Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Board of Trustees
Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2020

Committee Members Present: Chair Jay Cowles, Vice Chair Roger Moe, Trustees Asani Ajogun, Alex Cirillo, Dawn Erlandson, Jerry Janezich, Javier Morillo, April Nishimura, Oballa Oballa, Rudy Rodriguez, Kathy Sheran, George Soule, Cheryl Tefer, and Michael Vekich.

Absent: Trustee Ahmitara Alwal

Cabinet Members Present: Chancellor Devinder Malhotra, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Facilities Bill Maki, and Executive Director of Internal Auditing Eric Wion

Guests: Mike Cullen, Baker Tilly; President Angelia Millender, Century College; and President Scott Olson, Winona State University

Call to Order
Chair Cowles called the meeting to order at 10:45 am.

Chair Cowles conducted a roll call of the trustees participating via Zoom.

Chancellor Devinder Malhotra's Comments
Today marks a critical milestone for Minnesota State.

This fall, we have celebrated together with campuses the culmination of a bonding bill and the investments we and the state have made in our physical infrastructure. These are investments that we can walk through, take a picture in front of and that will physically hold and nurture students through their educational journey.

But sometimes the investments we make or not just in the brick and mortar. Sometimes investments are the intangible things that we can't see or touch but are equally important in the future of our colleges and universities to educate students for generations to come.

NextGen is that type of investment. It is an investment to provide the entire system a 21st century technology infrastructure, which positions us to secure our future. It is an investment that will propel our 37 colleges and universities towards sustainability - an investment in everything we do that will touch each student, faculty, and staff once rolled out.

The vision for NextGen was crystalized over six years ago and the number of those involved in bringing the work to this stage today numbers well into the hundreds.

I want to thank all the students, faculty, and staff who have contributed their time and energy to this critical effort. My thanks and deep appreciation to current and former trustees who have provided guidance and direction over the past six years to bring us to where we are today.

A shout out to our partners in this effort: CampusWorks, Dorsey & Whitney, and BerryDunn. Their efforts and contributions were critical to bring us to this stage of the project.

In particular, I want to acknowledge my deep appreciation of Rhona Schmidt, the lead attorney from Dorsey & Whitney who was also our lead negotiator during contract negotiations. Her advice and counsel was instrumental in bringing the negotiations to successful culmination.

I also want to acknowledge the ongoing partnership with Clint Davies and David Houle who provided us with the national context and assisted us in prioritizing our work and our focus.

Above all we owe a debt of gratitude to Ramon Padilla, Bill Maki, Melinda Clark, and others on the NextGen Project Team. Their leadership and hard work under difficult circumstances has positioned us well for the implementation of the project.

Someone remarked the other week that today marks the end of just the first chapter in our work to bring NextGen to reality. The next several chapters will take time and patience and the diligence of all involved. And I do hope that this is just one book that we are writing together – not a trilogy!

Chair Cowles' Comments

As I shared with trustees in the memo that accompanied this month's meeting materials, the presentations we are about to hear represent the culmination of many years of tremendous effort on the part of students, faculty, and staff across our system who have worked to define business requirements, issued a request for proposal, review and consider vendor proposals, and lastly to select a vendor and negotiate a contract. I sincerely thank everyone involved for their diligent efforts. I look forward to the next couple hours of sharing and discussion in anticipation of important votes that will impact the future of our colleges and universities and the students they serve.

Report from Bill Maki, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Facilities
Presentation slide deck for this report can be found on the [Board website](#).

Past Board and Community Engagements
Vice Chancellor Maki presented slides that provided the committee with an overview of past Board actions related to NextGen and the Phase 1 status report, reporting that in 2013-2014

replacement of the system's ERP first emerged as a priority in listening sessions across the system. There was widespread support of replacement of ISRS to include functionality that was more student centric and mobile friendly.

Vice Chancellor Maki reported that in March 2016 a business case for replacement of ISRS was reviewed and endorsed by the Leadership Council and Board of Trustees. A funding request was subsequently included in the 2018 budget request and supported by the Governor and the legislature. Funding for the project in the system's 2019 budget request was not supported. Funding was again included for NextGen in the system's 2020 budget request supported again by the Governor and the legislature. Funding for the project was also included in the system's 2021 budget request and not supported.

Vice Chancellor Maki reported that in June 2017 the Board authorized the launch of Phase 1. In January 2018 the Board approved the project design and the Phase 1 timeline. The project was reviewed and endorsed by the Leadership Council and the Board at meetings in March and June2018.

Vice Chancellor Maki explained that in June 2019 the Board approved the project and finance plan and in January 2020 the Board approved to enter negotiations with one or more SaaS vendors. BerryDunn was selected and approved by the Board as the third-party owner's representative for the project.

Status Report
Vice Chancellor Maki reported that the NextGen steering committee advises the Chancellor related to the project The committee has approved project timelines and deliverables, helped resolve operational issues and process questions, made policy and procedure recommendations, approved scope changes to establish those priorities and provided direction and guidance to the project.

Vice Chancellor Maki thanked outgoing Vice Chancellor Ramon Padilla for putting in place a very strong organizational structure to allow this work to continue forward not only with the steering committee, but with the team that was built within IT and within the Finance, HR, and Student Services communities to allow this work to advance.

Vice Chancellor Maki noted that Ross Berndt who was recently named Interim Vice Chancellor for ITS joined the committee and moving into Phase 2, Vice Chancellor Davis and Vice Chancellor Maki will serve as co-chairs of the committee.

Vice Chancellor Maki reported that the although the project timeline has been delayed due to the time it took to complete negotiations, there have been several deliverables completed during Phase 1.Highlights for Phase 1 were the project charter, business process mapping which was led by CampusWorks, creation of the campus transition management teams at each of the

37 colleges and universities, the readiness assessment to move to a new ERP that was done across the system, and the process of selecting a vendor and moving into Phase 2.

Report from Bill Maki, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Facilities
NextGen Update and Project Risk Review #6
Vice Chancellor Maki began the presentation by providing an overview of the sixth NextGen Project Risk Review (PRR). The PRR provides ongoing and objective assessments of NextGen to provide assurance to the board on project risk management and provide assurance and advisory guidance to the project steering committee on project risk leading practices.

Eric Wion, Executive Director of Internal Auditing, introduced Mike Cullen from Baker Tilly for an overview on PRR #6. Mr. Cullen shared that project risk reviews have occurred throughout Phase 1 of the project and that this will be the final checkpoint for Phase 1. Project risk reviews focus on four areas: project governance and management of the overall project; organizational change management planning and communication training; stakeholder involvement; and project execution. Mr. Cullen reminded the board that the Board's role within these four areas is within project governance and management and approving key milestone decisions. The Steering Committee recommends that the board monitor both status reports and project risk reviews and how the project risks are managed.

Mr. Cullen stated that Internal Audit has not reviewed every project deliverable in detail yet as those are still being finalized but has participated in project activities and deems that there is an appropriate risk management plan being executed by the project team to address the critical key risks of this project. Although negotiations are delayed, Internal Audit feels that the overall risk of not achieving success for Phase 1 is very low. As has been done in previous risk reviews, there are specific results for each of the four areas that were covered; there are no recommended changes during this checkpoint as the project team continues to do an excellent job of identifying and managing the risks on this project. A key strength of this project is the hiring of a third-party owner's rep and external counsel to help with contract negotiations and ensure that risks to the system are being addressed. He also noted that the leadership and management within Minnesota State that has been focused on this effort from the beginning of the project has also been an important strength. Hiring of a third-party owner's representatives and external counsel are not activities that typically occur in higher education for these types of projects but are important steps that demonstrate this project is being well-run.

Mr. Cullen stated that there is one recommendation that remains open from a prior checkpoint, but that cannot be fully addressed until the implementation begins. Internal Audit will report back to the board in the future once the project team is able to address the recommendation.

Trustee Erlandson asked if Internal Audit had a role in the reference check process for the selected vendor. Mr. Cullen answered that Internal Audit did not have a direct role in executing that but was involved in understanding the process that the project team went through to contact references given by vendors and to reaching out to other colleagues in higher education that have familiarity with vendors.

NextGen Phase 2
Vice Chancellor Maki introduced President Angelia Millender of Century College and President Scott Olson from Winona State University who serve as the president liaisons on the NextGen Steering Committee.

President Olson stated that the current ISRS system is more than 20 years old and was cutting edge technology for its time, before mobile and other devices. He stated that not having NextGen has made us less competitive and that NextGen puts unbelievable power in the hands of students to plan their degree program, make great choices, graduate efficiently and save money. It also supports the finance and HR functions in the back office that are necessary for those other tools to be deployed.

President Olson reported that the price tag for this will be high, but said we need to think about this in terms of what will be the cost of not doing this related to student success and student enrollment. He also noted that the university presidents support moving forward.

President Olson introduced President Angelia Millender from Century College to provide more details about how NextGen will serve faculty, staff and students within the system.

President Millender stated that NextGen will provide immediate and easy access to the information students need when they need it and on a mobile friendly device. Students would get the seamless experience no matter which Minnesota State college or university they attend. Students would have one portal to include financial aid information, student advisement, and educational experiences. It gives students a view of where they are and helps them stay on track, save money and to finish on time.

President Millender stated that the NextGen ERP started with a multi-layered and multi-year process of engagement with many stakeholders involving students, faculty and system office employees. In 2015 there were 52 listening sessions with students, faculty and staff and they conducted a systemwide survey of students who identified challenges and opportunities with ISRS. Additionally, in 2018 regional reviews provided feedback.

President Millender concluded her report stating that subject matter experts came together from colleges and universities as well as from the system office to draft and evaluate an RFP to supply Minnesota State with a cloud-based ERP and feedback was provided by students, faculty and staff. There is a significant cost to any project like this and the financial impact will be

different and will be felt differently at each college with strained budgets and competing priorities.

Vice Chancellor Maki thanked President Millender for her presentation and reiterated that we are at the end of Phase 1. Business process reviews for HR, finance, and student functionality began in January 2018 and were completed in January 2019. Planning and drafting for the RFP began in July 2018 and was completed in June 2019. The RFP was released to the market in June of 2019 with authorization from the Board of Trustees to enter negotiations with SaaS vendors in January 2020. Due to COVID and the nature of negotiations, more time was needed to negotiate a contract.

Phase 2
Vice Chancellor Maki reported that the Phase 2 implementation will last seven years, beginning with implementation planning in December 2020/January 2021 once the contract is in place with the selected vendor. The length of Phase 2 has been extended by approximately two years from the project plan last presented to the Board. Due to business process dependencies, finance and HR /payroll will deploy together, in time for fiscal year 2024 start in July 2023. A fifteen-month warranty period will follow implementation. Due to the scope and complexities of a student implementation it will occur after finance and HR. The student implementation will start October 2022 with planning. Functionality will deploy in phases starting July 2025 and concluding October 2026 with a warranty period through August 2027.

Vice Chancellor Maki presented the revised project financing plan of Phase 1 and Phase 2. In June 2019, the Board approved a financing plan that included a project budget of $151.1M. It was noted that all amounts were approximate pending the advice of the implementation vendor and the bids on the software solution. The revised project budget has increased from $151.1M to $242.7M. The revised project budget has been built on estimated internal costs, the revised timeline and the negotiated SaaS contract. The increase of $91.6M is primarily due to the following factors: increase of the length of the project from five years to seven years; completion of the RFP process and negotiations with the selected vendor; and addition of a project contingency.

Vice Chancellor Maki reviewed the following detail for the estimated budget of $242.7M:

Category	Description	Total Budgeted Amount
Minnesota State Project Team	• Implementation Teams • Training • Change Management	$41.6M
ERP Vendor Contract	• Implementation • Software License and Cloud Hosting	$168.0M

Other Professional Support	• CampusWorks – Phase 1 • Project Management • TPOR and Legal Counsel	$7.2M
Technology Maintenance and Support	• ISRS Refresh & Maintenance • Integrations • Data Reporting	$10.9M
Contingency	• Budgeted amount for changes and adjustments over the 7 years	$15.0M
	Total	**$242.7M**

Trustee Erlandson questioned the contingency budget of $15.0M. She asked where the cost change was and if it was due to a difference in the vendor bid or did the vendor submit a bid that was higher than what was negotiated and what changes affected the difference. Vice Chancellor Maki responded that the changes happened when the vendor submitted a bid that was higher than the amount that was negotiated and the negotiations that have occurred over the last several months had led us to the $168M portion of the budget. The portion for the Minnesota State project team has increased by $9.6M and that is due to having a better understanding of the capacity needed in order to have a successful implementation as well as the timing of the implementation moving from five years to seven years and to compare consistently with what was presented in June. The ERP vendor contract and professional support of $175.5M compares to $111.5M that was presented as part of the June 2019 budget so that portion has increased by about $55 to 60 million. Student module portion increased by $3 to 4 million since the original budget. Vice Chancellor Maki also added that there was no contingency in the original $151.0M budget.

Trustee Erlandson asked if the increase in the vendor and software cost was due to the bid being higher than expected or if the vendor increased their bid after submission. Vice Chancellor Maki answered that costs went up and down throughout the negotiation process because the negotiation process, terms and conditions of the contractual arrangement as well as what Minnesota State needed and what the vendor could provide shifted. It was a give-and-take throughout the several month process and the process is more complicated than having a fixed amount of services and a fixed cost.

Trustee Erlandson followed up by asking if Vice Chancellor Maki can break out the cost for the HR and finance as compared to the student portion. Vice Chancellor Maki responded that it was close to 50/50 for the implementation cost between HR and finance and then implementation of student modules and phases along the way. The licensing cost on an annual basis goes up every year as more products from vendors are brought to Minnesota State.

Trustee Morillo questioned if finance or internal operations of a university system versus the student services part are two different areas of work or specializations for vendors. Vice Chancellor Maki replied that it's important that we have an integrated system that includes HR

and finance functions, but they integrate with the student services function which is the most important.

Vice Chancellor Maki reported that the finance plan design goals and finance options were reviewed by the Leadership Council at its May and June 2019 meetings and again in August and November 2020 once budget funding requirements were further defined. The contribution method will continue the 2019 method which is a $12.5M charge based on an annual calculation of student and staff headcount. Colleges and universities can use any appropriate resources to cover the charge.

Vice Chancellor Maki stated that the revised financing plan for the $242.7M includes the following sources: $72M from state appropriation to the system for NextGen, $129.3M from annual contributions from colleges, universities, and the system office, and $41.4M from the reallocation other system or system-wide appropriations.

Vice Chancellor Maki stated that the base state appropriation of $8M per year would be utilized for implementation from fiscal years 2021-2027 along with the $16M in state appropriations from fiscal years 2018-2020. The NextGen appropriation was $4M annually for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 before a base increase of $4M, bringing it to $8M per year in fiscal year 2020. After implementation, the $8M annual state appropriation will be utilized for the annual software licensing and cloud hosting.

Vice Chancellor Maki stated that the annual contributions from colleges, universities, and the system office would remain at $12.5M per year. It was determined through leadership conversations that in our current financial environment, it would be problematic to increase the $12.5M per year so the recommendation was made to extend the same amount of contributions out to fiscal year 2029.

Vice Chancellor Maki stated that NextGen being a high priority for the system, conversations with Leadership Council gave the idea to examine the system's current allocation for state appropriations. The categories that will be examined are institutional priority allocations and system wide set asides. The reallocation amount projected is $4.6M per year for nine years and would be effective fiscal year 2024, bringing the reallocation of other system and system-wide appropriations to $41.4M. This allows time for planning over the next couple of years.

Vice Chancellor Maki stated that the project plan contemplates execution of the Phase 2 contracts outlined in November/December 2020 and creation of the related encumbrances. The external contracts included work plans that are expected to execute between 2020 and 2027. The estimated spending pattern for external and internal work peaks at $42M in 2026. An internal cash flow loan is required by campuses under all current assumed state funding levels. It is expected that internal agreements will be negotiated providing the loan of campus fund balances to the project are to be repaid with interest from future project revenues. The

amount of the internal cash flow load is projected to be $48M. Under all funding scenarios, the finance plan requires internal system contributions and internal cash flow loans in order to match the revenue pattern with the expected spending pattern. The finance plan in the presentation should provide a solution for the entire cost of the project.

President Olson reported that when the NextGen process began the State University Presidents were already budgeting something knowing this was happening and have been planning for it for quite some time. He noted that the cost is concerning since our budgets are under great stress.

Trustee Soule questioned if any companies made student modules that we can feel confident that our vendors can make and is there an opportunity to avoid the cost of the student module if the vendor cannot make it or we are not satisfied with it. Vice Chancellor Maki answered that as part of the contractual negotiation process and ensuring the mitigated risks and terms of the contract that we would sign, if approved indicates that we would have an opportunity at the end of HR and finance to review. It is with the student module and at that point to decide whether we are going to move forward with that or not and we would not be paying for the two modules.

Chancellor Malhotra noted that we had a very extensive process for vendor evaluation and two members of that steering committee are here today, President Millender and President Olson. It was in the context of that evaluation process that certain preferences emerged about the packages which were brought forward in response to the RFP which varied greatly by vendor. In that context, it was clear to him when he met with the steering committee that at the final selection was clearly above and beyond the other packages which were presented.

President Olson reported that the evaluation teams covered student services, HR and finance. They spent a few days going in-depth on the capabilities of the different packages. It was a very robust process with a prospectus that went through how things were to be scored in incredible detail.

President Millender reported that they heard from colleagues that there are ups and downs to every one of the 4 vendors, and that they heard there is not a vendor out there that's delivering everything right now. They are much more informed today than at the beginning of this process as to what the market could offer and whatever recommendation has come forth from this is a total collaboration across our system. They are getting better, more predictive and sophisticated in the delivery and are well informed.

Chair Cowles questioned if the approach that we are taking is not a pioneer approach but an improvement product for HR and finance and are being used today at other institutions of higher education. Chancellor Malhotra answered yes, HR and finance are also being used at some higher education institutions. The student module is also in use at some of these institutions. Vice Chancellor Maki responded that they considered existing customers with the chosen software vendors.

Trustee Erlandson questioned if the RFP bid from the chosen vendor is closer to what we originally budgeted. Vice Chancellor Maki replied that the original bid in relation to what Minnesota State's expectations were would have all been more than what was in the original budget.

Chair Cowles asked that given the current cost for the campuses and universities for the system, have they looked at estimates from third party owners as to what the cost would be for our 37 institutions if they attempted to provide for themselves rather than replace with a different ERP system. Vice Chancellor Maki answered that what was presented today equates to about $5.5M per institution over that 7-year ERP system and if each institution did this on their own it would be $8M-15M range per institution.

Chair Cowles commented that the Board studied carefully some of the recent large software development and installation projects for the State of Minnesota that have been subject to a lot of publicity and frustration in the implementation process. The business plan was to pursue a multi user software as a shared service model, because there is a concentrated effort specifically on the needs of higher education and we are getting the benefit of a more robust development process.

Trustee Morillo asked what other institutions are using and what timeline is used for coming online and is that included in the review process. Vice Chancellor Maki answered yes, that is incorporated into the timeline as we go through the process. By the start of next academic year student modules form this vendor will be up and running at approximately 20 institutions.

Chancellor Malhotra commented that after three years there is an option to proceed with student module or not. If our internal stakeholders determine that a student module is not in place that will not service our needs or is not as expected, we have an option to come back before the Board and inform them that we will exercise that option after seeking guidance from the Board.

Trustee Erlandson asked if after that 3-year period will there be an assessment of the current technology in the field and if so, will there be an increase in price even with the contingency. Vice Chancellor Maki replied that in relation to the student module we would not go out with a new process after HR and finance is implemented. We would know whether we are getting the latest in technology and the ability to serve our students and we would have the ability to look at different options. The price is part of the negotiation process and the contingency would allow us to look further into other options.

Chancellor Malhotra commented that there is a fundamental difference between the previous and current project cost. We really didn't know what the cost would be in the marketplace but more importantly there are enough features of the contract that help us be more flexible in terms of our relationship with the vendor. Whether we stay within the cost or not is dependent on how we implement the project internally. We set aside $41M for project and change management implementation where we bring subject matter experts from our

campuses to make sure the implementation is going smoothly and stays within the project budget.

Trustee Nishimura asked that within the revised project plan is there specific exit criteria and when do we define the project as done or complete. Executive Director Eric Wion replied that they do have those definitions spelled out in the statement of work with the vendor of how the payment schedule works with certain milestones of success as well as when its ready to move on to other phases of the negotiation process.

Trustee Sheran asked about ongoing technology assets that the system needs to offer and whether they offer new technology needs in the future as there is a consistent expectation that technology changes. Does this technology create a one door system, or will we be spending more money as technology expands? Vice Chancellor Maki replied that our learning management system is ongoing, and we are making significant investments in technology through the RFP process and we have a technology budget and resources to expand. Chancellor Malhotra added that there is technology that is specific to a campus or school based on specialty and project needs.

The Committee of the Whole recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the following motion:

> *The Board of Trustees approves the updated project plan and finance plan as outlined in the report. The Board will be asked to approve the final vendor selection and to give the Chancellor the authority to execute the contracts with the vendor. As the project enters the implementation phase, the Chancellor will establish a regular project status reporting program with the Board after consultation with the chair of the Board and the chair of the Finance committee.*

Trustee Moe moved to approve the motion with a second from Trustee Soule. Roll call vote was taken. The motion carried with twelve in favor (Chair Cowles, Vice Chair Moe, Trustees Ajogun, Cirillo, Janezich, Nishimura, Oballa, Rodriguez, Sheran, Soule, Tefer and Vekich), one opposed (Trustee Erlandson), and one abstention (Trustee Morillo).

Report from Bill Maki, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Facilities
NextGen Vendor Contract Approval
Vice Chancellor Maki reported that from November 2018 to June 2019 a team of 57 cross-functional subject matter experts came together from campuses and the system office to draft an RFP to supply Minnesota State with a cloud-based ERP. With assistance from Campus Works, the RFP team drafted an RFP that included 4,000 requirements to which vendors were required to respond. External consulting firm BerryDunn reviewed the RFP prior to its publication. Of all the vendors responding to the RFP, four vendors were selected to move forward: Campus Management, Ellucian, Oracle, and Workday.

Vice Chancellor Maki reported that the four vendors presented demonstrations over the course of four weeks in November and December 2019. Each vendor demonstration lasted three days and covered the vendor's approach to finance, HR, student services, and IT. The vendors were required to follow a script prepared by Minnesota State, and to focus on critical requirements. At the conclusion of each demonstration, RFP Team members filled out a survey on the vendor's capabilities. The Steering Committee took into consideration several inputs as a final decision was made regarding a vendor: debriefs of the RFP team, feedback from students, faculty, and staff, and reference checks. After thorough evaluation, stakeholders clearly preferred the functionality of one vendor over competing software options. Workday was selected as the NextGen enterprise resource planning tool with Deloitte as its implementation partner.

Vice Chancellor Maki reported that Workday was selected for many reasons. They are a 15-year-old Global leader in delivering software as a service for enterprise administrative functions. They have more than 43 million users and relationships with more than a hundred higher education institutions that are using their software as a service which is designed from the ground up and all users are on a cloud-based user system. The implementation partner of Deloitte brings a global professional services network that has a proven track record of implementing new technologies in higher education and they'll be assisting Workday and Minnesota State with the implementation. They provide a strong bench of experience to work side-by-side with us in making this project a success.

Trustee Erlandson questioned if this recommendation includes Deloitte and if Deloitte works for or in conjunction with Workday. Vice Chancellor Maki replied that it does include Deloitte who has an agreement with Workday.

Trustee Nishimura asked when Workday responded to the RFP did they include Deloitte as their implementation partner. Vice Chancellor Maki replied that they chose Deloitte to strengthen their proposal amongst the constituents that provided feedback.

Trustee Ajogun asked what modality is in place for a refund if the student module is no longer needed. Vice Chancellor Maki replied that those parameters are included within the contract with Workday.

The Committee of the Whole recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the following motion:
> *The Board of Trustees authorizes the Chancellor to execute contracts with the proposed vendor on behalf of the system office for a total term not to exceed thirteen years and a total amount not to exceed $244,629,000. The authority includes renewals and authority if needed to utilize up to $10,000,000 in contingency funds for project adjustments that might occur over the seven-year implementation period. As part of the regular project status reporting program, the Chancellor will inform the Board the status*

of exercising renewal options and the use of contingency funds for the project. The Board directs the Chancellor to execute all necessary documents.

Trustee Vekich moved to approve the motion with a second from Trustee Moe. Roll call vote was taken. The motion carried with twelve in favor (Chair Cowles, Vice Chair Moe, Trustees Ajogun, Cirillo, Janezich, Nishimura, Oballa, Rodriguez, Sheran, Soule, Tefer and Vekich), one opposed (Trustee Erlandson), and one abstention (Trustee Morillo).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm.

Recorded by: Dan Drain