



CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
and
2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12, 2009
MINUTES

Call to Order

The Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was called to order at 4:40 p.m., by Chairperson Tebo, in Conference Room B-104, VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Stephen Blaylock	CAC Member	Present
Chris Elias	CAC Member	Present
Ray Hashimoto	CAC Member	Present
Roberta Hughan	CAC Member	Absent
Robert Jacobvitz	CAC Vice Chair	Present
Erik Larsen	CAC Member	Present
Gaye Morando	CAC Member	Present
Charlotte Powers	CAC Member	Present
Sally Probst	CAC Member	Absent
Connie Rogers	CAC Member	Present
Martin Schulter	CAC Member	Absent
Peter Skinner	CAC Member	Absent
Noel Tebo	CAC Chair	Present

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

4. Committee Staff Report

Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer and Staff Liaison, reported: 1) Members of CAC participated in a tour of future South Bay BART locations prior to the August 12, 2009, CAC meeting; 2) Staff will advise committee members when future BART tours are scheduled; 3) A letter was sent in response to public comments received during the July 8, 2009, CAC meeting regarding access issues for the Silicon Valley Independent Living Center (SVILC); 4) SVILC's request was placed on the City of San José Traffic Planning Department's Pedestrian Improvements List for review and consideration; 5) Agenda Item #9 includes information on the success of the California Transit Association's (CTA's) lawsuit, at the California Courts of Appeal level; 6) CTA is attempting to protect state public transit funding from being diverted to the state's General Fund; 7) The state has filed the anticipated appeal with the Supreme Court of California, with three potential outcomes: the court may consider, reject or even delay the appeal for up to 60 days; 8) At its August 6, 2009, meeting the Board approved a fare increase acceleration for implementation in October 2009, instead of January 2010; and 9) Public meetings regarding the January 2010 proposed service reductions have begun. Jim Unites, Deputy Director Operations, will discuss the specifics of the proposal and relay initial public comments.

5. Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Tebo expressed enthusiasm for CAC's August 12, 2009, tour of future South Bay BART locations. He noted technical staff was available to answer committee member questions during the well-organized tour.

Chairperson Tebo presented his monthly report to the Board at its August 6, 2009, meeting. He advised the Board the CWC would be responding directly to the 2008-09 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury in response to its report entitled "Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Taking the Public for a Ride."

Member Elias took his seat at 4:50 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/ GENERAL MANAGER

COMBINED CAC AND 2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE CONSENT AGENDAS

6. Minutes of June 10, 2009

M/S/C (Powers/Larsen) to approve the Minutes of June 10, 2009.

7. Minutes of July 8, 2009

M/S/C (Powers/Larsen) to approve the Minutes of July 8, 2009.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Monthly Legislative History Matrix

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Monthly Legislative History Matrix.

9. Transit Funding Ballot Measure Research

M/S/C (Powers/Larsen) to recommend the Board of Directors adopt a resolution endorsing the California Transit Association's research activities related to determining whether it makes sense to pursue a ballot measure that would protect state public transit funding from being diverted to the General Fund.

2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

10. Local Program Reserve Measure: Measure A Fund Exchange Procedures

John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Officer, stated he would review the attachments to this item, discuss the memo and then answer any questions the committee might have.

Mr. Ristow noted attachments to this item include: 1) two previous board memos where the Board took action programming State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds; 2) VTA's Local Program Reserve (Fund Exchange) Management Procedures; and 3) STIP Documentation issued by the state.

Mr. Ristow described VTA's two separate functions, noting, as the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, VTA is responsible for prioritizing and approving funds for projects from federal, state, regional and local grants funding sources. VTA is also the agency responsible to collect, distribute and ensure delivery of the projects funded through the Measure A Sales Tax Program approved by the voters in November 2000.

Mr. Ristow reported, when the county was the fiscal agent for the previous Measure B Sales Tax Program, a similar round of fund exchanges took place using both state and federal transportation improvement dollars. VTA has had considerable practice with the fund transfer procedure.

Mr. Ristow noted fund exchanges allow VTA to leverage outside funds. With the Proposition 1B Funds adopted by the voters in 2006, VTA was able to leverage these local funds for \$187 million worth of Proposition 1B highway funds. VTA would not have been able to receive the highway funds without local matching funds. He stated the importance of following good procedure.

Mr. Ristow reported fund exchanges allow minimization of administrative bureaucracy. A reduction in the number of projects provides a reduction in administrative costs, as well as more control over functions, timeframes and approvals. He noted, once established, this fund exchange procedure must be tracked, monitored and reported.

Mr. Ristow noted Measure A Program funds would be repaid once a project is construction-ready. VTA will request an allocation vote for the construction-ready project from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Invoices sent to the state will be reimbursed monthly.

Mr. Ristow noted the two current projects are: 1) the Capitol Expressway Light Rail Train (LRT) Extension (Downtown-East Valley) programmed in Fiscal 2010/11, with funding available from July 1, 2010; and 2) the San José Airport People Mover, which has an indefinite programmed date. He noted funding commences within each project's programmed fiscal year.

Mr. Ristow stated, because VTA is the CMA, VTA is able to utilize Measure A funds for any construction-ready, Board approved Measure A project.

Mr. Ristow reported the state had borrowed money from vulnerable transportation funds in the past. He noted, through efforts of the transportation agencies, a change made to the state constitution guarantees repayment of borrowed transportation funds within a three-year period.

Mr. Ristow stated projects were not delayed to meet the exchange of funds. He noted VTA matches funds to construction-ready projects, with the LRT Extension to the East Valley as the next scheduled project.

Mr. Ristow reported the state allows programming of new STIP funds every two years. The 2010 STIP programming of funds will begin this fall. Proposition 1B was passed between the 2008 and 2010 STIP programming of funds, allowing an extra programming to occur for those newly-available funds.

In an effort to formalize and manage the exchange of funds process, staff provided an updated handout entitled "2000 Measure A Fund Exchange / Local Program Reserve Management Procedures," as a replacement to the Attachment B included within the Committee's agenda packet. This handout addressed the following: 1) Objective; 2) Principles/Conditions Required for Exchange; and 3) Typical Procedures/Process.

Member Elias questioned whether placing or sheltering the Measure A Funds in STIP would minimize the exposure of the entire fund from being raided by the state. Member Elias noted, as with California's current economic climate, California is relying on local funds to balance its budget.

Mr. Ristow stated in the past VTA placed large amounts of money on voter-approved projects, with the remainder of the project's funding backed by local taxes, voters and the Board. Such a scenario stands out to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as a fully supported project they would want to sustain.

Mr. Ristow noted, although the state has the authority to take funds from local agencies, the state is prohibited from taking locally approved sales tax funds directed for transportation projects.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz referenced the revised Attachment B handout, noting Item II states “VTA staff solicits and incorporates Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommendations on the fund exchange strategy and on specific programming actions (how much of which funds, to what projects) to recommend to the VTA Board.” Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz recommended the CWC have the final overview on the fund exchange strategy, and on specific programming actions, prior to the item going before the Board.

Members of the Committee agreed with Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz’ recommendation.

Mr. Ristow noted his agreement with Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz’ recommendation that the CWC have the final review of the fund exchange strategy prior to presentation to the VTA Board and stated staff will include this change in the revision of the procedures.

Chairperson Tebo noted, of all the funds VTA has access to, this Measure A Fund is the only fund that has a Citizens Watchdog Committee. He referenced the Board’s directive that work resume on the East Valley LRT Project and VTA’s initial budget proposal, which had recommended de-funding the East Valley LRT Project. He noted public perception at that time was that VTA had delayed projects.

Mr. Ristow acknowledged the public’s perception, noting that was why there was both Board and public commentary. The General Manager and staff worked to make it clearer that the funds remained set aside for the East Valley LRT Project. Mr. Ristow stated future staff communication would be clearer.

Member Powers stated money borrowed through the STIP Funds is money that has already been committed to VTA. She noted this was the point that needed clarification. She reiterated the CWC’s job is to ensure Measure A Funds are spent appropriately.

Chairperson Tebo noted the voters passed Measure A in 2000, the funds were not collected until 2006, leaving the public to question project status.

Mr. Ristow reported this item would be coming back to the CWC.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Local Program Reserve: Measure A Fund Exchange Procedures.

11. Measure A Fund Exchange Semi-Annual Report

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, noted the two approved STIP projects discussed in Item 10 are included in this report.

Mr. Ristow stated three projects qualified for Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds, only because VTA was able to use exchange funds to advance the projects: 1) \$71.6 million to I-880 HOV Widening; 2) \$30 million to US 101 Improvements 280/680; and 3) \$84.93 million for US 101 Improvements SR 85.

Mr. Ristow reviewed “Attachment A - Measure A Local Program Reserve Monitoring Report” with the committee.

Member Rogers praised VTA’s efforts on the Camino Arroyo Bridge project in Gilroy, noting she had used the bridge that morning.

Member Rogers expressed her appreciation to Mr. Ristow for bringing clarity to this item.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received an update to the Measure A Fund Exchange Semi-Annual Report.

12. 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee Response to 2008-09 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury Report

Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer and Staff Liaison, stated the Board received VTA’s draft response to the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) Report at its meeting on August 6, 2009. The Board provided feedback and requested some modifications.

Presentation of the revised CGJ Report to the Standing Committees will be on August 20, 2009. The revisions will address the tone of the response. The positions will not change. Ms. Helm noted VTA’s revised response to the CGJ Report would be posted on VTA’s website within the Standing Committee Agenda Packets.

Ms. Helm reported Chairperson Tebo notified the Board at its August 6, 2009, meeting that the CWC would be submitting its own response to the CGJ Report, since much of the report was directed toward the Committee’s activities.

Chairperson Tebo and Ms. Helm thanked the CWC Subcommittee Members, Sally Probst, Erik Larsen and Martin Schuler for their efforts in preparing the Committee’s response to the CGJ.

Member Larsen praised the efforts put forth by Member Probst as well as her leadership in formulating the CWC’s response.

Member Larsen made a motion, seconded by Member Powers, to approve the attached CWC response to the 2008-09 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury Report, “Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Take the Public for a Ride.”

Chairperson Tebo opened the item up for discussion.

Member Blaylock stated he had received a subpoena from the CGJ. He noted he did not agree with some of the disagreements within the proposed CWC response. He noted the CWC is a different committee than it was two years ago. He noted the letter should reflect the fact that some of the issues the CGJ listed were true at one time, but that improvements had been made prior to the CGJ’s investigation.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz noted, with Recommendation 1A, his preference to change the wording from “as required by 2000 Measure A” to “as mandated by 2000 Measure A.” Members of the Committee noted their acceptance of this change.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz referenced the response to Finding 3, noting both the CWC Chair and Vice Chair meet with staff to set the agenda. He requested “Vice Chair” be added to the response. Members of the Committee noted their acceptance of this change.

Member Rogers referenced the response to Finding 3, noting work plans reflect that items are included at the request of Committee Members. She recommended restating the response to read, “The work plans reflect that items are included at the request of Committee Members” and that it be added following the sentence ending with the word “inclusion.” Members of the Committee noted their acceptance of this change.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz noted in the response to Finding 4a, the third sentence in the response should read, “FY 2008 audit for 2000 Measure A was conducted by an independent auditor retained by the CWC and reported back to the CWC.” He noted this does not leave any room for interpretation. Members of the Committee noted their acceptance of this change.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz noted in the preamble to the CGJ Report, the constituent group NAIOP (National Association of Industrial & Office Properties), listed as one of the member groups of the Citizens Advisory Committee, had not been a member of the committee for at least three years. He noted as the Vice Chair, his organization was not recognized by the CGJ as having representation on the Committee. Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz then noted the Civil Grand Jury should have had a better understanding of the constituency of the Committee when preparing its report, including utilizing up-to-date information.

Member Rogers noted the CGJ holds office for one year and should not be using outdated information.

Member Larsen noted the Subcommittee focused on the findings and responses, taking care with the tone of the response.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz suggested the following addition to the first paragraph of the response: “The organization has changed. There has been an addition of other constituent groups and it is unfortunate the CGJ was not aware of this in their findings.” Members of the Committee indicated that they did not support this suggested change.

Member Rogers referenced the first sentence in Finding 12, “The Board put 2008 Measure D on the ballot, assigning responsibility for citizen review of future VTA long-range strategic plans to the CWC, without notifying the CWC of its intent to do so.” Members Rogers and Powers noted although the Committee did not receive a great deal of advance notice, they knew it would be on the ballot.

Chairperson Tebo requested Member Blaylock provide the Committee a list of the changes he required in order to approve the Subcommittee’s CGJ response prior to the CGJ’s deadline.

Ms. Helm referenced Member Blaylock's earlier statement, "The CWC is a different committee than it was two years ago." She questioned if having this acknowledged at the beginning of the letter, to frame the context that the CWC is not completely dismissing the findings of the CGJ, but rather noting the specific items to which it is reacting and responding, would make a difference.

Member Blaylock noted he remained hesitant on some of the points.

Member Powers noted there was an effort on the part of the CWC to be more responsible and responsive before any Members went to meet with the CGJ, or were even aware the CGJ was reviewing VTA. She noted the point to make was that the CWC had already identified what needed to be changed and had implemented those changes.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz and Member Powers noted the changes the CWC had implemented were in an effort to be more proactive as an overseeing group, having identified areas needing improvement prior to the CGJ Report.

Member Blaylock noted he had an issue with the tone of the response, which affected his initial position on this motion. He noted, with the inclusion of Member Powers' and Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz' statement in the first paragraph of the response, he would be willing to support this revised response from the CWC. Members of the Committee noted their agreement with the change.

Ms. Helm noted she would be restating all of the recommended changes prior to the end of the discussion.

Chairperson Tebo noted the CGJ response prepared by the subcommittee members focused on facts.

Member Elias noted, typically, when a response is submitted to address CGJ issues the responses are posted on the Web. He suggested information be included in the CWC letter requesting CWC responses be posted side-by-side with the CGJ comments.

Member Elias reminded the committee past CGJ Reports provided an appendix listing the titles and affiliations of those reporting to the CGJ. He noted the appendix was not included within this public-funded report. Member Elias suggested the following be included in CWC's response: As with past reports, please include an appendix listing the documentation reviewed as well as the titles and affiliations of those reporting.

Member Larsen expressed concern with revealing names of people reporting to the CGJ.

Member Powers stated the CGJ guarantees secrecy to those reporting.

Member Rogers expressed interest in the documentation used in preparation of this report.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz suggested the following be included within the letter to the CGJ: In interest of continuing positive change, it would help the CWC to know the points of reference in the CGJ's decision-making process.

Member Blaylock noted, even though the report would not identify individual contributors by name, perhaps it would cause people to be more apprehensive in blowing a whistle that might need to be blown.

Member Larsen noted the importance of responding to the CGJ Report and then moving forward.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz stated he would drop his recommendation to pursue the list of documentation.

Ms. Helm noted, within its response, VTA pointed out the list of reference documentation was not included as with past CGJ Reports.

Ms. Helm restated the points made by the Committee as:

1. At the beginning of the response to the CGJ Report, the CWC would like to include a reference to the fact that the Citizens Watchdog Committee, like any organization, is committed to continual improvement. The Citizens Watchdog Committee feels it is a different committee than it was prior to the investigation, which was the point of reference in the CGJ Report.
2. There was a specific request to change the wording in Recommendation 1A from “as required by 2000 Measure A” to “as mandated by 2000 Measure A”.
3. The Agenda is set in consultation with both the Chair and the Vice Chair. Under Finding 3, “Vice Chair” will be added to the response.
4. That the work plans reflect items are included specifically at the request of members be added to the response to Finding 3.
5. Request the judge post the CWC response on the Internet alongside the CGJ Report so the public can see the responses.

Members of the Committee directed staff to revise the CWC CGJ response as discussed.

Ms. Helm noted a copy of the revised CWC CGJ response would be sent to Committee Members via email.

In response to a request by Members of the Committee, Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, noted he would be responsible for posting the CWC’s response to the CGJ on the CWC section of VTA’s website.

M/S/C (Larsen/Powers) to approve as amended the attached response to the 2008-09 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury Report, “Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Take the Public for a Ride.”

13. CWC FY 2008 Annual Report and Publication Strategy

Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, noted two versions of the Annual Report for FY 2008 had been developed for consideration: 1) a comprehensive version for placement on VTA's website; and 2) an abbreviated, cost effective version for publication in local newspapers that refers the reader to the more comprehensive report on VTA's website.

Chairperson Tebo provided a handout for the Committee's review. It proposed additional language for the comprehensive version related to Measure A fund swaps. Member Blaylock noted the additional language, regarding the Measure A fund swaps, was developed at the Committee's request for the potential inclusion in the comprehensive report.

Members of the Committee suggested this item be deferred to the September 9, 2009, CWC meeting.

M/S/C (Powers/Rogers) to defer the Citizens Watchdog Committee FY 2008 Annual Report and Publication Strategy to the September 9, 2009, Citizens Watchdog Committee Meeting.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

14. January 2010 Service Changes

Jim Unites, Deputy Director Operations, provided a Power Point Presentation detailing: 1) Financial Overview; 2) Public Outreach; 3) Schedule; 4) Average Weekday Ridership & Proposed January Service Changes; 5) Bus Service Changes; 6) Weekday Average Riders per Hour and Proposed Changes; 7) Light Rail Service Changes; 8) Impacts; and 9) Environmental Review.

Mr. Unites noted information has been relayed to the public via: 1) news releases; 2) VTA's website; 3) brochures within vehicles; 4) flyers handed out on specific routes proposed to be discontinued; 5) multilingual newspaper advertisements in county-based publications; 6) mailings and emails to community organizations; 7) major employers; 8) Eco Pass; 9) colleges; and 10) cities. In addition, briefings were held with VTA Board members and other elected officials in cities where significant changes may occur.

Mr. Unites announced seven public meetings scheduled throughout Santa Clara County, in cities most impacted, during the week of August 10, 2009.

Mr. Unites stated public comments are due by the end of August. He noted through ideas received from committees and the public, the proposed plan will change. A final proposal, reviewed by the Transit Planning & Operations (TP&O) Committee at its September meeting, will be forwarded with TP&O's recommendations to the Board in October. Based upon the Board adopting the plan, major service plan changes are scheduled for implementation on January 11, 2010.

Member Powers questioned whether East San Jose was receiving more of the reductions than other areas. Mr. Unites responded that East San Jose is not receiving reductions in proportions greater than other areas. A Title VI analysis of the impact of the service reductions on minority and low income populations shows that the service reductions are not disproportionately impacting these groups. He noted bus lines serving these areas are receiving proportionally less reductions.

Member Rogers questioned why a public meeting was not held in South County. Mr. Unites stated South County service reductions were relatively minor.

Member Elias inquired if private operators could operate some of the service VTA will now not provide. Mr. Unites indicated there are currently private operators that provide service to the public, such as commuter bus service offered by Bauer.

Member Blaylock questioned if staff reviewed Lines 61 and 62 and the apparent duplication these routes present in some areas. Mr. Unites indicated the routes are well used and would be further reviewed.

Member Blaylock questioned if the service reductions included Highway 17 Express. Mr. Unites indicated no service changes are planned for this interagency service, but a fare increase is contemplated for next year.

Members of the Committee expressed general concern for the impact the proposed changes would have on the “transit dependent,” with no alternative means of transportation.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received information on January 2010 Service Changes.

15. Program Enhancements & Proactive CMP Report April - June 2009

Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, noted, as with this and future quarterly visits, staff will bring the Proactive CMP Report to the committees and provide brief presentations highlighting current development trends.

Staff commented on 26 of the 30 projects submitted from April through June 2009. Almost a quarter of those projects were transportation or infrastructure related projects. There were also quite a few long-range planning, general updates, circulation element and housing element projects.

Five major projects were approved during this quarter, including project in Alameda County (Union City and Fremont), Milpitas, Mountain View, Palo Alto and Santa Clara. Mr. Swierk highlighted two of those projects: 1) McCarthy Ranch Mixed Used project, office/light industrial and retail, on North McCarthy Boulevard between SR 237 and Dixon Landing Road; and 2) the Palo Alto Recycled Water Project, the next increment of the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant’s ongoing expansion of its recycled water system.

Member Blaylock praised the inclusion of a Development Review Projects map.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received a presentation on the Development Review Program Enhancements and the Proactive CMP Report for April through June 2009.

16. Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: August

Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer and Staff Liaison, reported an update on the ACE process would be presented to the Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee in September.

The Task Force did not reach a consensus on any of the options discussed. The Task Force is asking the Board for guidance.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received a brief update on the status and progress of the Advisory Committee Enhancement process to date.

17. Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report

Member Powers noted the suggestion that the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) appoint a representative from their committee as the BPAC representative on CAC in an effort to improve communication. Ms. Helm noted the BPAC indicated their interest and will poll their committee to determine if a BPAC member is willing to apply for a seat on the CAC.

Stephen Flynn noted an ACE recommendation for the Committee Chairs to review the consolidated Work Plan to determine opportunities for shared meetings.

Stephen Flynn noted the city appointed BPAC appointments are for a 2-year term. Member Powers noted the CAC bylaws would need to be changed to make the BPAC appointment to CAC concurrent with their BPAC term of appointment.

Members of the Committee directed Stephen Flynn to speak with BPAC on behalf of the CAC.

Member Powers noted a need for better communication between committees and a process for sending those communications to the Board. She noted much of this has already been addressed, with the Committee Chairs meeting with the Board Chair to review the work plan. There may be additional meetings, as required, to keep the communications open.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received a verbal update from the Committee's Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee.

COMBINED CAC AND CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE ITEMS

18. Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans.

OTHER

19. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

20. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan E. Garcia, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary