

**ITEM 2
PROPOSED MINUTES**

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

State Capitol, Room 126
Sacramento, California
October 26, 2006

Present: Member Anne Sheehan, Chairperson
Representative of the Director of the Department of Finance
Member Amy Hair, Vice Chairperson
Representative of the State Controller
Member Francisco Lujano
Representative of the State Treasurer
Member John Fillmore
Representative of the Director of the Office of Planning and Research
Member J. Steven Worthley
County Supervisor
Member Paul Glaab
City Council Member
Member Sarah Olsen
Public Member

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Sheehan called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Item 1 October 4, 2006

Item 1 was postponed to the December hearing.

PROPOSED CONSENT CALENDAR

HEARINGS AND DECISIONS ON CLAIMS, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7 (Gov. Code, §§ 17551 and 17559) (action)

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIMS

Item 10 State Controller's Resubmission and Correction to Reevaluation of Reimbursement Claims on *Graduation Requirements*
Education Code Section 51225.3
Statutes 1983, Chapter 498
San Diego Unified School District, Claimant (CSM 4435-I-01 and 4435-I-37)
San Jose Unified School District, Claimant (CSM 4435-I-04)
Sweetwater Union High School District, Claimant (CSM 4435-I-05)
Castro Valley Unified School District, Claimant (CSM 4435-I-13 and 4435-I-39)
Clovis Unified School District, Claimant (CSM 4435-I-06 and 4435-I-38)

On Remand from the Sacramento County Superior Court,
*San Diego Unified School District, et al. v. Commission on State
Mandates et al.*, Case No. 03CS01401 (Consolidated with Nos.
03CS01568, 03CS01569, 03CS01570, 03CS01702, 04CS00028)

INFORMATIONAL HEARING PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 8 (action)

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AND PROPOSED
PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AMENDMENTS

- Item 11 Proposed Parameters and Guidelines
Domestic Violence Arrests and Victims Assistance, 98-TC-14
Penal Code Sections 264.2 and 13701
Statutes 1998, Chapters 698 (AB 1201) and 702 (AB 2177)
County of Los Angeles, Claimant
- Item 12 Proposed Parameters and Guidelines
Missing Children Reports, 01-TC-09
Education Code Sections 38139 (former § 40048), 49068.5, 49068.6, 49370
and Section 14 of Statutes 1986; Chapter 249 (AB 606),
Statutes 1986, Chapter 249 (AB 606); Statutes 1994, Chapter 922
(AB 2587); Statutes 1996, Chapter 277 (SB 1562); Statutes 1999,
Chapters 832 (AB 646) and 1013 (SB 570)
San Jose Unified School District, Claimant
And
Request to Consolidate *Missing Children Reports with Law Enforcement
Agency Notifications*, 04-PGA-03 (4505)
Education Code Section 48902, Subdivision (c)
Statutes 1989, Chapter 1117 (SB 1275)
San Jose Unified School District, Requestor
- Item 13 Request to Consolidate Parameters and Guidelines
Handicapped and Disabled Students (04-RL-4282-10);
Handicapped and Disabled Students II (02-TC-40/02-TC-49); and
*Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) Pupils: Out-of-State Mental
Health Services* (97-TC-05)
Government Code Sections 7570-7588
Statutes 1984, Chapter 1747 (Assem. Bill No. 3632)
Statutes 1985, Chapter 1274 (Assem. Bill No. 882)
Statutes 1994, Chapter 1128 (Assem. Bill No. 1892)
Statutes 1996, Chapter 654 (Assem. Bill No. 2726)

California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Sections 60000-60610
(Emergency regulations effective January 1, 1986 [Register 86, No. 1], and
re-filed June 30, 1986, designated effective July 12, 1986 [Register 86, No.
28]; and Emergency regulations effective July 1, 1998 [Register 98, No. 26],
final regulations effective August 9, 1999 [Register 99, No. 33])

- Item 15 Request to Amend Parameters and Guidelines
Health Benefits for Survivors of Peace Officers and Firefighters,
 05-PGA-06 (97-TC-25)
 Labor Code Section 4856; Government Code Section 26135
 Statutes 1996, Chapter 1120 (AB 3478); Statutes 1997, Chapter 193
 (SB 563)
 Department of Finance, Requestor
- Item 16 Request to Amend Parameters and Guidelines
Sex Offenders: Disclosure by Law Enforcement Officers,
 05-PGA-09 (97-TC-15)
 Penal Code Sections 290 and 290.4
 Statutes 1996, Chapters 908 (AB 1562) and 909 (SB 1378)
 Statutes 1997, Chapters 17 (SB 947), 80 (SB 115), 817 (AB 59), 818
 (AB 1303), 819 (SB 314), 820 (SB 882), 821 (AB 290), and 822
 (SB 1078)
 Statutes 1998, Chapters 485 (AB 2803), 550 (AB 2799), 927 (AB 796) 928
 (AB 1927), 929 (AB 1745), and 930 (AB 1078)
 Department of Finance, Requestor
- Item 17 Request to Amend Parameters and Guidelines
Law Enforcement College Jurisdiction Agreements,
 05-PGA-10 (98-TC-20)
 Education Code 67381
 Statutes 1998, Chapter 284 (SB 1729)
 Department of Finance, Requestor

ADOPTION OF COMMISSION ORDER TO INITIATE RULEMAKING

- Item 19 Incorrect Reduction Claims Process
 Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Chapter 2.5,
 Article 5. Incorrect Reduction Claims, commencing with Section 1185

A motion was made to adopt items 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 19 on the consent calendar.
 With a second by Member Glaab, the items were unanimously adopted.

**APPEAL OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DECISIONS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA
 CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, SECTION 1181, SUBDIVISION (c)**

- Item 3 Staff Report (if necessary)

No appeals were filed.

**HEARINGS AND DECISIONS ON TEST CLAIMS, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA
 CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7 (Gov. Code, §§ 17551
 and 17559) (action)**

Ms. Higashi swore in the parties and witnesses participating in the hearing of items 4, 5, 6, and 7.

TEST CLAIMS

- Item 4 *Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training*, 01-TC-01
Penal Code Section 13519.4
Statutes 2000, Chapter 684 (SB 1102)
County of Sacramento, Claimant

Deborah Borzelleri, Senior Commission Counsel, presented this item. She stated that the test claim legislation prohibits law enforcement officers from engaging in racial profiling and establishes training requirements for law enforcement officers with the curriculum developed by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, or POST. Ms. Borzelleri explained that the test claim statutes, as interpreted by POST, require a one-time, five-hour initial racial profiling training course and a two-hour refresher course every five years. She noted that POST certifies both courses to allow local agencies to apply the training hours toward their 24-hour continuing professional training courses.

Staff recommended that the Commission partially approve the test claim for the initial five-hour training under the limited circumstances as specified in the analysis, and deny reimbursement for the two-hour refresher course.

Parties were represented as follows: Nancy Gust, on behalf of the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department; and Susan Geanacou, Donna Ferebee, and Carla Castaneda, with the Department of Finance.

Ms. Gust stated no objection to the staff analysis.

Ms. Geanacou concurred with the staff analysis.

Member Glaab made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Worthley, the motion carried unanimously.

- Item 5 Proposed Statement of Decision
Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training, 01-TC-01
See Above

Deborah Borzelleri, Senior Commission Counsel, presented this item. She stated that the only issue before the Commission was whether the proposed Statement of Decision accurately reflected the Commission's decision on the *Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training* test claim. She noted that staff would make minor changes in the final Statement of Decision to reflect the hearing testimony and vote count.

Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the proposed Statement of Decision, which was seconded by another member. The motion carried unanimously.

Member Worthley commented that the Commission makes findings that where a mandated activity could be absorbed into an existing program, the activity is not reimbursable. He stated his concern that at some point, it becomes almost ludicrous in terms of trying to actually perform the responsibilities within the allocated time allotments. He noted that he has heard anecdotal information indicating that point in time was approaching.

Chairperson Sheehan stated that it was a point well taken and encouraged those with the same concern to discuss the issue with members of the Legislature.

Item 6 *Racial Profiling, Law Enforcement Training (K-14)*, 02-TC-05
Penal Code Section 13519.4
Statutes 1990, Chapter 480 (SB 2680); Statutes 1992, Chapter 1267
(AB 401); Statutes 2000, Chapter 901 (SB 739); Statutes 2001,
Chapter 854 (SB 205)
Santa Monica Community College District, Claimant

Deborah Borzelleri, Senior Commission Counsel, presented this item. She stated that the test claim legislation prohibits law enforcement officers in K-14 school districts from engaging in racial profiling and establishes training curriculum developed by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, or POST, to include a one-time, five-hour initial racial profiling training course and a two-hour refresher course every five years.

Staff recommended that the Commission deny this test claim because it does not mandate any activities on K-14 school districts. Ms. Borzelleri explained that there was no legal requirement on K-14 school districts to establish police departments and there was no other evidence to support a finding that reimbursement should be allowed for this test claim when the training requirements are triggered by the K-14 school districts' discretionary decision to establish a police department.

Parties were represented as follows: Susan Geanacou and Carla Castaneda, with the Department of Finance; and Art Palkowitz, on behalf of the San Diego Unified School District.

Nancy Patton, Assistant Executive Director, noted that the claimant's representative, Keith Petersen, was unable to be present but notified staff that it was ok to proceed with the item because his objections were noted in the record. However, Mr. Petersen requested that the item be continued if any new issues were raised.

Ms. Geanacou supported the staff analysis.

Member Glaab asked why the constitutional provision requiring safe schools does not apply to community colleges. Ms. Borzelleri responded that the specific provision only applies to K-12. Camille Shelton, Chief Legal Counsel, added that the provision was an initiative adopted by the voters.

Member Glaab requested clarification as to whether a K-12 school district was required to complete the training requirements if it had a police department. Ms. Borzelleri said yes, noting that it was up to the district to decide what they need or how to carry out what they need to do to provide security. Member Glaab then asked how many school districts have elected to have their own police department. Ms. Shelton stated that staff did not have a number.

Member Worthley commented that many school districts contract with local police departments to get around the problem.

Mr. Palkowitz indicated that while many districts do contract, larger districts in urban areas such as San Diego and Los Angeles have their own police agency. He stated that it was necessary because of the lack of response time from a local agency to deal with problems at school districts. He pointed out that even though the law does not require a school district to have a police agency, various requirements must be followed once one is established. He noted that the Education Code does not require a school district to have a teacher, and thus, the activity in question, rather than the position or job title, should be examined.

Mr. Palkowitz noted that with suspension and expulsion cases, the act of suspending or expelling a student was discretionary, but if it was done, downstream related costs such as hearings were required, which is reimbursable. In this case, he argued that the required training should be reimbursable as well.

Member Worthley appreciated Mr. Palkowitz's comments but stated that in Fresno, police officers were stationed at the school so that response time was not an issue. He suggested that districts contract with the local jurisdiction for that type of service to make sure that the costs are reimbursed at the municipality level.

Mr. Palkowitz agreed, but contended that the cost of such service was an issue.

Ms. Shelton explained that in the *San Diego Unified School District* case, the Supreme Court found that certain discretionary expulsions may be considered mandatory but not reimbursable and left the mandate issue unanswered. She stated that in this particular case, the same facts in earlier cases were not present to suggest that it should be a reimbursable state-mandated program.

Mr. Palkowitz commented that very few things say "required" in the Education Code.

Member Worthley made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation, which was seconded by Member Olsen. The motion carried 6-1, with Member Glaab voting "No."

- Item 7 Proposed Statement of Decision
Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training (K-14), 02-TC-05
See Above

Deborah Borzelleri, Senior Commission Counsel, presented this item. She stated that the only issue before the Commission was whether the proposed Statement of Decision accurately reflected the Commission's decision in the *Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training (K-14)* test claim. She noted that staff would make minor changes to the final Statement of Decision, including hearing testimony and vote count.

Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the proposed Statement of Decision. With a second by Member Worthley, the motion carried unanimously.

- Item 8 *Pupil Safety Notices*, 02-TC-13
Education Code Sections 32242, 32243, 32245, 46010.1; 48904, 48904.3, 48987 and Welfare and Institutions Code Section 18285
Statutes 1983, Chapter 498 (SB 813); Statutes 1984, Chapter 482 (AB 3757); Statutes 1984, Chapter 948 (AB 2549); Statutes 1986, Chapter 196 (AB 1541); Statutes 1986, Chapter 332 (AB 2824); Statutes 1992, Chapter 445 (AB 3257); Statutes 1992, Chapter 1317 (AB 1659); Statutes 1993, Chapter 589 (AB 2211); Statutes 1994, Chapter 1172 (AB 2971); Statutes 1996, Chapter 1023 (SB 1497); Statutes 2002, Chapter 492 (AB 1859)
Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 11523
San Jose Unified School District, Claimant

- Item 9 Proposed Statement of Decision
Pupil Safety Notices, 02-TC-13
See Above

Items 8 and 9 were postponed to the December hearing.

INFORMATIONAL HEARING PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 8 (action)

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AND PROPOSED PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AMENDMENTS

- Item 14 Request to Amend Parameters and Guidelines
Handicapped and Disabled Students, 00-PGA-03/04 (CSM 4282)
Government Code Sections 7570-7588
Statutes 1984, Chapter 1747 (Assem. Bill No. 3632);
Statutes 1985, Chapter 1274 (Assem. Bill No. 882)

California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Sections 60000-60610
(Emergency Regulations filed December 31, 1985, designated effective January 1, 1986 (Register 86, No. 1) and re-filed June 30, 1986, designated effective July 12, 1986 (Register 86, No. 28))
Counties of Los Angeles and Stanislaus, Requestors

Item 14 was postponed to the December hearing.

PROPOSED STATEWIDE COST ESTIMATE

- Item 18 *Integrated Waste Management*, 00-TC-07
Public Resources Code Sections 40148, 40196.3, 42920-42928
Public Contract Code Sections 12167 and 12167.1
Statutes 1999, Chapter 764 (AB 75);
Statutes 1992, Chapter 1116 (AB 3521)
State Agency Model Integrated Waste Management Plan (February 2000)
Santa Monica and Lake Tahoe Community College Districts, Claimants

The California Integrated Waste Management Board submitted a late filing at the hearing.¹ Chairperson Sheehan stated that in the future, the members would appreciate receiving filings prior to the hearing.

[A few minutes were taken to review the letter.]

Cathy Cruz Jefferson, Senior Program Analyst, presented this item. She stated that on March 25, 2004, the Commission adopted its Statement of Decision finding that the *Integrated Waste Management* program constituted a higher level of service for community college districts. She indicated that staff reviewed the claims data submitted by the claimants and compiled by the State Controller's Office. The data showed that 27 community college districts filed 142 claims for fiscal years 1999-2000 through 2004-2005 for a total of over \$6 million.

Ms. Jefferson stated that on January 9, 2006, staff issued its draft staff analysis and requested additional information regarding the costs associated with diversion of solid waste and complying with the program that may assist in the development of a more accurate statewide cost estimate. On July 27, 2006, staff conducted a prehearing conference so the parties could assist in identifying offsets and developing a more accurate statewide cost estimate. Ms. Jefferson noted that the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the Department of Finance provided

¹The California Integrated Waste Management Board submitted comments to the final staff analysis. The letter was dated October 26, 2006, addressed to Executive Director, Paula Higashi, and signed by Elliott Block, Acting Chief Counsel.

comments; however, they did not provide enough evidence to help staff reduce the proposed estimate by deducting offsets that should have been realized but were not reported in claims.

Ms. Jefferson explained that, in general, the Board's comments focused on its request to amend the parameters and guidelines. She noted that because the reimbursement claims for fiscal years 1999-2000 through 2004-2005 were already submitted, the Board's suggestion to add additional information to the parameters and guidelines regarding offsetting savings would not affect the claims. Thus, staff was unable to improve the proposed estimate for the initial years based on the Board's comments.

Staff recommended that the Commission adopt the proposed estimate, which includes nine fiscal years for a total of \$10,785,532, averaging to almost \$1.2 million annually in costs for the state. If adopted, the estimate will be reported to the Legislature.

Parties were represented as follows: Elliot Block and Trevor O'Shaughnessy, on behalf of the California Integrated Waste Management Board; and Susan Geanacou and Carla Castaneda, with the Department of Finance.

Mr. Block noted that the Board provided information at the prehearing conference and just learned that it was not the kind of information that is useful in adjusting the claims. Thus, in the last few days, he compiled other information that specifically connects to the adopted parameters and guidelines, which allows offsets for revenues generated from the sale of recycled materials. He explained that the dollar amount attributable to the revenues that could be generated from recyclable materials, given the amounts reported by community college districts as being diverted, is about \$22 million for a five-year period. He asserted that this amount essentially wipes out the \$10 million statewide cost estimate.

In addition, Mr. Block stated that additional information on the avoided disposal cost issue was provided as well. He noted that staff's analysis states that avoided disposal costs are not an appropriate offset; however, he asserted that staff took a fairly narrow reading of the parameters and guidelines. He argued that avoided disposal costs occur automatically from the diversion of these materials. Mr. Block requested that the statewide cost estimate be reduced to zero.

Ms. Geanacou stated that at this time, she was not in a position to provide official testimony regarding the assertion of the value of recyclables and how it may or may not completely negate the proposed estimate, but would like the opportunity to comment.

Ms. Shelton stated that it would not be appropriate for the Commission to adopt a statewide cost estimate of zero because it would contradict the Statement of Decision, which found that there are increased costs mandated by the state as a matter of law. She added that a lot of the Board's comments were made before the Commission during the parameters and guidelines phase, and noted that their request to amend the parameters and guidelines is on file but not before the Commission at this time. Thus, anything having to do with the offset issue is a question of law that has to be dealt with at another hearing.

Ms. Shelton explained that the purpose of the statewide cost estimate is to notify the Legislature of the amount currently claimed. Staff questions the amount but does not have solid data to be able to reduce the figure. However, notice must still be provided to the Legislature.

Member Worthley asked if the estimate fixes the cost for future years. Ms. Higashi stated not necessarily, noting that once the report is made to the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office has a duty to evaluate the report. A recommendation is required during the budget

process, and that recommendation may be to: 1) fund it, 2) amend the statute, or 3) request a reconsideration by the Legislature.

Ms. Higashi asked if there was a statutory requirement to use the revenue from recycled material solely for the purpose of paying for this program. She recalled that these issues were addressed in a previous hearing because there was no statutory requirement that the revenues be used exclusively for the cost of the program, and thus, they were not a mandatory offset. She also pointed out that there are 72 community college districts and the proposed estimate only represents about a third of them.

Mr. O'Shaughnessy responded that Assembly Bill 75 states that revenues generated are to be used to enhance the recycling programs. Additionally, he stated that within the Public Contract Code, it states that the revenues generated by the sale of the materials and the keeping of those revenues need to be approved by the Integrated Waste Management Board up to \$2,000. Anything above \$2,000 must also be appropriated by the Legislature. Thus, the funds cannot roll back into an agency's fund of operations – it either needs to go back into the recycling program or to the state's general fund for allocation.

Ms. Shelton clarified that there were two separate issues being discussed. One is about offsetting revenue, which are identified in the parameters and guidelines, and the other is an alleged offsetting savings argument, which was denied before, but is the subject of a request to amend the parameters and guidelines.

Member Worthley commented that Mr. O'Shaughnessy just defeated their argument because if the money that is generated has to go back through the state's general fund, then the community college districts do not benefit.

Mr. O'Shaughnessy responded that the districts benefit because they are allowed to use those funds per the statute. They just need to request that the Legislature allocate the money because it is revenue that they generated.

Member Worthley pointed out that the allocation is a discretionary act of the Legislature. Thus, if the Legislature elects not to appropriate the money, the community college districts lose out.

Member Olsen commented that they needed to discuss the avoided disposal cost issue.

Mr. Block stated that staff's analysis was based on a clause in their statute that says that offsetting savings must be applied to the program to the extent feasible. He argued that staff viewed this as discretionary. He asserted that in the context of avoided disposal costs, there is no discretion involved because the very fact that the materials are diverted avoids the disposal cost. He acknowledged that the Commission's process is set out a certain way, but he felt an obligation to at least get the information into the record, especially since it will be forwarded to the Legislature. He maintained that in the long run, these programs are revenue-generating for community college districts.

Chairperson Sheehan stated her understanding that this issue will be addressed in the request to amend the parameters and guidelines. Ms. Shelton clarified that the issue was already addressed when the Commission adopted the parameters and guidelines, but it will be revisited with the new information provided when the request to amend comes up in the queue.

Mr. Block requested clarification that any changes to the parameters and guidelines would only be effective from 2005 forward. Ms. Shelton affirmed, noting that Government Code section 17557 governs the timing of a request to amend the parameters and guidelines. Because

the Board's request was filed after the initial claims filing period, it would not impact the initial years' claims. She stated that the State Controller's Office can reduce costs if they find that they are unreasonable or excessive.

Chairperson Sheehan noted that there was a mechanism on the revenue side to address the issue.

Member Worthley asked the purpose of the July prehearing. Ms. Jefferson responded that the Board and affected state agencies and interested parties were invited to provide information to help identify offsets and to help develop a more accurate estimate because inaccuracies were identified in the claims.

Member Worthley wondered if the results would have been different if staff received the Board's new information in July. Ms. Shelton noted that the Board was still making legal arguments that were previously denied. Thus, depending on what facts they would have presented, staff could not answer that question.

Member Olsen requested clarification that a Commission action today would not preclude the Controller's Office from taking into consideration the kind of information that the Board is talking about when reviewing and paying reimbursement claims. Ms. Higashi affirmed.

After further discussion about the two issues, Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Worthley, the motion carried unanimously.

STAFF REPORTS

Item 20 Chief Legal Counsel's Report (info)
Recent Decisions, Litigation Calendar

Ms. Shelton reported that the hearing in the *CSBA v. State of California* case was changed from December 15th to January 5th.

Item 21 Executive Director's Report (info/action)
Workload, Budget, Legislation, and Next Hearing

Ms. Higashi reported the following:

- *Next Hearing.* The December hearing will be on December 4th at 1:30 at a location to be determined.
- *Other Meetings.* Ms. Higashi will be attending an annual meeting with various organizations to go over future scheduling issues. Later in November, she will participate in a panel discussion at the California League of Cities Conference for a financial management seminar.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126 and 17526.

PERSONNEL

Report from Personnel Subcommittee and to confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code sections 11126, subdivision (a) and 17526.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Sheehan adjourned into closed executive session pursuant to Government Code sections 11126, subdivision (a), and 17526, to confer on personnel matters listed on the published notice and agenda.

REPORT FROM CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chairperson Sheehan reported that the Commission met in closed executive session pursuant to Government Code sections 11126, subdivision (a), and 17526, to confer on personnel matters listed on the published notice and agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, and with a motion by Member Hair and second by Member Glaab, Chairperson Sheehan adjourned the meeting at 10:54 a.m.

PAULA HIGASHI
Executive Director