



**Proposition O Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee
Wednesday, April 9, 2014**

TIME: 6:00 p.m. Meeting

PLACE: District Office
Board Conference Room
1130 Fifth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91911

UN-ADOPTED MINUTES

1. Meeting called to order by Nick Marinovich at 6:00pm.

Roll Call: Present: Nick Marinovich (NM), Bob Strahl (BS), Ditas Yamane, Edgar Guerrero (EG), Robert Carriedo (RC),

Teleconference: Terrance McKearney (TM)

Absent: Kevin O'Neill (KO) & David Butler (DB)

Staff Present: Tom Calhoun, Paul Woods, Cecil Martinez

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. 02/12/14 (Un-Adopted) deferred to May meeting. Chair wants to review with recording for accuracy.

4. Public Comment: non-agenda public comment

Ms. Cheers, was impressed with last week's meeting 4/1/14 meeting, felt it was very productive, felt that the whole committee seemed to be on same wave link, encourages the BOC to continue to do what they are doing, one member addressing Mr. Strahl, which has consistently said we need to look forward, we can't look forward if we keep looking in the rear view mirror. Concerned about something that happened last evening, and this is why she continues to questions the management of this district, using this as a basis way she continues to question the management of this district, her tax dollars are being spent, which is Prop O, there were two board meetings in March and they did not happen, one of the items was for money to be expended for informational advertisement, Sweetwater is wonderful, we put in a magazine called "Hometown Magazine" only on the east side, and she was going to speak against this she felt this is a frivolous expense, those meetings never happened, but the article was in the magazine today, the public and our board member are not being given the opportunity to speak on how tax dollars are being spent. Was told it was going to cost \$30,000 and was confirmed that it was only \$5,000, doesn't care if it was \$1, but feels that money that should be in the classroom, we do not need to be out there doing PR work, our district, Dr. Brand wrote some piece.

Ms. Brickman commented her objection was not only it was a PR on district part. It just doesn't go to everyone and does not like that it's not universal, if doing positive PR to recruit kids, should be spent in the classroom and why just the East, likes uniformity, likes what district does, it's on the website what's going on, we sit here and listen to committee and you may not always agree, but do come to a consensus, thank you.

Chair Marinovich recognized the presence of Trustee Lopez in attendance at the CBOC meeting.

(EG) agreed with Ms. Brinkman, he lives in Eastlake, he also saw that the Magazine is only distributed on the East side, why is it that only at the CBOC meeting citizens can express their concerns, mentioned about a committee to have oversight on Mello-Roos, Wanda Parris, and Bernardo Vasquez. Thanked Mrs. Lopez, but should there be some other citizen oversight committee e.g. SDPD, CVPD, etc. The CBOC should not be the only place public can voice your opinion in this district, that's not right, BOT should be able to listen to the rest of the citizens have not just Prop O items or any other tax items, just general public items.

(NM) as we move forward, these are all excellent points, commented that by example what this committee has done over the past two years, we've evolved and become a place that the people can feel they can express their thought. Next year it will probably be different, maybe there can be some kind other entity like this for other functions within the district like this and actually listen to them, and let the new appointed Superintendent and Trustees, to let them know we want to work with them not against them.

5. Report from CBOC Chair

- 1) San Diego County Taxpayers Association, Bond Certification program, several instructors including him at the end on what is bond oversight, well attended, several school board members, discussion was around financial projections and this relates specifically what this Committee is doing and the assessed value projections and the difficulty districts are having in having enough property assessed value growth or growth in general to have enough bonding capacity to do future projects, there is a limit on the amount

- this district can borrow, depending on the assessed value of the property is within the district. This committee is operating as the law was envisioned now and an independent committee.
- 2) issues There is a May 9th CalBOC, Controller Chang is going to be the speaker, given the issues with the travel up to now, and if he went he most likely would not be able to go due to his financial situation.

TM) commented on the lectures at the Bond Certification Program in the morning were very good about the /details mentioned by Chair, mentioned they received a copy of a book written by a gentlemen named Dale Scott. Feels a copy of that book would be good for the rest of the committee **(NM)** book is called "Win Win", and he will see if he can get copies for the whole committee, since the gentleman was giving them out for free, and Chair has his business card.

6. Fire Alarm Report from Chair

(NM) would welcome discussion on this, but feels since Kevin O'Neill & Dave Butler are the most senior members of this committee along with chair and, would like to wait until they are here to go over and discuss this report. Felt as Chair to put this report together on his own, with a lot of hours and going through information, and did this for future bond oversight committees, relating to central role which is accountability of the school district. Agrees with Bob (Bob Strahl) that we do need to move forward, since we are moving forward as a district, also important that the role of the committee is such that we let the districts know that we're going to watch over what they are doing and are going to be diligent and not let past behavior not appropriate to go un-noticed. What he did was took data collected by Channel 10 from other original sources, correlated it with district statements and emails, and organized it in chronological order in what was said, done and what was submitted to various government agencies. Also feels that everyone got so consumed as a committee and 700 forms and acting civil at meetings and fighting the Superintendent that we've lost time and focusing on core task of the committee is compare what was promised to the voters and how did we spend the money, if we had done that methodically each year we would have mentioned the fire alarms, what happen with those until Channel 10 uncovered it.

Concluded with the following recommendations:

1. We need to have an accountability each year
2. We need to have more transparency,
3. We need a structured process for setting project priorities
4. Public matters, a lot of the information received as chair is from public and media, district staff is not empowered to give all the information

(TM) addressed the Chair and commented he would like to get clarification from chair on what he means on the report card? We have structure for performance audit and financial audit, but what does he envision this report card to be, how is it done and who does it.

(NM) some logical organization of the ballot language, of what we said the voters were said, the projects we would spend the money on and array of projects, an accounting of projects or categories of where the money has been spend and a list of what remains to be done. If the M-1 report and the ballot language is correlated to the ballot language with the M-1 report, we have what's been completed what remains to be done, so that when change orders are made they are made in the context of what remains to be done and whether it meets logical criteria.

(TC) more of a checklist than a report card, a checklist what's happened and what's been done, what's been addressed? Mentioned measles graph, show all items that have been cover and how by categories, etc.

(NM) agreed that would be good, this is what he would envision.

(EG) mentioned money spent not on Prop O e.g. iPads, **(PW)** explained it this falls under Computer Technology, which is on the ballot language.

Public Comment

Ms. Bertha López, Board Member, agreed with Mr. Guerrero that this needs to be designated in a better format to the public, in regards to computer technology; it said other computer and technology, there were going to be within the classroom, not the iPad initiative.

(EG) mentioned in general there needs to be clarified and more specific. **(RC)** commented that the districts position is that the iPads is part of the computer technology category which was on the ballot language, and as a committee we can have a recommendation or opinion whether or not that appropriate or valid or whether or not the money was spent in the manner that the we believe the ballot initiative said it should have been used

(TM) noted that he had gone back and this happened before most of committee was there, committee did agree that the iPads were part of technology, that's the way the original discussion went down, at the end the original call on the BOT was that the iPad and the Infrastructure that went them was consistent with the language of the ballot, which was written four year before first iPad was sold.

(NM) agreed and remembers that committee said it was legal and within the ballot language.

(TC) informed the committee that the District has taken the input, and not buying anymore iPads using Prop O money, and putting technology and infrastructure to support them, Wi-Fi, and using other funds as well, we are not using any Prop O money on short term equipment devices.

(BS) suggested that this should be discussed at the next meeting, under a structure of a motion, for following reasons:

- 1) Will give committee time to look over and review it.
- 2) Concerned about process, his understanding that this did go up on the prop o website and feels that the process should be as a committee make that recommendation and not just an individual have the authority to post something on that website. Feels it opens Pandora's Box as far as what each of them can put up on website, prefers to have the opportunity to discuss this as today and make recommendations for changes and as a committee vote as a whole as to what to do or forward on to the website, necessary for history to be created, and again the process that he questions, and ask the Chair to trail this to the next meeting, and do as an Amendment item that we would take action on.

(NM) agreed to trail, but asked to set the record, understands that the Chair can put an item on the agenda, and this is why "the Chair is the Chair" Informed that this Chair runs committee different, he welcome input from any member that wants to docket an item, but when Chair adds an item on the agenda and their item is listed in a public meeting and there is a report to be discuss, Chair cannot submit report to committee and say "keep this secret guys, we'll talk about at the next meeting", this is not the way this committee is structured to do business, and as long as he is Chair if he has an item that he believes is appropriate to hear, will docket the item and it will be on agenda and posted on website, commented if committee does not like this approach, and can find a different Chair.

(BS) commented it was not a question of finding a different chair, feels it's a process here, when on website it gives the impression that it is from the complete committee and it isn't, and does not see it necessary that it go on up on that website we're not holding up anything from the public, the public is more than welcome to looking and even put input on it and would like that to be done before going up on website.

(NM) addressed (BS) that the report says prepared by Nick Marinovich, Chair, it does not say from the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee, he prepares report for the full committee to hear, and feels that's appropriate. In the future would suggest this to be handled with a sub-committee that can look at the report before it going public. Mentioned he's been holding on to this for about four months and feels it was necessary to get this information to committee since there's a possibility that he may not be there to explain data and information.

(RS) agreed, but would like to trail this to next meeting.

(EG) also made statement about the process, it is what it is, for the public to get ahold, he's here for others to feed them information, and there are other people out there cannot get this information, if we are going to be transparent like Chair said, we need to be transparent, this says draft so it not the official publication, disagrees with (BS) and feels this is the best we can do with organization we are of part of, and at one point or another we will disagree, but feels the time, accuracy, the detail he commends this report, he sees no other way that Nick could have done this, we've been talking about this important issue, and the public needs to know about because the public was involved with this, whether it's a draft or a final, we need everybody involved in this, because we are a Citizens Oversight Committee and we do answer to the public and that's who we represent. We are not city council, school board, we are representatives of different areas, he's a PTSA Member, use to be PTSA President and he would take this information back. A lot of individuals he cannot email everyone, everyone in the Eastlake area. Ultimately respects this, and has no issue with this, he lets people know and encourage them to go to the website.

(NM) emphasized and feels the district can be given a A+, when district discovered that there were significant fire alarm upgrades to be done, they did a remarkable job in getting it done, Tom's staff and whole organization got the job done, that was no easy task.

Public Comment

F. Brickman, feels that for the first time and not because of the news coverage, people now go to the website, they know it exist, Channel 10 brought attention to this, it brought a lot of attention to it and looking at other things. Thinks this is a great thing, very good thing, keeps everyone informed.

C. Cheers, over five years of attending these meeting, the issue this CBOC has had is lack of information and lack transparency, as a taxpayer why shouldn't the information be share with her, no entity is perfect in her opinion, show the tax paying public the truth, this will build the faith back. Made the comment that is not FBC (Friendly Bond Committee) the BOC (Bond Oversight Committee) her and Ms. Brickman disagree on many things, but have respect for each other.

Ms. Bertha López, Board Member, whether the process was used or not is not questionable, as the BOC you owe the public the that information, whether process was used as to posting on the website, as a Board Member she constantly says whatever she is given should be posted to the website for the public. Has always asked and agrees that everything should be put up on website.

(RC) feels that it may have not been intentional but really the sub-committee put this together. **(DY)** believes the report is commendable, informative, feels what one member is reminding everyone on thought process, we are not a policy making committee, we are a recommending committee and we need recommendation to the people who are making the policy which is the BOT. Wants everyone to just be diligent in the process, e.g. if a lot of people got in trouble if the due diligence were not addressed properly so we want to make sure that we take care of business by following the process. Grateful for the reports, information trickled down to members and respects that, respect chair, but in order to be transparent we need to follow the process.

(TC) has read report, found factual information, would like to remind everyone on committee and the public that anything that comes before this body and is going to be discussed has to be posted, 72 hours in advance. We sometimes post items late, due to various meeting last week and this week, but we try to get things up 72 hours in advance per the Brown Act to be able to discuss them as a committee.

A motion was made by Ms. Yamane, that be tabled until next meeting, seconded by R. Carriedo for purpose of discussion. Pass unanimously, with DB & KO absent.

(TM) what are we expected to after reading thru this, also commented that it should have also marked as DRAFT.

Are we accepting report, endorsing it, approve it would just like clarification, feels as a committee we should accepted it as the work of our Chair, acknowledge it. (DY) feels that just so that we are in compliance with the notice, of the right number of days that we have to put it out there, so at next meeting we can discuss it, accept and approve.

7. Review of Financial and Performance Audits

(NM) mentioned (DB) not able to be in attendance and he is the key player on this item. Chair and McKearney discussed before meeting the Performance Audit, nothing to say about Financial Audit, question to staff if there has been any district feedback on the Financial Audit. (PW) mentioned there were no findings to respond to.

(NM) added that it was a clean audit, also performance audit by Nigro & Nigro, there was no action, mentioned a statement, Nigro & Nigro said that the financial audit needed to make sure it meet the legal requirements so he was unsure of that comment, since there was no explanation. (TC) clarified to chair again on phone what he felt regarding that statement, the Performance Auditor is different than the Financial Auditor and they may be competing firms.

(NM) commented that sub-committee had requested to be looked at in detail, the iPad acquisition and the auditor choose not to look at that, disappointed in that, audit did show how cost effective district staff is compared to what it use to be, no major findings, addressed staff on what will be going to the board? (TC) same thing, board has received it thru a Friday updated and posted the same day, CBOC and BOT received it at the same time, before the 31st of March which is required by law, and BOT will accept it formally on the 21st April, 2014. And district will respond within 60 days or sooner.

(RS) in report it did make recommendation, and he asked that the district respond to those recommendations. (TC) acknowledged that the district will respond.

Public Comment

F. Brickman, asked when next board meeting, May 12th, next CBOC meeting May 14, which is after Board Meeting.

8. Review Proposed Bylaw Revisions

(NM) address staff if there were any report from staff or where it stands. (PW) waiting for comments from CBOC.

(RC) mentioned that him & Mr. Guerrero met, prepared comments that he emailed to (TM & EG) the synopsis is the why there needs to be a limiting language and more restrictive in the new Bylaws, it will make it more difficult to have a number of qualified candidates because of the new residency requirements and the new issue of coming from a certain area. This advisory committee is looking for people with certain qualifications, certain knowledge, doesn't believe that it's necessary to have this limiting language; it was mention in the past meeting that there was not a large number of candidates. In the respect to conflict of interest, each member in this committee has to comply with the conflict of interest and the prohibited action section of the Bylaws as they exist now, so there doesn't seem to be a need limit membership for participating in other committee or organizations, seem unnecessary. Also added regarding the 700 form should apply to this committee legally it's not necessary legally It's not necessary we do not fall within that category with that legislative section, the board mandates it, it's not required under the law, we do not qualify under any of the categories.

(DY) feels that district is going with the trend of districting for accountability purposes, even now in local government there is a representative or elected official that is a representative of that district, right now everybody is pointing at everyone, because all five BOT are representing the whole district. Also, added if you are govern under the Browns Act you have to have the form 700.

(EG) commented again, so if the district go to by district with BOT, feels they not elected to this committee, we are volunteers we come from everywhere, not getting paid to attend, difficult to find the expertise in this oversight committee, if the district goes with this, it will not have enough members, we can't get the volunteers to be part of this, feels we shouldn't have to follow the same trend. (DY) in regards to Mr. Guerrero's statement, again, feels that when committee recommends it goes to BOT, recommend that they revisit and see what is good for this particular committee, we need to see all the underline situations and why they are doing this.

(TM) informed committee he is against the proposed bylaw changes; district governance is an ongoing debate in government, going on everywhere, Thinks this issues of not being able to serve on other board, is dead wrong, we want people who are involved in your community be part of the CBOC.

(RS) commented as far as the 700 form, just fill them out, we're about transparency, strongly believes it, CaLBOC recommends it in their best practices. Feels if someone has a problem filling out this 700 than you shouldn't be talking about transparency. Also mentioned he believes in area representation, feels it's a great thing to that district is wanting to do this, part of the American government, house of representatives, that's how things get done, is compromise, he didn't always feel this way, and there were two people in this room that changed his mind and in kindness pointed and said Ms. Cheers. Feels that committee should be made up of a member that represents a certain number of schools. Sat at a meeting with Bonita HS parents say that their school was falling apart, ask why Montgomery High getting a gym when their school earlier than MOH, because of Ms. Cheers.

(EG) clarified that committee is oversight, to oversight on Prop O funds only, committee has no authority to made decisions. Committee represents the citizens no matter where they are at, website is important for all to get all the information of what is going on at all the sites.

(TC) One of the things that the District as looked at and heard throughout other school districts, other bond oversight committees, the term is "there should be no representation without taxation", gets to residency rule, you should be a member of the community that is being taxed and paying taxes on the proposition to be represented here. The area issue came up to district at looking at districting thru County of Education, talked about this back in December residency and district stuff, conflict of interest. There could be a planning commissioner that would make some issue on it and would hopefully recuse themselves, added that the Bond Oversight Bylaws should include a statement that no member of any other elected board serve as a CBOC Member. These would be conflicts of interests. Feels that the elephant in the room and mentioned Nick will be likely to respond on this would be straight residency issue.

(RC) again reiterated that the Bylaws already has a conflict of interest provision, no need for a further a conflict of interest, if somebody abide by it, that's something else.

Public Comment

Ms. Bertha López, Board Member, point of clarification for the Trustees areas for the school board, reason why people who ran petition, was basically they wanted change on the board, not so much as trustee areas, running a school board election is very expensive so this would eliminate a lot of the cost, she lives in the Bonita area and gets lots of calls from the west side, parent complaints and she does not ignore those calls. Agrees with Mr. Guerrero, not everyone is dying to be a volunteer here, the way the process has been handled in the district, it was actually closing the doors to a lot of members, she knows a lot of good people that applied and it was the Superintendent decision to let them in or out, she said he was the bearer in many cases, as board members didn't know who had applied until after the fact. Feels that when this committee came to play, they started asking a lot of questions.

Ms. C. Cheers, coming to meetings for over five years, people in attendance have been Kathleen Cheers, Ms. Lopez, Ms. Brickman, Ms. Adato, Mayor Cox and a bus driver. Not talking about government, oversight committee, volunteers with expertise. We have had in the past relatives of board members, they lived in the district. The public has trust in this BOC, mentioned that she sees this action as a direct move to get rid of Mr. Marinovich and Mr. O'Neill. She would recommend that those who believe in not adopting this go to the next board meeting and speak during public comment at beginning of meeting. Mentioned she's really upset about this and will fight this issue.

F. Brickman, added that finally the word punitive came out and beyond trying to get rid of Chair and Kevin O'Neill, feels that the BOT from each area will be seen as if you're the Bonita person you're doing to be representing and make sure my schools get what they need, that's not the function of the BOC, we are for the public. It turns it into something it's not, your transparent, you're doing what's good for everybody not an area, this concerns.

(NM) his observations and one of the critical factors of whether this committee does things the right way, member selection process, if it's flaud, you can have all the rules and regulations in process, if you have friends of friends, it will fall apart, personally to Chair, residency requirement, it's a difficult task to get people to spend the time and do the work on this committee, has put out a lot of work on this committee, a lot of his friends live in the Sweetwater School District. He got more emotionally involved about this district when he moved to La Mesa and had a kid and his father who did some work for him, and the father was so proud of his son and was going to join the Navy, graduate from SOH, he went to join and he couldn't speak English well enough. What's wrong with this? What will happen, by in action terms run out June 30th, what's Plan B?

(TC) whether the board members and number of board members currently, whether the Bylaws would be amended or not, if it dies due to quorum or it gets only two votes to support it, then the Bylaws remain as they are, same thing for reinstatement, if you want to be reinstatement and continue a term, let us know, it's put into the board by June meeting, three board members have to vote to provide that, if not, no votes, then recruitment begins. Ms. Huezo has been recruiting for the Member of a Senior Organization actively and an At Large member as well. Bottom line if board remains as is, Kevin and himself are off committee.

Ms. C. Cheers, mentioned to Members in past when Mr. Vazquez term was going to be over, the committee voted that they wanted him, and it went to the BOT, no big deal.

F. Brickman, added the quorum vote with

(TM) concerned about on this discussion and going into more than what needs to be done, CBOC has no control over the new board, new superintendent, etc., before us here, feels CBOC needs to focus on Bylaws,

A motion was made by Terry McKearney, that as a committee reject all the proposed changes to the Bylaws, and that CBOC recommends that no changes be made to the Bylaws for the CBOC until the end of the calendar year. Seconded by Nick Marinovich, motion passes unanimously, with DB & KO absent.

(RC) **A motion was made by Robert Carriedo that committee does the same as done previously and recommends to the BOT re-appointed of Nick Marinovich, Chair and Kevin O'Neill and be kept on committee. Seconded by Edgar Guerrero, motion passes unanimously, with DB & KO absent, B. Strahl, No (5-1-2).**

(DY) Discussion: committee is not following the process, if term ends 6/30/14, we need to follow the process, and it will still be the BOT that will adopt it, approve or disapprove it. Let the expired member re-apply and then can be re-appointed, we cannot re-appoint. **(EG)** we're not asking for re-appoint, only recommending that we want these individuals to remain on this board.

9. Discussion of CBOC Budget for FY 2014/2015

(NM) Sub-committee of BS, KO & DY. **(DY)** Mr. O'Neill was driving that sub-committee and would defer this issue to Mr. O'Neill. Continued discussion of how to proceed regarding the approval of budget prior to taking to the BOT.

Special meeting scheduled on the April 16, 2014 at 5:00pm after NCM Topping Out Ceremony to deal with the budget issue. **(TC)** to get a classroom to meet there to cover this specific issue.

10. Bond Project Updates - **(PW)** went thru all the board items recap. (See handouts for details)

- a. Board Items Report
- b. Project Status Reports
- c. Project Financial Summary
- d. Program Management Update – *Long Range Facilities Master Plan*

(NM) requested total cost of Title IX and what port Prop O paid. **(TC)** will provide this to committee at next meeting.

Public Comment

C. Cheers, questioned food service issue at the LRFMP meeting she attended, it was brought up that a lot of the students don't eat lunch. In line and then over, please explain what the money is going to be used for.

(TC) \$200,000 will help provide enough capacity to feed a number of students, at this one we need more refrigeration space, so it will be a modular space, aluminum panels that will expand, and be able to reuse at other sites, it will be a facilities space that kitchen people can prep and serve. **(PW)** also mentioned that there may be some USDA funding, which will be supplemented and/or reimbursed. This is a band aide that can be used at other places as a band aide while new cafeterias are being built.

11. CBOC Sub-Committee Update

- a. **Annual Report** (*N. Marinovich, D. Butler, 2012-2013*) Work is complete.
- b. **Best Practices** (*E. Guerrero, T. McKearney*)
- c. **Finance** (*D. Butler, T. McKearney*)
- d. **Audit** (*N. Marinovich, D. Butler, T. McKearney,*)
- e. **Asset Management** (*N. Marinovich, K. O'Neill*)
- f. Sub-Committee Formation/Membership

12. CBOC Information Request Log - Nothing new added

13. Letter from Chair to Kathleen Cheers, Fran Brinkman, and Maty Adato for service to the CBOC

(NM) mentioned appreciation of the public, how they have put in a lot of time to committee and district, and just wanted to give them a letter thanking for their assistance for the time they've spent providing the information. Felt it was appropriate to have a generic thank you letter to them.

A motion was made by Chair (NM), chair be authorized to prepare a letter of thank you for those three individuals for their assistance to the bond oversight committee, Seconded by Robert Carriedo, motion passes unanimously, with DB & KO absent

(BS) commented about meeting on April 1, 2014, there was a different format, and appreciated the materials handed out, but found on last page a full page ad for Marinovich Consulting, would like to have it on next month's agenda, and know more about it, and what is Marinovich Consulting.

(NM) commented on this, material presented to the San Diego County Taxpayers Association and is beginning to pursue extra income for himself and his daughter, no conflict of interest; he has not been paid a dime. He was disappointed at Robert Strahl insinuations of ulterior motives for him being on this committee. Also mentioned several emails that have gone out from Robert Strahl directed at Chair and he does not appreciate it. He will be putting an item on next agenda, will talk to Tom about this, to have in closed session if we can do this and have a discussion on this. As committee members feels we should have respect for each other. Mr. Strahl commented that he did speak with Chair, and could provide a copy of email and would like this on next month's meeting.

(TC) will have to check if there is a reason for having a closed session. Probably not, since BOC doesn't really have authority to do this, will contact the Assistant Supt. of HR on that. **(NM)** can let committee know that he will be happy to fully disclose all activities, full transparency, no problem.

14. Committee Member Reports: *Individual members of the CBOC may make announcements or raise issues to be addressed in the future.*

15. Meeting Schedule/Format

a. Calendar Additional Site Tours

b. Retreat Scheduling (*this item to be removed*)

c. Schedule joint CBOC/BOT meeting in May, Bylaws do call for a meeting in May, comments last month about skipping this years, should come as a formal decision by this board, if you're not going to do this joint meeting.

A motion was made by Robert Carriedo, in following with the CBOC the Bylaws, motion requesting that the CBOC and BOT have a Joint meeting, Seconded by Nick Marinovich passes unanimously, with DB & KO absent.

16. Staff Announcements – Next CBOC Meeting May 14, 2014

17. Adjourn at 8:31p.m.