it. We are looking at air conditioning in six schools, remodeling offices and entrance fencing at three, possibly four of the schools, and a plethora of other projects, so it will be a very busy summer. The hope is to have the plan in place first and start committee meetings after school starts.

### **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Next meeting date is scheduled for Tuesday, May 15, 2018, 6 pm. No members present had any date conflicts. Motion was approved 5-0.

Mr. Vance asked that we schedule the meetings through the calendar year (possibly September and November). Mr. Marsh will have potential dates sent out and will send Mr. Vance board dates for presentation.

Mr. Marsh explained that we would be looking into appointing an additional committee member, since one member has missed two meetings.

### **COMMITTEE'S CHOICE**

Mr. Rutledge asked if we have accomplished everything so we can present in May. Mr. Marsh confirmed we have done so.

Mr. Vance suggested we discuss the Board presentation at the next COC meeting on May 15, and to place this as an item on the meeting agenda.

Mr. Vance asked that we also continue our discussion on the Davidson Field information being sent to the members on costs.

Mr. Marsh said another item would be to bring back the EHS Theater project.

Mr. Vance thanked the committee, and district staff, and commented how everyday he sees a campus in Newport-Mesa he is continually impressed with the condition of the schools.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Vance adjourned the meeting at 7:38 pm.

These minutes are distributed to the members of the Measure F Citizens Oversight Committee and the community organizations they represent in the district.