

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CAPITAL OUTLAY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
December 17, 2019
STATE CAPITOL BUILDING, ROOM 317
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO**

Members Present: Mr. Joe Guillen, NMSBA Mr. Raúl Burciaga, LSC
Mr. David Abbey, LFC Mr. Antonio Ortiz, PED
Ms. Rachel S. Gudgel, LESC
Ms. Stephanie Rodriguez, Office of the Governor

Designee: Mr. Martin Romero (for Ms. Marguerite Salazar, RLD)

Members Absent: Ms. Olivia Padilla-Jackson, DFA
Mr. David Robbins, PEC

1. **Call to Order** – Chair Guillen called the meeting to order at 8:34 A.M.
 - a. **Approval of Agenda** – Chair Guillen asked if there was any objection to the agenda presented; as there was none the agenda was unanimously approved.
 - b. **Correspondence** – None.
2. **Public Comment** – None.
3. **Presentation from NM IT Directors Cyber Security – Cyber Security in NM Schools**

Mr. Lee Reynolds, Director, IT Services (Rio Rancho Public Schools), presented on behalf of the New Mexico IT Directors Cyber Security Forum. Speaking on cyber security, Mr. Reynolds referred to issues schools are facing with ransomware as well as a variety of other issues related to phone systems, entry access and security cameras; all items that run off the internet. Though E-rate does a tremendous job of putting in the infrastructure, it does very little with providing funding for firewalls. The question is how to go about securing things like wireless access points, telephones, etc., as not all districts have the same resources, and this is a huge issue with the schools. Dr. Pierce Jones, IT Operations Administrator (Los Alamos Public Schools) stated that a few year's prior, the district had hired an agency to do an analysis of their network to determine their strengths and weaknesses. Dr. Jones stated he would like to see some form of money go to small school districts that don't have the resources to hire a third party to evaluate their networks and have those reports provided to the PSCOC. Mr. Guillen noted the New Mexico School Boards Association has entertained a resolution to make this a priority for the upcoming legislative session. Mr. Guillen asked whether Mr. Abbey or Ms. Gudgel had anything in the works that would address this type of situation; Ms. Gudgel replied in the negative and stated members were interested however the subject matter falls slightly outside the scope of education. Noting work being done between PSFA and PED, Ms. Gudgel suggested it might be good to put this on the Science & Technology and Telecommunications Committee's radar. Mr. Abbey urged Mr. Reynolds and Dr. Jones to

provide an action plan on what they were seeking help for, what the cost would be, whether consultants were needed or if there was a list of best practices the group might put out. Mr. Reynolds stated DoIT had been contacted and noted they were trying to tie this in with the New Mexico Broadband Initiative. Mr. Reynolds also stated he had an action plan which included surveying and identifying the weaker points at all school districts and working with vendor/partners so dollar amounts could be identified to rectify individual issues. Mr. Abbey reiterated that the action plan should include: who, how, what, when and at what cost. Per Dr. Jones, Mr. Adan Delgado, PED Deputy Secretary of Finance and Operations, would like to put \$2.0M from Legislature towards solving these problems. The plan is to use \$2.0M to send a third party out to evaluate districts before products and services are purchased. Mr. Reynolds stated that the proposal they are trying to put forth is to utilize the BDCP to support these activities so the dollars are focused where they need to be. Mr. Reynolds stated he would share his plan with PSFA and to the members for review. Mr. Abbey asked if the \$2.0M was an official PED request; Dr. Jones replied it was an endeavor that Mr. Delgado put forth but was unsure where it was in the process. Mr. Burciaga stated he had recently attended a conference on cyber security and noted it was a huge issue not only for schools but for all levels of government; two things noted to be the biggest threats with cyber security were 1) people (ie: clicking an attachment or link they shouldn't) and 2) how you restore because inevitably something is going to go wrong and how you restore and isolate the issue is important. Mr. Reynolds agreed and noted these concerns have been addressed.

Mr. Chamblin added that through conversations with PED, DoIT, and Council, staff has been learning about this topic and one thing we are looking for collectively is an operational owner for this issue at the state level. Districts state that they need help; that they don't have the expertise to manage, configure or protect their network and then respond to an attack and rebuild. From PSFA's perspective there is no easy capital fix to this problem. What we see is a need to address the operational side; what to invest in at a capital level in terms of equipment and parts for a network infrastructure. From our perspective we don't see an easy path to move forward with capital investment to fix cyber security without operational support and commitment so districts can select and use hardware relevant for their facility.

Ms. Gudgel asked if E-rate covered the type of equipment being discussed; Ms. Lauren Trujillo, Director of Global Channel with Risk Sense, replied in the negative. Mr. Abbey suggested that PSFA collaborate with the group to provide a one or two-page guidance checklist of short term and long term needs to Superintendents as well as collaborating with the PED Secretary; Mr. Guillen agreed. Mr. Reynolds and Dr. Jones were encouraged to continue working with PSFA and communicating with the school districts on what they need to be doing now and what is being looked at in the long term including the upcoming legislative session. When asked how soon the assessments from the 89 schools districts would be needed, Mr. Abbey replied during the first week of January.

4. PSCOC Financial Plan

Mr. Evans reviewed the changes to the financial plan since the last meeting: increased Capital Improvements Act (SB9) by \$700K in FY20 and reduced the previous \$20.0M increase to \$17.5M in FY21-FY24. Reducing standards-based awards in FY21-22 by \$5.0M, reinstating systems-based awards in FY21-22 at \$10.0M and keeping the reduction of \$20.0M for FY23-

24. The projected fund balance is \$269.9M. Regarding Pre-K capital appropriations awarded to PSFA for FY21-24 staff anticipates it will become a classroom facilities initiative and not part of the capital appropriations act. Referring to the changes identified, Mr. Guillen stated he did not recall them being done in this manner previously and, noting several items were dependent on legislative action, was unsure if the financial plan should be changed in anticipation of action that could/could not occur, however, Mr. Guillen did agree staff should be cognizant of, and prepared in the event the changes do occur. Mr. Guillen did not feel the reductions in the standards and systems-based awards should be done in advance and asked the Awards Subcommittee to explain why they were coming forth at this time. At the request of House leadership, Ms. Gudgel and Mr. Abbey had been asked to convene meetings across the state to talk about the Zuni litigant school districts concerns about inequitable access to capital outlay funding. SB9 is one thing that came up as it is based on property tax revenue and is not very equitable. The Public School Capital Outlay Oversight Task Force (Task Force) endorsed a bill last month and, if it is based on program units, the approximate \$38.0M they assumed will change over time as districts phase in K-5 plus and extended learning time program units. It was reiterated that the financial plan is a planning tool and if the Legislature doesn't adopt and make these legal changes we wouldn't need to plan for them, however, as a planning tool, we are being responsive to those conversations as we think about making Pre-K awards and, in the spring, releasing award letters for the standards, systems and security programs. Mr. Guillen noted several Legislators have expressed concern regarding reducing the systems-based program and stated it had been announced as something we were doing when we haven't, as a Council, taken action on it. Mr. Abbey responded by stating this started with a recognition of two important things: the demand of some programs was under-subscribing funding standards and systems-based and a new revenue projection that showed we will likely have a higher bonding capacity. This is the practice we have followed in the past and if the revenue estimate went down we showed red in a projected out-year and presented that to the Task Force. The Task Force would then ask what we would do about it and we would respond by saying we would have to scale something back. In light of stronger revenues and undersubscribed demand, the Awards Subcommittee sought to find constructive ways to take advantage of the surplus.

MOTION: Council approval of the Awards Subcommittee recommendation to adopt the proposed changes as outlined in the Financial Plan Assumptions and Summary. As this was a Subcommittee recommendation a second was not needed and the motion was unanimously approved.

5. Consent Agenda

- a. Approval of Minutes – November 14, 2019
- b. 2020-2021 PSCOC Work Plan Timeline
- c. BDCP – 2018 Category 2 (Equipment) Awards
- d. BDCP – 2019 Category 2 (Equipment) Awards
- e. BDCP – Renewal of E-rate Central Agreement
- f. Gallup – 2018-2019 School Security Awards – Award Language Change
- g. Los Alamos – Outside of Adequacy Award – Award Language Change

Mr. Guillen read through the items listed within the consent agenda and asked members if any item needed to be pulled for discussion; as there was none, a motion to approve was made.

MOTION: Council approval of the consent agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

6. 2019-2020 Award Cycle

a. Las Vegas City – S18-003 – Los Niños ES – Additional Funding

This systems-based project was awarded in the first year of the program and used the methodology of all at once funding. After the district got the award they split the project into different phases for functionality and constructability reasons; Phase 1 was for exterior/site work and Phase 2 was for work on the building. The district moved forward with Phase 1, which is now done, and are returning with a request for the remainder of Phase 2. Cost increases during Phase 1 were related to increased site work costs as well as cost increases for Phase 2 and for market conditions, bidding climate, inflation, and cost increases for materials and labor. There is also an additional cost to the project for a portable campus. The cost increase from Phase 1 plus the portable campus to facilitate Phase 2 is about \$1.9M. Mr. Abbey reiterated that the action of the Subcommittee was to remove the portable campus from the recommendation. Mr. Abbey asked if that was reflected in the numbers presented as it was not reflected in the narrative; Mr. Avila replied that the cost for the portable campus initiated in Phase 1 was 100% district cost and the cost increase referred to by Mr. Chamblin was the cost of moving the children from four classroom pods into the portables and with the sequencing of construction. Mr. Abbey and Mr. Romero agreed it was not presented as such to the Subcommittee. Mr. Avila recalled that the Awards Subcommittee recommended approval for the cost increases associated with items identified by Mr. Chamblin, but that staff would pull out any cost associated with the portables. What Mr. Chamblin identified is that of the \$1.9M which is before the Council, \$1.0M of that could be attributed to that sequencing of construction to bring the portables on board. Instead of handing over the entire school facility project to the contractor, the contractor is having to sequence the work into pods of four. Mr. Abbey reiterated that the Subcommittee action was to approve the cost overruns for the repairs to the school, not to pay for any cost associated with the portable campus on the theory that a cheaper alternative would be available at an existing school. Members expected staff to return with the base cost of building a new facility and additional costs related to a portable campus would be presented separately. Per Ms. Larryssa Archuleta, Superintendent, the situation existed prior to her tenure and it was her understanding the portables were 100% district funded. The district had the portables and the plan was that it would take nine months to move four pods into different areas as construction took place. Ms. Archuleta's predecessors moved all of the students and right-sized, unfortunately those students cannot go to another building to right-size because POMS stated it is not safe to move them until construction was completed. Unfortunately, that has not occurred and the students are in the building and cannot be moved into one of the empty schools because they will not all fit; there is also another 125 students being held in a different building that are to be joined with those from the four additional classrooms. The reality is that the district has gone from \$5.0M to \$14.1M and cannot afford to pay this amount and is requesting Council participation in the increase. The district's bond is \$11.0M and they cannot go out for another bond until 2023. Mr. Abbey reiterated that the

concern of the Subcommittee was triggered by the statement that the PSFA staff recommended utilization of previously closed schools as swing space in an effort to reduce costs and the district declined. The Subcommittee wanted more information on how far away the existing schools were from the renovated campus. The Subcommittee supported the cost overruns for construction but in order to support participating in relocation, members wanted more information about the original recommendation and what the incremental costs were. Mr. Avila replied that staff did work with the district's representative, Mr. Clay Simmons, in terms of the additional costs; because of the portable campus, the added cost to construction was \$500K. Construction went from a five-month to a nine-month project and now the cost of general conditions adds up to another \$500K which is the \$1.0M Mr. Chamblin identified as the cost increase for not utilizing the swing space. Ms. Archuleta acknowledged that the playground equipment had been removed from the elementary schools that were closed as well as additional items that were removed from inside the buildings; the district would incur significant costs to make the closed schools acceptable for students to be placed there during construction. Ms. Gudgel clarified that the \$984,811 was due to construction increases related to the systems project and would be the motion for Council to approve and that the issue of swing space would be sent back to the Awards Subcommittee for additional information and analysis. Upon splitting the motion, Ms. Gudgel asked what it would do to the project; what the impact would be. Ms. Archuleta replied that the district had gone out to bid and work was to begin in January however, the district was wanting to see what action Council took so that they would know in which direction they were to move the 400+ students for the second semester. Mr. Guillen suggested taking action on the first part of the motion and authorizing the Subcommittee to take final action on the second part. Mr. Abbey moved Mr. Guillen's suggestion and Ms. Gudgel seconded. Upon inquiring as to when the next Subcommittee meeting would be Ms. Gudgel asked if there was need to have a meeting prior to January. Mr. Abbey suggested it be done this week to avoid further delay; staff agreed. Per Mr. Avila, it is important to act on this soon as hard bids have been received and the general contractor will hold those bids for 90 days. Staff has worked with the district and advised them to request a best and final number and as we get into contract with the general contractor we will explore value engineering to reduce costs.

MOTION: Council approval of the Awards Subcommittee recommendation to amend the 2017-2018 Systems-Based award to the Las Vegas City School District for Los Niños ES based on actual cost to complete the work with an increase in the state share amount of \$1,984,811 (55%), and a corresponding additional local share of \$1,623,935 (45%).

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Abbey moved for Council approval to amend the 2017-2018 Systems-Based award to the Las Vegas City School District for Los Niños ES with an increase in the state share amount of \$984,811, and a corresponding additional local share of \$805,754 (45%). Ms. Gudgel seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION: Mr. Abbey moved for Council approval to authorize the Awards Subcommittee to make a final decision on the balance of the request as soon as possible in order to move the project forward. Ms. Gudgel seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

b. NMSBVI – P14-019 – Quimby Gym – Request for Local Match Reduction

This is a 2013-2014 standards-based project with an original award of \$1.84M. The design for the project began in 2014 and as they got into design and investigation in to the existing building, additional construction costs were identified by the design team from unforeseen conditions within the building. The design is now complete and bids were solicited (as of 2019). The district's request is for additional funding to cover the cost increases as well as a waiver of the local match required to complete the work. The districts offset balance of \$9.3M has been applied, as calculated based on appropriations received since 2012.

Ms. Patricia Beecher, Ms. Margie Macias, and Ms. Sylvia Hartley were in attendance to represent the district and answer questions. Ms. Beecher acknowledged that the Quimby Gymnasium was an important project for the students as it is educational space for both the core curriculum and expanded core curriculum which includes recreation and leisure skills, sports teams, fitness programs, and physical therapy.

Mr. Evans drew member attention to the breakdown of NMSBVI's financial analysis as of December 2019 noting the beginning cash balance of \$3.9M in FY18. Mr. Evans worked through the numbers for revenue and expenditures through FY23 and noted they would have a surplus of slightly more than \$5.0M upon reviewing their capital revenue and capital expenditures, it becomes clear they have set aside some cash money to cover some capital projects which leaves them with capital projects through FY23 and a \$4.7M deficit. They are saving some of the surplus to cover the deficit in capital projects, leaving them with approximately \$270K in cash balance through FY23. Ms. Gudgel clarified that the surplus dollars were restricted as they were direct legislative appropriations for particular projects; Mr. Evans and Ms. Hartley replied in the affirmative. Ms. Gudgel further clarified it was not technically a surplus but rather dollars the Legislature created for specific things that haven't yet happened. Mr. Abbey asked if this would be the last of the projects or if more would be coming; Ms. Beecher replied there would be two projects moving into Phase 2; Sacramento Dormitory and Garrett Dormitory, and will be coming back for construction funding. Ms. Gudgel clarified that the district had their local match for those projects through direct legislative appropriations; Ms. Beecher replied that they have part of their local match for Garrett Dormitory, however, there is a \$1.6M increase that they are looking for resources for; the Sacramento Dormitory project should be fully funded. Referring to Garrett Dormitory, Mr. Avila stated that when the project was originally awarded it was at 50% state match and 50% local match which the school district found their match by going through HED. For the Sacramento project, NMSBVI went directly to the Legislature and received an appropriation through HB55.

MOTION: Council approval of the Awards Subcommittee recommendation to amend the 2013-2014 standards-based award to the NM School for the Blind and Visually Impaired for Quimby Gymnasium, to include construction to renovate the existing facilities to adequacy for 70 students, grades K-12. Council approval of the balance of the HB 55 Appropriation in the amount of \$1,751,814, and reduction in the local match in the amount of \$517,991, for an adjusted state match of \$2,269,805, and a corresponding adjusted local

match of \$610,193. As this was a Subcommittee recommendation a second was not needed and the motion was unanimously approved.

c. Zuni MS – Discussion of Award Language - *informational*

This was a 2018-2019 standards-based award and had been brought to the Awards Subcommittee to get direction on the award language for the project. The district is ready to move forward with what was awarded at the time; a planning phase award of \$75,000 to do a structural investigation and feasibility study. Since the time of award, the district has reformulated their approach to their middle school and high school and rather than having separate schools are looking at potentially moving forward with planning, design and construction for a combined mid-high on the high school site. The request and subsequent discussion at the Awards Subcommittee was whether the existing award language was broad enough to allow the district to move forward with the structural investigation/feasibility study for the middle school at the high school site rather than at the middle school site. Over the last few weeks, PSFA has been updating the ranked position, wNMCI score, and the representation of the school within the database; currently, the high school's preliminary ranking is about 48. The district's plan is to move forward with the middle school project; the investigation of the high school site to accommodate the middle school students, the structural investigation of the high school buildings as would have happened at the middle school in addition to some planning work to see if the middle school students could fit at the high school if the buildings are structurally worth keeping. Based on the ranked position of the high school, the district has expressed that this cycle they are going to come for a standards-based application and potential award for the high school site. The district would like to move forward with the structural investigation now and have it wrap up mid-summer. Direction received from the Subcommittee is that the award language is generally broad enough to allow for this change in direction and taking the \$75,000 preliminary award from last year and using it at the high school site for a structural investigation rather than at the middle school site which is no longer relevant. Based on the changes that have been made, Ms. Gudgel asked what the high school's FCI and wNMCI was; Mr. Chamblin replied that the numbers would be provided.

Ms. Gudgel suggested that the district start talking about a new lease for the site as Council generally requires 25 year leases with a tribe with an option to extend for another 25 and if Council is thinking about doing this it is probably time to start negotiating that conversation for a new lease for the site (it would be needed for the middle school site or the high school site, depending on what they are going to do). Mr. Chamblin stated the conversation has taken place and agreed to follow up with the district.

Mr. Romero noted that he was able to do a site visit with other trade bureaus and noted that the issues at the middle school were significant. The Bureaus are in process of drafting a letter to PSFA noting not only are there structural issues, there are heating/cooling issues, maintenance issues, fire alarm issues, etc... The heating and cooling issues are so bad that they are literally melting grills on the ceiling as there are no thermostats to control; in some teaching rooms there are portable cooling systems to cool down rooms as temperatures are at 96 degrees. Mr. Romero noted that one of the big things is

maintenance; Ms. Gudgel asked how much the district would need for maintenance as they currently receive about \$500,000 a year to maintain four schools. Ms. Gudgel noted LESC is looking to put a proposal forward to get SB9 dollars to districts that need it. Mr. Romero replied that it was more about the training as some individuals are not trained to service certain equipment.

Mr. Chamblin noted that the campus also has teacher housing clusters and the district has also expressed their desire to include a request for 50 new teacher housing units on the high school site as part of the mid-high combined award.

Mr. Abbey commented that he wanted to keep in mind a record of failure; this is a fairly new school that is not in great shape and stressed that it was disappointing the project would need to be done again at 100% state cost. Regarding the foundational and structural issues at the high school, Mr. Martin Romine commented that he had recently found the report from Terracon regarding the piers used; but had not found any reports regarding allegations of fraud. Referring to the burial site/ruins issue, Ms. Gudgel said that the district is potentially looking at using the same site and asked what indications there were that the same problems wouldn't arise on the same site moving forward. Mr. Romine replied that when the elementary school was done, one of the first things that had to be done was to have the archaeology department do an assessment of the property to ensure there were no ruins or burial grounds. The elementary school has been there for 3½ years and you do not see cracks in the floor, shifting, problems with walls or structural issues. Between the archaeological assessment that has to be done and with their experience with the elementary school, Mr. Romine was confident they could build on the soil as they now know what they have to do to stabilize the soil to make sure they don't have the same issues. Regarding the lease, Mr. Romine stated that the tribe has dedicated 100 acres of the area for educational purposes, we have the teacherage out there, the high school and A: Shiwi College and there is still a lot of land out there that can be used. The district has a good working relationship with the tribe and Mr. Romine did not anticipate there being an issue if they were to ask for an additional 25 years.

7. Informational

a. Discussion on Potential Changes to Systems-Based Program for 2020-2021

Staff is looking for direction on rules and methodologies for the systems-based program for the upcoming year assuming that it moves forward. There had been a request from the Awards Subcommittee to bring this item forward for additional discussion with options laid out for the program and the upcoming year. The program is a relatively new program; only a few years old, and has been modified over time based on lessons learned within the program. Referring to the graphic included in the meeting material, Mr. Chamblin reviewed the baseline requirements for the program which included some carry forward and some new concepts for the program. One thing to note was the increased criteria for maintenance performance to be eligible for an award through this program. Other potential program criteria were reviewed with Option A continuing with the list of eligible system types from 2019-2020, Option B focusing on a limited list of eligible systems and Option C excluding site systems. Mr. Abbey asked when a recommendation would be brought back to Council for approval and what Subcommittee it would come from: Mr. Chamblin

replied that program rule discussions typically go through AMS and a proposal would be brought back in January that could be approved by Council and an application letter would be released following the January meeting.

b. PSCOC Project Status Report

Mr. Chamblin noted that for Anton Chico (Santa Rosa), the district has completed the second structural investigation/soil investigation/geotechnical investigation. The report did bring forth some findings that they are using to go back and send a demand letter to the architect and contractor to bring back a proposal to fix by their February board meeting. By February we hope to have a path forward to fix the building from the original project team otherwise we will need to look at other measures. Likewise, on the West Las Vegas MS HVAC project that has been ongoing, we have provided plenty of time now for the original project team to address the issues that are occurring with the HVAC system; we haven't received a good plan to fix it and are looking to move into a new direction to get it fixed as quickly as possible.

Referring to the project status report, Ms. Gudgel noted that Las Cruces was red on every project they are doing and asked if the district has entered into contracts with design professionals and do we know what the delays are; Mr. Avila replied that the district has been focusing on certain systems projects and are just waiting to move forward with other projects. Mr. Avila believed the district was currently pursuing design efforts for the systems projects.

c. Master Plan Project Status Report

This item was not presented.

d. FY20 Budget Projections and Personnel Update

This item was not presented.

8. Consideration for Approval to Adjourn to Executive Session Pursuant to the Open Meetings Act NMSA 1978, 10-15-1 (H)(7) for the purposes of discussing the Zuni Lawsuit (Roll Call)

Mr. Chamblin noted that Olga, from the AG's office was available by phone and Mark Swanson would be available in person.

MOTION: Mr. Burciaga moved for Council approval to adjourn to executive session pursuant to the Open Meetings Act NMSA 1978, 10-15-1 (H)(7) for the purposes of discussing the Zuni Lawsuit. Ms. Gudgel seconded and roll was called.

Roll Call:

Mr. Abbey – Yes	Ms. Rodriguez – Yes	Mr. Robbins – Absent
Mr. Burciaga – Yes	Mr. Ortiz – Yes	Mr. Romero – Yes
Ms. Gudgel – Yes	Ms. Padilla-Jackson – Absent	Mr. Guillen – Yes

Adjourned to executive session at 10:36 a.m.

9. Reconvene to Open Session (Roll Call)

MOTION: Mr. Burciaga moved for Council approval to reconvene from executive session pursuant to the Open Meetings Act NMSA 1978, 10-15-1 (H)(7) for the stated purpose of discussing the Zuni Lawsuit. Only the above referenced item was discussed and no votes were taken.

Roll Call:

Mr. Abbey – Yes	Ms. Rodriguez – Yes	Mr. Robbins – Absent
Mr. Burciaga – Yes	Mr. Ortiz – Yes	Mr. Romero – Yes
Ms. Gudgel – Yes	Ms. Padilla-Jackson (arrived during executive session) - Yes	Mr. Guillen – Yes

Reconvened from executive session at 11:41 a.m.


10. Next PSCOC Meeting- Proposed for January 24, 2020

Members requested that the January meeting begin at 1:30.

Mr. Abbey confirmed that Ms. Irina Ivashkova, PSFA Regional Facilities Manager, was retiring; Mr. Chamblin replied in the affirmative and noted that she was retiring after more than 15 years of service with PSFA. Mr. Abbey asked if Mr. Guillen would consider writing a letter of congratulations; Mr. Chamblin replied a letter would be brought to the January meeting.

Mr. Guillen thanked staff and wished everyone a Merry Christmas and a bright New Year.

11. Adjourn – There being no further business to come before the Council, Mr. Burciaga moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ortiz seconded and the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

 Chair

1/24/20 Date