



BETH KROM, Mayor

www.ci.irvine.ca.us

City of Irvine, One Civic Center Plaza, P.O. Box 19575, Irvine, California 92623-9575 (949) 724-6233

September 13, 2006

Honorable Nancy Wieben Stock
Presiding Judge
Orange County Superior Court
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

**Re: Response of City of Irvine to Orange County Grand Jury 2005-06 Report
("The Orange County Great Park: Whose Park is it?")**

Dear Judge Stock:

Please consider this letter to constitute the response by the City of Irvine to the Grand Jury Report on the Orange County Great Park (the "Report") in accordance with Section 933.05 of the California Penal Code. The enumerated items in this response correspond to the numbering of the Findings and the Recommendations contained in the Report.

Introductory Statement

The Report was received by the City on June 19, 2006. It is unfortunate that advance copies of the Report made their way to the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Orange County Register*, which published extensive articles about the Report on June 17 and 18, respectively, but not to the City of Irvine. This is somewhat disconcerting because the Foreperson's cover letter recited the statutory prohibition on disclosure of the contents of the Report prior to the public release date, which was June 20. The one copy directed to our City at the time of public release was sent by regular mail to Mayor Beth Krom. No other copy was provided to the City.

We appreciate the efforts of the Grand Jury and the opportunity to review and respond to its Report. As outlined below, there are several incomplete and inaccurate provisions of the Report, including the factual background, the findings and the recommendations. By letter dated March 31, 2006 to the Grand Jury, the City requested the opportunity to

review and comment on a draft of the Report, specifically to avoid such problems, although this opportunity was not provided.

Time and time again, the City of Irvine has demonstrated its commitment to a planning process that provides a strong and meaningful forum and voice to the entire Orange County community in decisions regarding the Orange County Great Park. The City remains proud and steadfast in its proven commitment to create a world-class park development that will benefit all people of Orange County – and, indeed, all of Southern California. The evidence of this commitment includes:

- the unprecedented County-wide outreach program conducted by the City to solicit public input into Great Park design issues;
- the creation of the Orange County Great Park Corporation, which conducts its business publicly and exercises significant responsibility regarding planning, design and operational issues, and whose Board members include persons from throughout the Orange County community; and
- extensive and ongoing opportunities for public involvement in all decisions regarding the Great Park.

The planning process for the Orange County Great Park is open and inclusive. All members of the Orange County community have had and will continue to have an opportunity to lend their voice to this process. The City of Irvine, as the entity with land use authority for the Orange County Great Park and which legally owns the 1,347 acres of land on which the Orange County Great Park will be developed, is obligated as a matter of law to retain ultimate control over Great Park land use decisions.

It is also appropriate for the City of Irvine to retain ultimate responsibility for the development of the Orange County Great Park because the City of Irvine has committed substantial resources to advance its development. The City expended more than \$27 million of municipal funds in opposition to the County's airport plan. Furthermore, the City drafted Measure W and is intimately familiar with its provisions.

Following the passage of Measure W, the City successfully developed a land use plan in cooperation with the Department of the Navy consistent with the spirit of Measure W. The City of Irvine also prepared the Development Agreement that was subsequently signed by Lennar for the dedication of the Great Park property to the City in return for limited development entitlements provided by the City. The City, through the Development Agreement, is directing at least \$401 million in resources to the development of the Great Park.

The Great Park is now a reality. The City obtained the land and secured the funding for the Great Park. A Great Park master design is well underway. Detailed engineering and construction plans will commence within the next year. None of this progress could have been made without the leadership and commitment of the City of Irvine to develop

a Great Park for the people of Orange County and the greater Southern California community.

Response to Findings

6.1 Great Park governance: The Irvine City Council has created a structure and governance incompatible with the intent of Measure W. (Report, page 10.)

Response: The City of Irvine wholly disagrees with this Finding.

Measure W amended the Orange County General Plan to restrict the uses on MCAS El Toro (the "Base") to park, open space, education and other uses. Measure W is completely silent regarding the governance structure for development of the Orange County Great Park. As a matter of law, Measure W could not control or determine the governance structure for the Great Park once the Base was annexed to the City. This is because Measure W applied to the Base *only if* the County of Orange retained land use control of the property. The County elected not to assume responsibility for honoring the will of Orange County voters as expressed through Measure W.

The Orange County Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO") and the Orange County Board of Supervisors approved Irvine's annexation of the Base with full knowledge and understanding that after the annexation, the City of Irvine would have land use authority over the Base property and would be the lead agency with regard to the development of the Great Park.

The staff report for the November 12, 2003 LAFCO public hearing on the annexation, makes clear that the purpose of annexation was to subject the Base to the City's land use regulations rather than Measure W, and to develop a "Great Park" to be owned and operated by the City. For example, page 1 of the executive summary to the staff report distinguishes between Measure W and the City's land use plan, as follows:

"Measure W amended the Orange County General Plan to designate the unincorporated MCAS El Toro property primarily for park and open space uses and removed the designation of the site as a commercial airport. The City of Irvine has proposed a land use plan for the annexation territory which provides for a variety of reuse options including significant park and open space uses surrounded by commercial, retail, and research uses. The purpose of the annexation is to allow for an extension of city services to implement the City of Irvine's land use plan."

Similarly, pages 17 and 18 of the LAFCO staff report, regarding park and recreation services, explain that following annexation, the Great Park will be a City-owned park, and that "the city proposes that parks and recreation services be shared between the City and the Great Park non-profit corporation."

Given the above history, it is difficult to understand the basis of the Grand Jury's finding that the Great Park governance structure adopted by the City Council is somehow incompatible with Measure W. Indeed, the Great Park vision could never be realized in the absence of the governance structure established by the City. After passage of Measure W, the County had the opportunity to take the lead in the development of the Great Park. It elected not to do so. Recent statements by a majority of the Board of Supervisors confirm that the County has no desire to take responsibility for the development of the Great Park. The Report advocates that the County initiate legal action to wrest control of the Great Park from the City. (See, e.g., Recommendation 7.3.) Regrettably, this recommendation encourages a significant expenditure of limited public funds to pursue a course of action that would not produce a better Great Park project.

The City recognizes that the Great Park is an important resource for the people of Orange County and for Southern California. As we documented in our prior correspondence to the Grand Jury, there are many examples around the State where facilities that provide regional benefits are owned or controlled by a local agency, including Griffith Park in Los Angeles and Balboa Park in San Diego – to name two in Southern California. Has it ever been suggested that it is somehow inappropriate for the City of Los Angeles to control decisions concerning Griffith Park or for the San Diego City Council to control decisions concerning Balboa Park?

Measure W authorized park, recreation and other uses at the Base and contemplated that these uses would provide benefits to the larger community. Had the County of Orange wished to take responsibility for developing the Great Park in accordance with Measure W, it certainly could have done so. In that case, decisions regarding the governance structure for development of the Great Park would have been controlled by the Board of Supervisors. As noted above, the Board of Supervisors determined not to retain land use authority over the Base and instead decided to support Irvine's annexation of the Base property, understanding and accepting that the City would be primarily responsible for the reuse of the Base consistent with the spirit and intent of Measure W.

We believe the Board of Supervisors' decision reflected the practical reality that, given the decision of the Department of Navy to sell the base and the lack of interest on the part of the County in assuming responsibility for park planning and development, the vision of Measure W could best be achieved through annexation of the property to Irvine. The decision by the Navy (made after the passage of Measure W) to sell the Base property at auction, to maximize revenues to the federal government, meant that the development of the Great Park could be achieved only through a development agreement with the private purchaser(s) of the property.

The annexation of the Base property to the City of Irvine made it possible to achieve the Navy's objectives of maximum revenues from the sale of the Base and Irvine's objective to build the Great Park as soon as possible. The combination of annexing the Base to

Irvine, entitling the former base with the significant park and open space uses envisioned by Measure W, and allowing residential, commercial, and other private development uses at the edges of the park, made it possible to obtain the necessary commitments by the developer to dedicate land and money required to develop the Great Park.

Only as a result of the City's annexation and the City's development agreement was the City (and thereby the public at large) able to obtain a conveyance of property from the developer at no cost to the public and also obtain a source of financing for development of the Great Park. This structure, conceived and implemented by the City of Irvine, transformed the vision of a Great Park as articulated in Measure W into a reality. No one (including the County Board of Supervisors) could seriously assert that this result would have been achieved in the absence of annexation of the property to the City of Irvine.

6.2 *Control of the Great Park Project:* Control of the Great Park is maintained by a three member bloc on the Irvine City Council. (Report, page 10.)

Response: The City of Irvine wholly disagrees with this Finding.

This finding is misleading in that it is both incomplete and inaccurate. From the inception of the Great Park project to the present day, the principal governance authority and responsibilities have rested with the City of Irvine. This is because the City of Irvine owns the land and has land use authority over the Base property and because the City of Irvine is committing dedicated public funds (consisting of such items as Development Agreement and other development entitlement fees and public financing revenues) within its authority for the development of the Orange County Great Park.

The Irvine City Council adopted the Orange County Great Park Bylaws on September 23, 2003. The Orange County Great Park Corporation was formed as a separate nonprofit corporation to assist the City in its efforts to plan, design, construct, operate and maintain the Great Park. In order to comply with legal requirements to allow this corporation to be fully exempt from Federal and State income taxation, the corporation was formed as a so-called "supporting organization" under Section 509(a)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Code. A "supporting organization" is an unusual type of tax-exempt entity that serves to support the functions of an existing government agency – here, the City of Irvine – and serves as a subsidiary of the government agency. Under the Internal Revenue Code, a "supporting" organization must, among other requirements, be organized to be able to perform designated functions of the "supported" government agency and, more importantly, must be operated, supervised and ultimately controlled by the "supported" government agency. That is, the "supported" governmental agency must possess virtual veto authority over the "supporting organization." Thus, applicable tax laws mandate that the City of Irvine exercise essential control over the Orange County Great Park Corporation.

These tax law limitations were recognized and respected in the formation of the Orange County Great Park Corporation. In order to comply with the control requirements for a "supporting organization" under Section 509(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Corporation's Board of Directors was structured as a body of nine, with five of the nine directors being the five members of the Irvine City Council and four "independent" members appointed by the City Council. In addition, the Corporation's bylaws provide that the adoption of certain corporate decisions, including all those regarding substantive financial matters, is dependent on support not only by a majority of the Board of Directors but also by a majority of the City Councilmembers sitting on the Board. A majority of the City Council consists of three, four or five members. It is unfortunate that the Report did not take note that nearly all of the decisions adopted by the Orange County Great Park Board have received unanimous support by the City Councilmembers.

The Report is incorrect in its claim that the initial Corporation bylaws included only two City Council members on the Great Park Corporation Board of Directors. The bylaws adopted by the Corporation Board of Directors on December 5, 2003, provided that the Corporation Board of Directors would include all five members of the City Council. The bylaws always required that certain decisions of the Corporation would require approval of a majority of the Councilmembers. No previous or subsequent bylaws were adopted.

The Report's statement that the City Council Resolution of April 25, 2006 modified the Corporation bylaws is simply wrong. The April 25, 2006 Resolution **made no changes** to the Corporation's bylaws.

The governance structure established for the Great Park in the original bylaws reflects the important fact that a substantial portion of the anticipated funds for construction of the Great Park project are expected to be generated from public financings – in particular, the establishment of a community facilities district – as is acknowledged by the Report. However, what the Grand Jury evidently did not understand is that the Orange County Great Park Corporation is not legally authorized or empowered to issue such indebtedness. Rather, the City of Irvine would need to create the appropriate financing district and would need to be the issuer of the bonds, certificates of participation and/or other evidences of indenture in order for the debt to be issued on a tax-exempt basis, so that the cost of borrowing is minimized. Because the proceeds would be used for the benefit of the Great Park, and in order for the issuance to be fully tax-exempt under both Federal and State income tax laws, it is necessary that the City retain control over financial matters to satisfy the required criteria for control and substantial identity between the members of the government agency and the not-for-profit entity.

The Grand Jury gave no weight to the facts that the City of Irvine owns the property in question (with the accompanying potential liability consequences), and that the City is constrained by law from surrendering or delegating important governmental powers and functions to any other entity. These factors, combined with the above-noted legal

requirements, constitute a compelling reason why the City has exercised and must continue to exercise fundamental control over all prominent aspects of the Great Park project, especially those activities having financial consequences.

At the same time, the Orange County Great Park Corporation was formed in large part to ensure the institutionalized participation and input of persons and interests outside the City. This goal has been achieved through the four independent members of the Board of Directors.

The Report's suggestion (on page 7) that the vesting of control of the Great Park within the City somehow creates a conflict of interest is without support. For example, the fact that the City of Irvine owns an aquatic complex no more creates a conflict of interest than the fact that the County of Orange owns more than one regional park. Every public body is required to address and reconcile community needs and concerns in light of available resources. The Orange County Board of Supervisors faces competing demands on County resources every time it must decide whether and how to create or expand County facilities and services. There is certainly no "conflict of interest" when publicly elected officials need to decide how best to expend public resources to address community needs.

In this case, the Irvine City Council has made policy decisions to expend funds generated through specific financing instruments to develop the Great Park. There is no conflict of interest inherent in the City having control over public facilities within property owned by the City.

6.3 No-bid contracts: The citizens of Irvine are exposed to the potential business risks associated with the use of no-bid contracts. (Report, page 10.)

Response: The City of Irvine wholly disagrees with this Finding.

The Orange County Great Park Corporation acts in a fiduciary capacity on behalf of the City of Irvine, expending public monies received by the City and transferred to the Corporation for the design, development, construction, operation and maintenance of the Orange County Great Park. The procurement of goods and services is performed with care, in order to obtain high quality goods and services at the lowest cost and in compliance with State, Federal and Corporation guidelines.

The Orange County Great Park Corporation adopted Procurement Policies on May 27, 2004. Since that time, procurements for Orange County Great Park have been administered by the Corporation's staff in coordination with the City of Irvine's Purchasing Agent. Financial management of contracts has been conducted by the Corporation's staff with assistance from the City's Administrative Services Department.

In the fall of 2005, the Orange County Great Park Corporation conducted a review of its Procurement Policies and implemented changes that clarified ambiguities within the policies and modified the disclosure requirements. The revised Procurement Policies

are consistent with those of the City of Irvine. The following is a summary of the key levels of contract authority and signature levels contained in the Great Park Procurement Policies. Authority to sign a contract must be preceded by approval of the contractor, program or expenditure, either through the budget process or through separate action of the Corporation's Board of Directors. The levels and amounts are consistent with comparable functions in the City of Irvine.

Contract Amount	Contract Authority
\$100,000 and less	Orange County Great Park Managers
Greater than \$100,000 up to \$1,000,000	Deputy Chief Executive Officer & Chief Executive Officer
Greater than \$1,000,000	Chief Executive Officer and Chairman*

*Any contract requiring the Chairman's signature must first be approved by the Board of Directors

Additional highlights of the revised Orange County Great Park Procurement Policies include:

- Purchases or contracts in excess of \$5,000 for supplies, equipment or construction require three qualified bids or quotes.
- Professional services or consultants require a formal proposal process for contracts expected to be greater than \$5,000. In this case, three qualified proposals are also required. Pricing, however, is of secondary consideration to qualifications (as required by applicable State law).
- The use of a Consultant Team Program whereby certain professional consultants are pre-qualified through a competitive selection process and have master agreements which extend for a period of up to 3 years. (Consultant Teams pre-approved by the City are available for use by the Orange County Great Park.)
- Sole source – the policies allow for a sole source purchase or contract where a competitive bidding or selection process cannot be accomplished. Such situations could occur due to time constraints, proximity, highly specialized knowledge or unique product. Sole source requests, in all cases, must be accompanied by a justification memo to the Chief Executive Officer.

The Grand Jury makes particular reference to "no-bid" contracts in relation to public relations, legal and recycling services. In actual fact, the Corporation's legal services contract was awarded based on a competitive bidding process. The City's public relations contract was an existing six-year contract which was extended for one additional year to enable the Park to complete the selection of its Master Designer on time. This contract was competitively bid for the current fiscal year, which began July 1, 2006.

The “contract” for recycling services was not a services contract at all; but a lease of 60 acres of land to a green waste recycling company following a thorough review by Great Park Corporation staff and a unanimous recommendation of the Orange County Great Park Asset Management Ad Hoc Committee, which is comprised of directors Steven Choi, Sukhee Kang, Michael Pinto, and Walkie Ray.

Response to Recommendations

7.1 Great Park governance: The Irvine City Council should revisit and reconsider decisions that have split the City Council and that exclude county-wide participation in the control of the decision making process for development of the Great Park. As an example, the Irvine City Council should consider a resolution to amend the Great Park Corporation bylaws to require two Orange County supervisors, two members of the Irvine City Council and three elected at-large members from Orange County. (Report, pages 10-11.)

Response: This Recommendation will not be implemented.

This Recommendation is based on an incorrect perception of facts and events. At the least, the City of Irvine believes that the recommendation is unwarranted. Moreover, the change in governance structure recommended by the Grand Jury cannot be accommodated as a matter of law in light of the status of the Orange County Great Park Corporation as a “supporting organization” under the Internal Revenue Code, the restrictions imposed on the City relating to public financing, and the other legal constraints discussed above in connection with Finding 6.2.

While the vast majority of decisions made by the Irvine City Council are made unanimously, the fact that some decisions are rendered on the basis of 4-1 or 3-2 votes is not an adequate justification to “revisit and reconsider” them. Were that to be the case, the successful and efficient formulation and implementation of responsible public policy-making would be severely impaired. The City Council consistently strives for consensus, yet because of occasional differences of opinion – whether philosophical, political or otherwise – unanimity is not always achievable. Many votes by county and city decision-making bodies are not unanimous due to sincerely held and honest contrary viewpoints, especially when matters of public controversy are implicated. One simply cannot conclude that 4-1 and 3-2 votes somehow are less legitimate or less effective than 5-0 votes. The Grand Jury’s position conflicts with the fundamental democratic principle that public institutions are governed by the majority.

Another assumption underlying the Recommendation is erroneous. The recommendation refers to decisions “that exclude county-wide participation in the control of the decision making process for development of the Great Park.” The Grand Jury does not identify any such decisions. If the Grand Jury had Irvine City Council Resolution No. 06-42 in mind, the Grand Jury would be mistaken. That resolution simply restated and clarified the governing structures and responsibilities relating to the

Orange County Great Park. It altered nothing with regard to the authority of the Great Park Corporation or the legal relationship of the Corporation and the City. Prior to the adoption of Resolution No. 06-42, there were four non-City members of the Orange County Great Park Corporation. Following the adoption of Resolution No. 06-42, there are still four independent public directors. The input and quality of participation by these directors has been tremendously important and invaluable.

Even though, as legally required, the City of Irvine exercises final decision-making authority as to substantive financial matters, the City Council typically grants a great deal of deference and respect to the extensive study and careful consideration of the Corporation's Board of Directors. To date, not once has a recommendation of the Board been rejected. And since the establishment of the Board of Directors, all of its decisions have been accompanied by majority if not unanimous support of the independent directors. In short, the City Councilmembers serving on the Board never have voted as a group to overrule a prevailing position of the independent directors.

The Grand Jury suggests that the Irvine City Council modify the composition of the Orange County Great Park Corporation Board of Directors to include two Orange County supervisors, two members of the Irvine City Council, and three elected at-large members from Orange County. This suggestion will not be implemented because such a move would effectively surrender governance of the Corporation to people outside of the City of Irvine.

Indeed, it would be possible – some believe even likely – that were this suggestion implemented, the reconstruction and configuration of the Orange County Great Park Corporation Board of Directors would consist of just two members of the City Council and all five members of the Orange County Board of Supervisors.

For all of the reasons stated above, the Irvine City Council continues to believe the current composition of the Great Park Corporation's Board of Directors adequately and properly allows for broad public input into the Great Park's design, planning, construction and operation, while leaving ultimate governance of the Great Park in the hands of those elected by the citizens of Irvine to represent their collective interests.

7.2 No-bid contracts: The Irvine City Council should review current practices involving no-bid contracts to ensure that appropriate business controls are in place to protect the citizens of the City of Irvine. (Report, page 11.)

Response: This Recommendation has been implemented.

As described above, the Corporation Board of Directors has reviewed its procurement policies and has adopted policies consistent with those utilized by the City for many years. Certain factual assertions in the Report regarding the award of no bid contracts are in error.

The Irvine City Council has reviewed current practices involving no-bid (or sole source) contracts, ensuring that appropriate business controls are in place to protect the citizens of the City of Irvine. This review was performed in the context of a City Council study session held on September 27, 2005, during which time City staff presented a comprehensive review covering all aspects of the City's purchasing, bidding and contracting functions. The City Council found that current policies and procedures are consistent with all applicable laws and regulations, contain appropriate business controls, are periodically reviewed by the City's Finance Commission and City Council, and followed by all City staff. Generally, goods and services with a value greater than \$5,000 are competitively bid. In some instances, sole source contracts are awarded if a firm is considered uniquely qualified to perform a particular service. (The City Council possesses the authority to make such a determination.)

Public Relations Contract

The contract for public relations services for the Orange County Great Park for FY 2004-05 was unanimously approved by the Irvine City Council on July 27, 2004.

The contract was extended through FY 2005-06 to accommodate the on-going Great Park Master Design Competition and public outreach program. This contract was extended on a 3-2 vote at the July 12, 2005 City Council meeting. The competition and related public outreach effort extended from March 2005 to January 2006. The contract was managed by Great Park staff in accordance with the approved Great Park Procurement Policies and all applicable City of Irvine procedures and practices.

Legal Services Contract

The Report is in error. The contract for legal services awarded by the Orange County Great Park Corporation on May 27, 2005 was the result of a procurement process that was initiated with the issuance of a Request for Proposals in April of 2005. The selected firm was the top-ranked candidate during both the interview and the proposal review processes.

Recycling Lease

At its March 31, 2006 meeting, the Orange County Great Park Asset Management Ad Hoc Committee authorized staff to enter into lease discussions with Tierra Verde Industries regarding an interim lease on 60 acres of land. Tierra Verde was interested in relocating its green waste recycling operations from property north of Irvine Boulevard. As part of its deliberations, the Committee not only reviewed the revenue benefits to the Park from the lease but also considered other aspects of the proposal that assist the Great Park, the Irvine community and the County as a whole. To assist it in evaluating the public benefits to be provided by the lease, the Corporation engaged a consultant experienced with green waste recycling business to provide independent confirmation that the lease terms are competitive and conform to relevant business standards and practices.

At its meeting of April 13, 2006, the Orange County Great Park Board of Directors recommended to the City Council the signing of a lease with Tierra Verde Industries to operate a recycling facility at the Orange County Great Park with the revenue and benefits generated from the lease being dedicated to Great Park development. The land lease is expected to generate an estimated \$2.7 million over the four year lease term, or \$2.0 million if terminated at the three-year option date.

Concluding Statement

In closing, the City of Irvine again thanks you for the opportunity and ability to respond to the Findings and Recommendations made by the Grand Jury in its Report. It is truly unfortunate that many important details were overlooked or misunderstood, given the responsiveness of the City in providing the Grand Jury all the information necessary to avoid such deficiencies. The City provided the following prescient statements in its March 21, 2006 letter to the Grand Jury:

“As you no doubt have discerned, there is a complex history associated with the Orange County Great Park, spanning a significant period of time, involving numerous governmental and private entities and persons, and encompassing voluminous documents. Appreciating that the quality and credibility of your ultimate findings and analysis will be dependent on having an accurate and complete grasp of a multitude of factual matters, the City requests that it also be furnished with a copy of your draft report so that it may comment on the correctness of any underlying facts and circumstances relevant to your conclusions and/or recommendations.”

However well-intentioned, the Grand Jury’s efforts have been compromised by the lack of consideration for fact and detail and the insufficient investigation and analysis underlying its Report.

Working with the Orange County Great Park Corporation and benefiting from the active support of residents throughout Orange County, the City of Irvine is poised to create America’s first great metropolitan park of the 21st Century. This commitment has been reinforced through extensive public outreach, focus groups, a stakeholders’ conference, on-line polls and publications designed to engage and inform as many individuals and constituencies as possible throughout Orange County. These sustained and extensive efforts culminated in an international competition to select a master designer for the Great Park and just recently, the Orange County Great Park Corporation completed a series of meetings between the design team and various interest groups regarding the Park’s conceptual plan. This process will culminate with a public Open House in mid-October to reveal the preliminary Master Design before it is presented to the Orange County Great Park Corporation Board of Directors and the City Council later this year.

Honorable Nancy Wieben Stock
Orange County Superior Court
September 13, 2006

The City of Irvine is understandably and justifiably proud of its accomplishments relating to the effectuation of the mission, vision and values associated with the Orange County Great Park for the benefit of present and future generations. The City welcomes and encourages the continued constructive involvement of people and sharing of ideas as we move forward in honoring our commitment to this magnificent, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Beth Krom', written in a cursive style.

BETH KROM
Mayor

cc: Orange County Grand Jury
Irvine City Council
Orange County Great Park Corporation Board of Directors