

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

**MINUTES AND REPORT OF THE MEETING OF
May 6, 2019**

The Citizens Oversight Committee met on Monday, May 6, 2019, in the NMUSD Roderick H. MacMillan Boardroom 2985 Bear Street, Bldg. A, Costa Mesa, CA 92626.

Members Present:

Richard Rutledge, Chairperson, Estancia Parent & PTA Member
Mitch Vance, TGV Partners
Lee Ramos, City of Costa Mesa Senior Commission
Robert Ooten, Member at Large
Laura Ursini Marroquin, Community Relations, Newport/Naples Rib Company
Suzanne Gauntlett, Member at large, HCPTA Vice President of Legislation

Members Absent:

Julio Zunzunegui, Mariners Parent

Also Present:

Tim Holcomb, Assistant Superintendent, Chief Operating Officer
Jeff Trader, Executive Director, Chief Financial Officer
Ara Zareczny, Director of Facilities Development, Planning & Design
Peggy Webster, Executive Assistant/C to Tim Holcomb

Handouts:

Meeting Agenda for May 6, 2019
Meeting Minutes from February 4, 2019
Measure F OCDE Budget – Web Inquiry

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Committee Chair, Richard Rutledge, opened the meeting promptly at 6:00 pm.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Agenda for the May 6, 2019 meeting was adopted as presented.

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

Minutes from the February 4, 2019 meeting were reviewed. One spelling correction was made, and the revised minutes were adopted.

FISCAL REPORT

Mr. Jeff Trader provided a handout of the OCDE Web Inquiry budget displaying the Measure F financial status. He noted the earned interest on the account as well as the bank fees charged.

The two notable encumbrances were the surveying cost of \$25,670 utilizing C Below, Inc. and Salazar Surveying, Inc., and the architects cost of \$1,499,300 utilizing Pfeiffer Partner Architects for the current Estancia High School 350-seat theater project. The total amount budgeted for the project is \$21,637,800.

A question of what ‘encumbrance’ meant was asked and Mr. Trader described it as ‘reserving’ the funds, in that they aren’t actually spent yet but are set aside to be spent for that designated purpose.

Mr. Rutledge asked if the Web Inquiry format showing the financial status would work for the board presentation and Mr. Vance confirmed that it would be fine.

Mr. Ooten asked if the project had been bid yet, and Mr. Trader responded that it has not yet gone to bid.

PROJECT REPORT

Ms. Ara Zareczny reported on the Estancia Theater project. She wanted to mention that the report was just a high-level draft / overview that has not been presented to anyone yet. This Friday, May 10, 2019 will be a draft presentation to the theater committee.

The overall idea with the Estancia High School theater is to make a “new face” for the school.

In development of Pfeiffer’s 33-page report, the following was addressed:

- 1) Establishing what the program was and making sure that it was consistent with the other sites.
- 2) Some assumptions had to be made including what existing areas could be re-used and what would have to be new.
 - a. It was determined that the instrumental room, choral room, and rehearsal space could all be kept and reused. Of note is that the committee is a comprehensive and qualified group that includes a music teacher, drama teacher, and community member.
 - b. The black box space could also be kept but may be utilized differently.
- 3) The need of having continued public access, determining how people will get to the front entrance, addressing the requirements of having fire lanes, etc.
- 4) What all of the various options are for the best location on campus, and a list of 5 (five) options was developed.
 - a. Option 1 (near Placentia and Joann Street) – Lots of work would be needed for public access and parking. The sewer lift station is currently in that space, as well as a high-pressure gas line.
 - b. Option 2 (within the main bus drop-off area) – Great central location and good proximity.

- c. Option 3 (parking lot) – Proximity would be a problem. It is farther away from the existing spaces that are going to be utilized. It would displace the tennis courts.
 - d. Option 4 (within the tennis courts area) This would require the tennis courts to be displaced.
 - e. Option 5 (back part of campus) – Logistics will definitely need to be addressed. Solar structures are current back there and the cost of moving them or not would have to be weighed.
- 5) Of the options, Pfeiffer focused on Options 2 (two variances of it) and 5, and they compiled a comparison matrix. Ms. Zareczny shared a few slides of what each of those options would look like.
- 6) Regarding Option 2, Mr. Rutledge expressed his concern about the drop-off/pick-up traffic and that the flow-through would still be needed.
- 7) Regarding Option 5, the question was asked why not integrate the theater in the current building. Mr. Holcomb explained that it is a waffle slab-style structure, which means that there are many steel support ridges and to change it would be expensive. At least one-fourth of the building would have to be rebuilt in order to put a theater in that building.
- 8) Mr. Holcomb noted that we would like to leverage as much of the budget toward the rest of the campus as a whole and not just in the theater alone.
- 9) Next steps:
- a. Present the options to the committee.
 - b. Make a decision on the location.
 - c. Schematic Design – two-month allocation
 - d. DSA approval
 - e. Bidding, getting a contractor on-board (by late 2020)
- 10) The time-line is about one month later than anticipated because we have spent the extra time delving into all of the possible locations.
- 11) Construction is estimated to start in late 2020 with a 14-month construction schedule.
- a. If we add any scope or decide to relocate the lift station, we will have to incorporate that into an earlier phase ahead of the construction of the theater.
 - b. Estimated opening the new theater in spring of 2021.
 - c. The caveat is that if someone feels passionate about the location and opposes every step of CEQA that we present, then it could add another year before the theater opens.
- 12) Mr. Holcomb stated that the committee will be able to explore all of the options because the architect put together a thorough explanation of each. However, Option 4 (within the tennis courts) did not seem like a viable option, so each of the other four options will be reviewed by the committee this Friday.

PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD

Mr. Rutledge had emailed to the COC members a draft of what he would like to present to the Board on May 28, 2019. He used the Sacramento City Unified School District's Bond Oversight Committee's report as a template, and he reviewed his presentation with the members.

The template contained a page for Recommendations and Mr. Rutledge asked the group if there were any recommendations that should be included. It was felt that no recommendations were needed and so he will remove that slide.

The question was asked if all committee members needed to be present for the presentation and it was decided that it is not necessary for everyone to be present.

Another question was if there would be any discussion that night regarding the theater, and the answer was no, it was just an annual report-out.

COMMITTEE'S CHOICE

Ms. Gauntlett advised the members that HCPTA is going to have to appoint a member for next school year as her child is graduating this year. She already advised Julie Lenk and Vicky Waldo of HCPTA that the position needs to be filled and that it should be someone from the Estancia zone.

Mr. Holcomb asked if she was going to step down before the end of the term and she responded that technically she will no longer be a parent after June. Tim let her know that once she was appointed she could remain a committee member until the end of the calendar year unless she did not want to continue. The only requirement was that she had to be a parent at the time of the appointment. Ms. Gauntlett was not aware of that and she agreed to continue through the end of the calendar year.

NEXT MEETING DATE

September 16, 2019 (Monday, 6pm)

Since there is just one project at this time, the only agenda item for the next meeting will be the theater. Therefore, the agenda will be just like the current one minus the Presentation to the Board item.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 6:55 pm.