



250.20

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor

Item: E-1

**MINUTES**

**San Joaquin River Conservancy Governing Board  
Wednesday, September 17, 2014**

**Meeting Location:**

Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District Board Room  
5469 E. Olive Avenue, Fresno, CA 93727

**and via phone conference**  
California Department of Finance  
State Capitol, Room 1145  
Sacramento, CA 95814

and  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Central Valley District Office  
22708 Broadway  
Columbia, CA 95310

5469 E. Olive Avenue  
Fresno, California 93727  
Telephone (559) 253-7324  
Fax (559) 456-3194  
[www.sirc.ca.gov](http://www.sirc.ca.gov)

**GOVERNING BOARD**

Steve Brandau, Chairperson  
*Councilmember, City of Fresno*

Andreas Borgeas, Vice-Chairperson  
*Fresno County Board of Supervisors*

Max Rodriguez  
*Madera County Board of Supervisors*

Donald E. Holley  
*Councilmember, City of Madera*

Barbara Goodwin, *Director*  
*Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District*

Carl Janzen, *Director*  
*Madera Irrigation District*

Jeffrey Single, *Regional Manager*  
*Department of Fish and Wildlife*

Kent Gresham, *Sector Superintendent*  
*Department of Parks & Recreation*

John Donnelly, *Executive Director*  
*Wildlife Conservation Board*

Patrick Kemp, *Assistant Secretary*  
*Natural Resources Agency*

Michael McKown, *Designee*  
*State Lands Commission*

Eraina Ortega, *Chief Deputy Director*  
*Department of Finance*

Bryn Forhan  
Paul Gibson  
Carolyn Nolan  
*Citizen Representatives*

Melinda S. Marks  
*Executive Officer*

**CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairperson Steve Brandau called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. and led the pledge of allegiance.

**A. ROLL CALL**

Name	Present	Telecon- ference	Absent	Late
Mr. Steve Brandau, Chair	X			
Mr. Andreas Borgeas	X			
Mr. Max Rodriguez	X			
Mr. Donald E. Holley	X			
Ms. Barbara Goodwin			X	
Mr. Carl Janzen	X			
Dr. Jeff Single	X			
Mr. Kent Gresham		X		
Mr. John Donnelly	X			
Mr. Patrick Kemp			X	
Mr. Michael McKown				10:08
Ms. Karen Finn		X		
Ms. Bryn Forhan	X			
Mr. Paul Gibson				10:10
Ms. Carolyn Nolan	X			

Joshua Morgan confirmed that a quorum was present.

Legal Counsel Present: Michael Crow, Deputy Attorney General

Staff Present: Melinda Marks, Executive Officer  
Joshua Morgan, Associate Governmental Program Analyst  
Scott McFarlin and Heidi West, Public Lands Management Specialists, Wildlife Conservation Board  
Rebecca Harris, Intern, Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT & BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

The first ten minutes of the meeting are reserved for members of the public who wish to address the Conservancy Board on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Conservancy. Speakers shall be limited to three minutes. The Board is prohibited by law from taking any action on matters discussed that are not on the agenda; no adverse conclusions should be drawn if the Board does not respond to the public comment at this time.

Christina Windover, resident of Sacramento, stated her support for vehicle access and parking for the River West Fresno, Eaton Trail Extension Project, citing the benefits of widely available access to the American River Parkway.

Steve Thao, Trout Unlimited, announced the Salmon Fest at Lost Lake Park on November 8<sup>th</sup> co-sponsored by the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust, Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. RiverTree Volunteers is also actively involved. Over 800 people attended last year, and they hope to double attendance. Mr. Thao thanked Mr. Holley and Mr. Rodriguez for attending the fishing derby last spring.

**C. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Items identified after preparation of the agenda for which there is a need to take immediate action. Two-thirds vote required for consideration. (Gov. Code § 54954.2(b)(2))

**It was moved by Mr. McKown and seconded by Dr. Single to approve the agenda as presented. The Board unanimously approved the motion on the following roll call vote:**

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Steve Brandau, Chair	X		
Mr. Andreas Borgeas, Vice-Chair	X		
Mr. John Donnelly	X		
Mr. Donald E. Holley	X		
Mr. Max Rodriguez	X		
Dr. Jeff Single	X		
Mr. Michael McKown	X		
Ms. Bryn Forhan	X		
Mr. Paul Gibson	X		
Ms. Carolyn Nolan	X		
Mr. Carl Janzen	X		
Ms. Karen Finn	X		
Mr. Kent Gresham	X		

**D. POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Any Board member who has a potential conflict of interest may now identify the item and recuse themselves from discussion and voting on the matter. (FPPC §97105)

None.

**E. MINUTES**

E-1 Approve Minutes of June 18, 2014

Ms. Marks noted that the minutes should be dated June 18, 2014, and requested the Board to approve the minutes as corrected.

In response to inquiry from Vice-Chairperson Borgeas, Ms. Marks confirmed that the Board would discuss the necessity for written permission of the property owners to perform environmental review under item G-2.

**It was moved by Ms. Nolan and seconded by Mr. Gibson to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board unanimously approved the motion on the following roll call vote:**

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Steve Brandau, Chair	X		
Mr. Andreas Borgeas, Vice-Chair	X		
Mr. John Donnelly	X		
Mr. Donald E. Holley	X		
Mr. Max Rodriguez	X		
Dr. Jeff Single	X		
Mr. Michael McKown	X		
Ms. Bryn Forhan	X		
Mr. Paul Gibson	X		
Ms. Carolyn Nolan	X		
Mr. Carl Janzen	X		
Ms. Karen Finn	X		
Mr. Kent Gresham	X		

**F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

All items listed below will be approved in one motion unless removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion:

There were no Consent items on the agenda.

**G. DISCUSSION**

G-1 Receive Report from County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning regarding the Friant Corridor Feasibility Study

Staff Recommendation: The Board will receive an informational report from the County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning regarding the Friant Corridor Feasibility Study. No action is recommended.

Bernard Jimenez, Department of Public Works and Planning, presented an overview, characteristics, and background of the study. The Fresno County Board of Supervisors directed the department to conduct the

study provided it was privately funded. Property owners and interested parties funded the \$120,000 study. The County will be focusing on opportunities for recreation, natural and cultural resource awareness and conservation, tourism, and supportive commercial uses. The department plans to have the study completed and presented to the Board of Supervisors in early 2015.

On inquiry from Ms. Nolan, Mr. Jimenez reported that most of the donors are developers; the County has maintained a website for the study, and the donors are listed on the site.

On inquiry from Mr. Gibson, Mr. Jimenez reported that the study area is not within the sphere of influence of the cities of Fresno or Clovis.

G-2 Authorize Expanded Scope of Work and Increased Budget for the Agreement with URS Corp. for the River West Fresno, Eaton Trail Extension Environmental Impact Report, and Authorize Additional Bond Funds to Evaluate an Additional Entrance and Parking Alternative in the Vicinity of Palm and Nees Avenues

Staff Recommendation: It is recommended the Board:

- 1) Authorize an amendment of the agreement with the URS Corp. to expand the scope of work, increase the budget by \$147,000 (amended total not to exceed \$357,533), and extend the timeline for preparation of the River West Fresno, Eaton Trail Extension Environmental Impact Report (EIR), to analyze the potential environmental impacts of an additional public access and parking alternative in the vicinity of the Palm Nees private access road; and
- 2) Authorize an additional \$86,000 in Conservancy bond funding for the project (augmented total \$486,000), and request the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) to authorize the funds as well at its next meeting.

Ms. Marks summarized the recommended action which would authorize an amendment to the agreement with URS Corporation to analyze the environmental impacts of an additional public access alternative (Alternative 5) to be studied in the River West Fresno, Eaton Trail Extension EIR. This amendment would expand the scope of work and add \$147,000 to the URS agreement. The action recommends authorizing an additional \$86,000 in bond funds for the project, plus \$61,000 unallocated from the existing WCB grant, thereby totaling \$147,000.

Ms. Marks explained that the expanded scope of work to study the additional access alternative will generate significant additional costs and delays; however, the proposal is responsive to public and agency comments received on the scope of the EIR; draws support from varied stakeholder groups; and may be cost effective in the long run since the Conservancy eventually plans to provide Parkway features and access at the location of the new alternative. Studying this alternative was requested in many public comments, requested in writing by the City of Fresno, and generally supported in letters from the River Parkway Trust and the San Joaquin River Access Coalition (the latter two letters were received after preparation of the staff reports and distributed at the meeting). Staff is recommending that the Board amend the scope of work and budget for the EIR to proceed as comprehensively as possible. The EIR will analyze the impacts of the two-mile trail extension, the four alternatives that are already in process, and this additional alternative.

Ms. Marks added that the Conservancy is starting from scratch for this study area: there are no constraints and opportunities analyses, resources assessments, preliminary designs, topographic evaluation, analysis of existing easements, and other analyses. The intent is to find a broadly supported, feasible, and environmentally superior plan for the entire EIR/Trail Extension Project. The scope allows for rigorous review of the environmental setting, impacts, and mitigation equivalent to all of the other proposed project elements. When the work concludes, the Board can certify the EIR and select among all alternatives.

Ms. Marks reported that Alternative 5, with river access from the vicinity of Palm and Nees avenues, has been part of the long-term Parkway Master Plan, and was identified as a reasonably foreseeable future

project in the current scope. The Palm Nees alternative will be complex and costly, including analyses of remediation, regulatory, title, and engineering issues. The added expense is comparable to the cost of extensive conceptual design and an environmental review of a stand-alone project. The incremental review and development of projects within the Parkway is allowed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to the Parkway Master Plan Program EIR.

Ms. Marks explained that the locations, grades, dimensions, and alignments have not yet been defined for Alternative 5. Generally, 5a will enter from the Palm-Nees intersection, following the existing private access road and an existing easement at the base of the bluff along the river. Alternative 5b will be located somewhere in the area of Spano Park at the end of the Palm Avenue cul-de-sac. Both would lead to a possible parking area on the inert disposal site parcel with a trailhead for the planned trail. The Conservancy and consultants will work with the property owners, City of Fresno, and State Lands Commission, among others, to develop preliminary designs for the 5a and 5b alternatives. The City General Plan shows the Palm Nees access road as an entrance into the Parkway, and the City of Fresno has public access easements (with restrictions) through two private parcels on the existing private road.

Ms. Marks reviewed maps of the ownerships, land uses, areas affected by past disposal operations, and topography of the expanded study area. She noted the draft EIR in-progress will need to be revised throughout to include the expanded study area. The URS current contract is \$210,533; with the increase it will be \$357,533. The current WCB grant is \$400,000; with the proposed increase of \$86,000 there will be \$486,000 to prepare the EIR.

Mr. Borgeas asked Mr. Crow whether the Conservancy must own land or have explicit permission to include areas in a project EIR.

Mr. Crow responded that CEQA requires a lead agency to study a reasonable range of alternatives, although the agency isn't required to study every conceivable alternative. Most court cases that have addressed analyzing alternatives not owned by the project proponent involved projects where the lead agency has the power of eminent domain. One of the constraints or issues that the Conservancy will need to address is the fact that it is statutorily prohibited from exercising eminent domain, and does not have regulatory authority over land use. The Conservancy may study land that it does not own in an EIR, which is recommended in the circumstances of this particular case. The underlying merits of the alternative can't be determined until it is studied, including the possible pros and cons, and what the Conservancy can and can't do to implement the project. The CEQA Guidelines contain a non-exclusive list of factors to determine the suitability of a site. In this case economic viability, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and ownership or access rights are relevant factors.

Mr. Borgeas asked whether the boundary of the proposed expanded study area shown in Exhibit 1 of the staff report could be modified to encompass a larger area.

Ms. Marks responded that the Board may expand the study area; however, it should also consider the impact on the proposed scope of work and budget. She noted that the proposed expanded scope of work doesn't include additional features and possible Parkway Master Plan improvements as suggested in the letter from the River Parkway Trust. The Trust requested expanding the study to include a parcel further west, and including in the project a trail connection shown on the City General Plan. That trail connection will be shown as a reasonably foreseeable future project in the EIR and will be considered in the cumulative impact analysis; however, the scope does not include a full resources assessment or preliminary design of that area and trail. The intent of staff's recommendation is for the River West Trail Extension Project to have an independent function and a logical terminus at Highway 41 to the east and Palm and Nees on the west.

In response to Mr. Gibson's request, Ms. Marks reviewed the property ownerships within the proposed study area. Owners are: Mr. Tutelian, Spano Enterprise partnerships, and the state sovereign lands under the

jurisdiction to the State Lands Commission. Two parcels are in escrow between the River Parkway Trust and the Spano family.

Chairperson Brandau commented that the study area boundary does not include the land on the river at the base of the Palm Nees access road. This area must be included in Alternative 5 to provide for recreation not just on River West, but also at the base of the road.

Ms. Marks responded that the proposed scope of work does include studying potential improvements on state sovereign lands associated with Alternative 5, such as an entrance station, restroom, bollards, whatever might be needed so that people could park, walk, fish, or use that area for river access. The study area map was based on Assessor's parcel map boundaries—an oversight, since the Assessor's parcel maps do not include state sovereign lands.

Chairperson Brandau emphasized that area where the existing access road descends to the river from Mr. Tutelian's property needs to be clearly included in the study. For future visitors, the primary destination will be the river. On behalf of the City of Fresno, eventually the best way for citizens to access the river is through the Palm and Nees area.

Ms. Nolan agreed the study area boundary should include that area.

Mr. McKown confirmed the adjacent area was state sovereign land. The State Lands Commission also has public access easements on the Palm Nees access road and at the base of the bluff proceeding toward the River West property. Mr. McKown used the map on display to show the state sovereign lands that should be included in the expanded study area.

There was additional discussion to determine an appropriate study area for the Alternative 5.

Ms. Marks noted that when the Conservancy began planning the trail extension on River West Fresno, before 2008, it proposed a project on Conservancy and City property. In response to the EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) comments, staff is recommending studying an additional access alternative that might address some of the controversy over access to the proposed trail. The proposed expanded scope includes determining access road improvements, alignments, and the effects of recreational uses.

Chairperson Brandau commented that the proposed trail extension is a wonderful project to serve the citizens of the area and the partners have been working on its planning for years. There are opportunities to eventually connect the trail to a trail system on the Madera side of the river. He noted that, as suggested by Ms. Windover earlier, the City of Fresno has a responsibility to provide Parkway access. Each alternative has its own set of issues. He advocated for including the area at the base of the Palm Nees access road in the study area to better serve future access and parking needs.

Ms. Marks suggested that expanding the study area would require a reasonable modification of the scope of work and budget. The study area boundary and scope of work could be modified to consider a limited amount of parking at the base of the Palm and Nees access road, in lieu of or in addition to parking at the inert disposal parcel, and consider associated uses in the area. David Young, the URS consultant, was in attendance if the Board needed to confer with him.

Dr. Single asked whether the Board might be able to refine the recommended action in a way that will keep the project moving forward, versus directing staff to return at another meeting with a revised study area, scope and budget.

Mr. Crow and Ms. Marks indicated that as long as the Board provides clear direction in its motion, staff could proceed with refining the final contract amendment and WCB request.

David Young, of URS, stated that the study area and scope could be expanded at some added cost; however, since technical experts will be in the field performing evaluations for the variety of resources that need to be evaluated in the EIR—biology, cultural resources, design opportunities, etc.—efficiencies can be gained because the field staff will be onsite in any case. The most costly added items are the road feasibility and traffic analyses, but the other resources analyses would not increase costs that much.

Ms. Marks explained that, if the Board does not approve a proposed scope of work and budget amendment at this meeting, later approval will add three months, to February 2015, to secure WCB approval.

On inquiry from Mr. Borgeas, staff confirmed the Conservancy had land ownership information for the area.

Mr. Gibson noted that if the more westerly parcel to be acquired by the River Parkway Trust is included, it will increase the cost of analyses due to its past use for waste disposal.

Ms. Marks stated there are Phase 2 hazardous waste site assessments that may be publicly available to help keep costs reasonable.

#### Public Comments:

Dave Koehler, San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust, expressed their strong support adding Alternative 5. He emphasized that the project will serve not just the City of Fresno, but the entire region. The project will provide critical community benefits. Research has demonstrated physical and mental health benefits of these kinds of projects. Two months earlier the Chair of UCLA's Environmental Health Sciences Department completed a study specifically on urban river parkways in California, which included the Parkway. His study concluded that every dollar spent on trails results in \$3 saved to the public in medical benefits and healthcare services. Another study completed this summer by the University of California Centers for Health and Community found that pregnant women that were actively using green spaces during their pregnancy had far healthier babies than those who didn't. The River Parkway Trust is especially focused on providing for the access needs of seniors, individuals with disabilities, and very young children, and that's why these vehicle access points become so critical. Mr. Koehler noted the importance of living within the "walkshed" of public recreation facilities, defined as the ability to walk to a facility in 10 to 15 minutes. While the River Parkway Trust supports studying the added alternative, the development of access at Palm and Nees seems to be less certain and more problematic than developing access at the Riverview and Bluff entrance.

Mr. Koehler provided information about the parcel west of the proposed study area they are acquiring from the Spano family, and the planned trail across that parcel shown on the City's General Plan. They are requesting consideration of the future trail connection in the EIR, but not necessarily requesting the Conservancy to complete a full preliminary design of it. Parkway planning for the expanded area could facilitate an application for an EPA brownfields grant to clean up the contaminated sites. All access alternatives should be given the same level of consideration within the EIR—the new alternative and potential for access at Riverview and Bluff should be "co-equal."

John Kinsey, an attorney representing the San Joaquin River Access Coalition, spoke on behalf of the organized citizen group, including several neighbors. The Coalition supports the proposed Eaton Trail Extension project, bike and pedestrian access via the existing bluff trail, and an EIR that evaluates all access options. The benefits of access at Palm and Nees include: alignment with other plan documents, locating the entrance at the intersection of two arterials—Palm and Nees, and reduced vehicle trips and trip lengths.

Mr. Kinsey expressed support for modifying the study area and adjusting project alternative to include the state sovereign lands and Spano/River Parkway Trust parcels. He noted that a lead agency can study projects on lands it does not own.

Mr. Borgeas asked Mr. Kinsey his opinion regarding studying the Palm Nees access road, in light of the restrictions in the existing public access easements.

Mr. Kinsey noted that the EIR would need to recognize the constraints of the easements, and may be able to propose solutions, such as negotiating with the owners.

Mr. Borgeas asked Mr. Kinsey if the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires access at each location. Mr. Kinsey said he was not aware of any such requirements.

Mr. Crow reported that the consultants, Conservancy legal counsel, and State Parks' experts were researching requirements to ensure the project would comply with the ADA.

Mr. Borgeas asked Mr. Kinsey various questions about the potential for a Conditional Use Permit to be required for the Palm Nees access alternative, the potential for the Conservancy to adopt a project contrary to the City General Plan, and potential zoning requirements.

Mr. Kinsey responded that it would be more appropriate for the Board to approve a project consistent with the City General Plan.

Mr. Crow added that as a State agency, the Conservancy has certain sovereign powers over land uses on state-owned lands.

Cliff Tutelian, owner of Park Place and part of the private access road, stated that the recommended action was well-intentioned, but involved juggling multiple issues. He strongly supported studying Alternative 5b, creating the access at the cul-de-sac at the intersection of Palm and Nees. This alternative would be consistent with City policy that ingress/egress should occur at public streets. This alternative will relieve the burden and the pressures that the neighbors are feeling. He supported expanding the study area boundaries for the Palm/Nees alternative to evaluate the impacts on those lands. He strongly cautioned against any grading that would cut into the garbage disposal site east of the access road, which would result in odors, dust, and risks to public health and safety.

Mr. Tutelian explained the limits of the existing access easements. The easements are 22 feet wide. The entry into Park Place is 16 feet on one side, with a traffic circle, which is not designed to carry the traffic reasonably foreseeable as a result of the proposed project. He reported problems with parking, vandalism, vagrancy, and people undertaking illegal activities in the vicinity of the river, which is disturbing to tenants and customers. Mr. Tutelian believed that Mr. Spano had communicated to the City that he would allow the agencies to study access through Spano property as a proposed condition of a development permit. This alignment would cut through the slope, exposing buried garbage. If that alignment is studied in the EIR, significant soils and hazardous materials investigations will be required. He stated an access road at the cul-de-sac would be the most practical and beneficial.

On request of Ms. Nolan, Mr. Tutelian pointed out these features on the map.

Mr. Tutelian cautioned the Board that practical problems will arise to implement Alternative 5a, and the EIR must study the potential impacts given the limitations, terms, and conditions of the existing easements.

Mr. Gibson asked Mr. Tutelian to further to describe how and where the access road could be developed from the cul-de-sac and through Spano Park, given the small size of the park, the steep bluff, and the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District basin below.

Mr. Tutelian responded that Spano Park should be envisioned as a grand entrance to the Parkway. The City could research whether to use a portion of the park, or also use some of the adjacent Spano property,

which the City could require to be dedicated as a part of the development permit process. He stated that in his experience, problems with vagrancy will be reduced when the Parkway is open to the public.

Jeff Reid, an attorney representing Tutelian and Company, commented that on July 7, 2014, his client submitted a letter in response to the NOP. The fundamental point is that if access is restricted at one location, it will impact another location. The potential effects and consequences must be evaluated. He expressed appreciation that the EIR is being expanded to better evaluate access issues. The restrictions in the easement on the Palm Nees access road are relevant to the CEQA analysis: first, they reflect that there is an adverse impact on his client's property if access is limited at another location (i.e. Riverview); second, if there is no access provided at the Riverview location, under the terms of the easement, the access road will not be available for public access either. Further, the Board must consider whether it can negotiate with willing owner to secure a new easement. The Tutelian easement was exacted by the City with certain terms, conditions, and limitations. The Conservancy should not expect Mr. Tutelian to disregard the City's negotiations, and accept the terms and promises of another agency.

Mr. Reid stated that he believed the recommendation to expand the EIR and proposed study area was the right approach, within Conservancy's authorities. The study should evaluate the impacts of the public uses that would be generated by public access. He recommended the access should be part of the proposed project, not an alternative, because an alternative analysis is not required to have the same level of evaluation.

Mr. Reid emphasized that regardless of CEQA analysis, the Palm Nees access road is not going to be legally feasible. There have been prior commitments reflected in the City/Tutelian access easement. The other alternative access may have better engineering feasibility and a willing landowner. The adjacent owner may be willing to negotiate while securing development entitlements or the City may require conditions of approval. The Board would be wise to take the 5a option out of the study. He requested the Board to move the boundary and take the Palm Nees access road out of the expanded study area.

On inquiry from Ms. Nolan, Mr. Reid confirmed that his request was to delete the 5a alternative. If access was provided from the Palm Nees cul-de-sac (5b), the restrictions of the existing easements are avoided, potential impacts on Mr. Tutelian's commercial operations are eliminated, and vehicular access desired for the project is accommodated without necessarily developing such access at Riverview. The Conservancy could develop an effective appropriately sized access point, which would minimize the adverse impacts that the terms of the existing easement were intended to avoid. Finally, to address some of the nuisance impacts, the EIR should take into account another policy in the Draft City General Plan, Parks and Open Space Section, Policy 7g, which recommends public access should be avoided until adequate and sustainable funding is available to support proper operations. The EIR must evaluate whether the project will protect resources and public safety.

Ms. Marks explained that the consultant's scope of work will include evaluating the existing public access easements and the feasibility of alternatives. The EIR will identify restrictions and how they might be addressed within the Conservancy's powers and authorities. Construction of the trail cannot begin until long-term operations and maintenance resources are in place. The alternatives 5a and 5b are described narratively because the scope of work is fairly extensive to determine a feasible access road and trail location. It is possible that the access road may come off of the Palm Nees cul-de-sac rather than in the vicinity of the existing access road. In very preliminary discussions Mr. Spano indicates he is willing to work with the Conservancy, but there is no particular proposal yet. Staff will work with the landowners and City of Fresno, and evaluate risks and remediation associated with the waste disposal sites.

Mr. Tutelian expressed his objection to grading into land affected by garbage disposal. He discouraged the Board from considering an access that would parallel the existing access road, aligned on Mr. Spano's property, due to wastes and contamination risks. He noted that he had first-hand experience with

remediation on his adjacent property. Hundreds of thousands of yards of dirt and wastes were excavated down to native soil, and the site was built back up with clean fill.

Pete Weber, residing at 320 W. Bluff Ave., and a member of the San Joaquin River Access Coalition, thanked the Board for considering this action. He and his associates have advocated for a long time that the Palm and Nees access option should be a part of the proposed project. The Conservancy's EIR should address all of the possible options for access to the river from the Fresno side. He was encouraged by the discussion and thinks an access solution can be found. No option should be preemptively foreclosed; all should be considered. Mr. Weber briefly summarized the Coalition's position: First, they are wholeheartedly in support of providing access to the river for the residents of Fresno County, and want to see that take place as expeditiously as possible. That means locating the trail as close to the river as possible, providing convenient access for able-bodied as well as disabled residents, and—critically important—having in place an operations and maintenance plan, including public safety for visitors and nearby residents. Second, they support pedestrian and bicycle access at Riverview Drive and Churchill Ave. They have serious concerns about vehicular access at Audubon, Del Mar, and Riverview; those concerns have been very well articulated in response to the NOP. They support approval of staff's recommendation to expand the scope of work, including the modifications proposed by the Board. Finally, the Coalition wants the Conservancy to remain in alignment with the City of Fresno's General Plan, to be adopted later this fall; failure to do so will create a "legal quagmire" and probably significantly delay the project.

Mr. Holley had to leave the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Bob Papazian, residing in Fresno, noted that as a boy he would ride his bike to Lost Lake Park to visit the river; sadly, 50 years later that is still the primary place to get to the river. He encouraged the Board to keep options open at Riverview Drive, especially since the Palm and Nees access has legal restrictions. For everyone to be able to enjoy the river there needs to be access by car as well as by hiking and biking.

Sharon Weaver, San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust, emphasized that all in attendance seemed to agree that the alternatives need to be fully evaluated in the EIR, and possibly incorporated into the proposed project description. She asked the Board to be clear in its motion, so that it is very clear how the alternatives will be considered in the EIR.

#### Board Comments:

Ms. Forhan asked Mr. Crow to weigh-in with regard evaluating alternatives or incorporating them within the proposed project description.

Mr. Crow responded that in this case the EIR must adequately analyze the significant and practical facts regardless of whether all options are included in the project description or analyzed as alternatives.

Ms. Marks added that although CEQA does not require an in-depth review of all alternatives in an EIR, in this case the proposed scope of work and the Board's clear direction is that there will be detailed and equivalent review of all the alternatives, equal to the components of the proposed project, so that the Board can choose among components when the EIR is certified. There are three different trail alignments that are being reviewed (one proposed and two alternates) as well as three possible vehicular access routes (one proposed and two alternatives).

Dr. Single asked staff to confirm that the final CEQA document will support the Board's possible decision to approve any of the analyzed alternatives. Ms. Marks confirmed he was correct.

Mr. Borgeas asked, as an aside, whether it is legal to swing on a rope into the river. Ms. Marks explained that it is legal; however, it is called out in State codes as a hazardous activity, with participation at your own risk.

Mr. Borgeas then inquired whether the state sovereign lands in the area were included in the proposed project and EIR. Ms. Marks responded that they were.

Mr. Borgeas asked whether, for example, the Conservancy could propose a launching area at the base of the Palm Nees access road on state sovereign lands, and if a project at that location would come under the jurisdiction of the Conservancy.

Ms. Marks responded that some of the improvements contemplated in the scope of work would necessarily occur within state sovereign lands. She pointed out the sovereign lands on the project study area map.

Mr. Borgeas suggested the study area boundary as shown on the exhibit should include the state sovereign lands lying north of the parcels shown, to the river.

Mr. Janzen indicated his agreement.

Mr. Borgeas raised the issue of reviewing the access routes as alternatives v. incorporating them in the proposed project description, in order to ensure the review of alternatives has the same level of scrutiny as the proposed project elements. He noted the River Parkway Trust, Coalition, and the interested landowner's attorney all support incorporating the Palm and Nees access into the project description. He expressed his support for that approach.

Ms. Nolan asked whether Mr. Borgeas would also support including the other alternative, Riverview Drive, in the project description.

The Board members and staff reviewed the vehicle access components of the proposed project and possible alternatives: The proposed project includes vehicle access and parking off old Highway 41. One alternative involves vehicle access at Riverview Drive with parking in the mid-portion of the project site, and the expanded scope includes an alternative vehicle access (either 5a or 5b) in the vicinity of Palm and Nees avenues.

Mr. Gibson asked staff if Alternative 5b in Attachment 1 of the expanded scope of work was the alignment proposed by Mr. Tutelian at the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Marks responded that Mr. Tutelian's proposal is among the possibilities; the scope includes preliminary design analysis to determine a feasible alignment.

Mr. Gibson noted that although the scope of work indicates the area is in private ownership, it actually could be on private and/or public land.

Chairperson Brandau allowed Mr. Kinsey to return to the podium. Mr. Kinsey noted that the item as described on the agenda provided for the Board to consider adding a new access alternative to the EIR. The agenda item didn't relate to other points of access.

Mr. Crow advised that the Board could provide related direction that falls within the scope of the agenda item.

Ms. Marks reviewed how the project description was developed. The City of Fresno and Conservancy, with input from stakeholders, determined commonly supported project elements, and those became the proposed project. The alternatives represent proposals that were not held in common by the various stakeholders. The EIR will have a project description and 5 alternatives; however, those alternatives will be reviewed thoroughly so that when the Board approves the EIR, it can select from the alternatives if it chooses. The recommended action will add an additional alternative. At this point, without the benefit of the

analyses, the Board has not arrived at a consensus of what alternatives should be part of the proposed project. The proposed scope of work is inclusive of the study area discussed today, with the exception of the new downstream Spano/River Parkway Trust parcel. The EIR will study potential impacts of the possible improvements, and of the activities generated by the improvements. Ms. Marks asked the Board to consider how it might deal with the scope of work and budget modifications to add the additional area immediately downstream of the Palm and Nees access road.

Mr. Gibson stated that the scope of work for Alternative 5b should include investigation of the access route suggested by Mr. Tutelian from the cul-de-sac at Palm and Nees. Ms. Nolan also asked for confirmation that 5b would encompass studying an access road from the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Marks reported that the scope of work provides for that analysis. Options are open until the study provides better information; 5b could extend from the cul-de-sac or could be parallel to the existing access road. Mr. Tutelian raised some good points about the technical, regulatory and legal difficulties. The EIR will help identify the difficulty, feasibility, and expense for alternatives 5a and 5b. It would be premature to make any decisions about whether the alternatives are realistic without that information.

Mr. Gibson asked whether the completed EIR will show the Board whether the various alignments of 5b are viable, and whether they could be aligned on public property.

Ms. Marks indicated that the first tasks under the scope of work and discussions with the property owners will help determine which alignment is viable.

Mr. Janzen made a suggestion to accommodate the Board's requested changes in the proposed scope of work and provide an adequate budget: The existing scope of work didn't cost as much as the Board budgeted and authorized, so there's \$61,000 left in authorized Conservancy bond funds. The Board should authorize an additional \$147,000 for the expanded scope of work described in the staff report, and keep the \$61,000 in reserve. The Board should direct staff to add to the scope the expanded study area and other Board concerns not addressed in the staff proposal, and use the \$61,000 as necessary to cover those change orders. The Board's added issues cannot be met within the \$147,000, and postponing the decision will delay the WCB authorization to the next quarterly meeting.

Ms. Marks expressed appreciation for this approach. Staff would be able to proceed toward Wildlife Conservation Board approval of the proposed scope of work and budget in November, and make task to task transfers of the \$61,000 to accommodate the additional items. Ms. Marks suggested the change orders could be reviewed by the Board at the next meeting.

In response to Ms. Nolan's inquiries about avoiding delays, Ms. Marks noted that this would solve the problem without added delays.

Mr. Donnelly stated that staff and the WCB can make routine task to task transfers without returning for authorization from the Board. The Board has approved a not-to-exceed budget to complete the EIR, and staff can move budgeted amounts among different tasks.

Mr. Gibson asked Chairperson Brandau if he would entertain a motion to approve the amended scope of work for the EIR and \$147,000 in new funding to cover the cost of the amended scope of work. He suggested that Mr. Janzen could add a second motion to add the Board's expanded study area to the scope and fund that through task-to-task transfers of the available balance of funds.

**Mr. Gibson made, and Chairperson Brandau seconded, a motion to approve the amended scope of work (add Alternative 5) at the stated cost of \$147,000 to augment the EIR, and request the WCB to authorize the additional funding for the project.**

Ms. Nolan noted that the motion would not elevate the alternatives to become part of the proposed project description.

There was discussion about proper proceedings under the rules of order.

Dr. Single asked for clarification about expanding the study area to include parcel 17s (to the west of the study area proposed in the staff report), and whether it was intended to include the trail connection further to Northridge Avenue, as shown on the City of Fresno bicycle and pedestrian trails master plan, which was Attachment 1 of the River Parkway Trust's comment letter.

Ms. Marks suggested the logical end point would be the boundary between parcel 17s—which will become property of the River Parkway Trust—and the adjacent private property. It is assumed the future trail connections to that point will be required by the City of Fresno to be dedicated as conditions of approval.

Dr. Single indicated his concurrence with this approach.

**Chairperson Brandau made a motion, and Mr. Borgeas seconded, to amend Mr. Gibson's motion, to include in the study of Alternative 5 the State Sovereign Lands and parcel 17s, and instruct staff to transfer the funds necessary from other tasks, with an equal level of study for the proposed project and all alternatives.**

In response to Board comments about the proposed amendment, Ms. Marks stated that the motion would provide staff the authority to make move forward with getting the amended contract processed. Staff will report back to the Board.

The Board continued discussion about identifying 5 alternatives, each studied to the same level as proposed project elements, versus elevating any of them to become part of the proposed project description.

On request of Mr. Donnelly, staff confirmed that the level of scrutiny and study for each alternative will be equal.

Ms. Nolan made the point that there were three different entities that identified advantages of including the alternatives as part of the project description.

Mr. Borgeas noted that the specific direction to staff and the consultant is that all alternatives must be treated coequally—that there is no preferred access route; there is no higher scrutiny or lower scrutiny of any possible element.

Dr. Single stated that this approach is used when the decision makers will have a final choice of one or two or three possible outcomes. This can be very helpful because they will all be analyzed to the same level of detail. The Board will have both the information and the back up under CEQA to make different choices based on that information. This will provide the Board the most flexibility.

Mr. Borgeas asked staff to have a very prominent declaration in project documents that says there is not a preferred alternative, that all of the alternatives are co-equal and will be given the same amount of consideration.

Ms. Marks added that if the alternatives became part of the proposed project, there might be CEQA processes the Conservancy would need to redo. Staff will make sure that the study of alternatives is rigorous, and ensure the Board has analyses adequate to make informed decisions.

Mr. Young suggested that, although CEQA uses the term "proposed project" and "preferred project" interchangeably, he would in this instance refer to the "proposed project." Under CEQA there needs to be a

meaningful analysis of project elements so that the Board can make an informed decision—that implies an equal analysis of the alternatives in order for the Board to take an action to approve any of the possible alternatives.

Mr. Brandau called for a vote. Due to a software failure, Ms. Finn and Mr. Gresham were inadvertently disconnected from the meeting conference call at 11:05 a.m. A quorum remained in attendance. **The Board unanimously approved amendment of Mr. Gibson’s motion on the following vote:**

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Steve Brandau, Chair	X		
Mr. Andreas Borgeas, Vice-Chair	X		
Mr. John Donnelly	X		
Mr. Max Rodriguez	X		
Dr. Jeff Single	X		
Mr. Michael McKown	X		
Ms. Bryn Forhan	X		
Mr. Paul Gibson	X		
Ms. Carolyn Nolan	X		
Mr. Carl Janzen	X		

**The Board subsequently unanimously approved the amended motion on the following vote:**

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Steve Brandau, Chair	X		
Mr. Andreas Borgeas, Vice-Chair	X		
Mr. John Donnelly	X		
Mr. Max Rodriguez	X		
Dr. Jeff Single	X		
Mr. Michael McKown	X		
Ms. Bryn Forhan	X		
Mr. Paul Gibson	X		
Ms. Carolyn Nolan	X		
Mr. Carl Janzen	X		

G-3 Authorize a Restricted Grant of Easement to the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust to Provide Legal Access Across the Conservancy’s River West Fresno Property to the Adjacent Trust-Purchased Parcel to Facilitate the Parcel’s Final Transfer (carried over from August 20, 2014)

Staff Recommendation: It is recommended the Board authorize the Executive Officer to execute a Grant of Easement (substantially in the form of the attached) to the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust for an access easement over and across the Conservancy’s River West Fresno property (APNs 402-030-68ST & 402-030-69ST) to the River Parkway Trust’s adjacent parcel (transfer of the parcel from the Spano family to the River Parkway Trust is pending).

Ms. Marks summarized the recommendation to grant an access easement to River Parkway Trust across Conservancy property to provide legal access to two parcels in escrow between the Spano family and the Trust. The easement would facilitate the transfer of the parcels purchased by the River Parkway Trust as a result of the Spano property acquisition in 2003 through 2005. These parcels were identified in the previous item: the inert disposal site and parcel 17s. The easement would cross Conservancy property as shown in

the staff report. The River Parkway Trust cannot finalize and record the transfer until they have legal access to the parcels. They have pursued all other access options to no avail. The River Parkway Trust would be prohibited from using the easement for general public access. The easement is on an existing unmaintained access road. There is no direct cost to the Conservancy. The public benefits of granting the easement are adequate compensation for the value of the access easement: it allows the Trust to conserve the parcels for Parkway purposes, the Trust is specifically created as a public benefit nonprofit organization to develop the Parkway, and it will allow for the Trust's future management and cleanup of the area.

On inquiry from Mr. Borgeas, Ms. Marks confirmed that the River Parkway Trust would be prohibited from using the easement for general public access.

There was discussion among Board members regarding the disposition of the easement if the parcel was sold or transferred to the Conservancy or any other party. The easement and the prohibited uses/covenants detailed in the easement would be appurtenant to the River Parkway Trust's property and would run with the land, provided any subsequent sale or transfer of the Trust's property would also be solely for uses consistent with the San Joaquin River Parkway Master Plan. At the Conservancy's discretion, the easement may be terminated and all rights of access rescinded if the Trust's property is sold or transferred for other uses or purposes. The easement would be non-exclusive, so the Conservancy would continue to be able to use the easement area for any of its own purposes. If the property was sold to the Conservancy the easement would merge with the Conservancy's ownership and rights.

After further discussion among Board members, Dr. Single explained that if the property transferred to the Conservancy, the prohibitions on use would not affect the Conservancy. The Conservancy can use the property and access road as it sees fit. The easement just allows the River Parkway Trust to use the access for very limited purposes. Under the proposed easement, number 6, Successors and Assigns, any new owner—other than the Conservancy, the underlying landowner—would be bound by the restrictions.

Mr. Donnelly emphasized the River Parkway Trust is prohibited from using the easement for general public access, the Conservancy is not.

#### Public Comments:

Mr. Bauer, member of San Joaquin River Access Coalition, stated that he was not in opposition to the recommended easement. He wanted to know if the easement would be necessary if the parcels are not included in the final approved River West Fresno project. He asked why an easement is necessary, since it is not required in the escrow documents. He asked whether the Board should wait until the end of the EIR process to see if either property is needed for the project.

Mr. Kinsey, representing the San Joaquin River Access Coalition, stated that his clients question whether the easement is necessary. The Conservancy has the right to allow people onto its property without a formal recorded document. That said, he suggested some minor technical edits to the easement to make sure the easement is being granted solely for access to the grantee's property, not to engage in any improvements that would trigger CEQA. First, the Conservancy should add "of the grantee property" at the end of paragraph one. In paragraph two he suggested adding, "Grantee shall not improve, expand, or otherwise enhance the easement area," so that there is no suggestion that work will be performed related to the River West Trail Extension project. The Conservancy might also consider an end date to the easement.

Mr. Borgeas and Mr. Rodriguez had to leave the meeting at 1:25 p.m.

Ms. Marks apologized if the public was confused regarding the purpose of the easement. The Board authorized staff to negotiate with the River Parkway Trust a year ago, solely to facilitate the transfer of two parcels to the Trust. The property was purchased by the Trust as a result of a large Parkway acquisition from the Spano family; the property was paid for many years ago and the property can't be transferred

without legal access. The proposed easement doesn't have anything to do with the River West trail expansion proposal, other than being located within the same area.

On inquiry from Chairperson Brandau, Ms. Marks confirmed that escrow could not close if the parcels did not have legal access. The parcels became landlocked when the Conservancy acquired the adjacent land, declined to acquire the subject property, created new parcels lines, and severed access.

Mr. Tutelian made additional comments about the potential for public access to the River West Fresno project via Riverview and Bluff v. the Palm Nees access road.

Mr. Koehler addressed some of the questions that came from the public: The River Parkway Trust and the Trust for Public Land acquired the entire property, including the two subject parcels, from the Spanos with the intention of selling it all to the Conservancy. In the final months the Conservancy informed the trusts that it would not take ownership to these two parcels because of the environmental remediation issues, therefore they were carved out of the sale to the State. The trusts' purchase price had been negotiated with the Spanos, and so the trusts arranged for an option on each parcel, plus an additional remnant parcel. At the end of the five-year period the River Parkway Trust exercised the option; one parcel transferred and the two subject parcels did not because there is a contractual obligation to provide legal access to them. Every possible access solution has been pursued. Mr. Spano has noted one correction to staff's report: there is not an existing easement between the two parcels. Mr. Spano has the legal right to grant an easement between them to the River Parkway Trust. There is no intention to use the proposed easement for public access, and no intention to do any kind of incremental movement toward providing public access through this request. First, the Trust wants the easement in order to take ownership, and secondly they want to pursue cleaning up the parcels. No regulatory agency is requiring the Spano family to cleanup the properties, and to date, the owners will not be compelled to perform cleanup on these parcels in order to secure land use entitlements for their adjacent proposed development. If the parcels are not remediated, they cannot be used for public Parkway use. It is the River Parkway Trust's intention is to take ownership and pursue funding for remediation. They will likely return to the Conservancy request to support for a grant application, such as an EPA brown fields cleanup grant. There's public value to this property, whether it's eventually used for a future trail or for habitat. Once remediated, they intend to sell the properties to the Conservancy.

In response to Chairperson Brandau's inquiry about the construction equipment needed for cleanup, Mr. Koehler replied that for the inert disposal site parcel there would likely be large dump trucks with clean fill. There is not a draft workplan for the other parcel, so the needed equipment is not known.

Chairperson Brandau asked staff whether the easement is capable of carrying those types of vehicles without degrading the slopes. Ms. Marks replied that the road had been used as a haul road for mining, the Conservancy would be involved in approving the work and operations, and the River Parkway Trust would be required to perform any required repairs.

Chairperson Brandau stated that stakeholders do not oppose the River Parkway Trust having an easement to begin cleanup of the property; however, the Conservancy should ensure that the easement does not somehow open the door for future public use of the easement.

Ms. Marks emphasized that the use of the road per the terms of the easement would be limited to management of the property, monitoring, and cleanup. If the Board is concerned about cleanup operations, it could strike "remediation" from the easement, and then later provide the River Parkway Trust with a specific construction easement.

Mr. Koehler added that although the easement is required to allow transfer of ownership, they specifically intend to remediate the parcels, and would prefer remediation activities were allowed under the easement.

There was additional discussion of the possibility of a future temporary construction access easement, and of the proposed easement's requirements for the River Parkway Trust to repair any damage caused by their use.

Chairperson Brandau stated that as long as the easement will not facilitate the route morphing into a public access point and the River Parkway Trust could not grant access to the public, the Board should support it.

Mr. Crow stated that as drafted, the easement adequately protected against any right of public access.

Mr. Donnelly interjected that, regardless of the proposed easement and the focus of the day's discussion, the Conservancy's mission is to provide and increase public access and public use of Conservancy lands and the river. The Board should not foreclose on the future opportunity to provide greater access. It would not be bad if the uses allowed on Conservancy property, would eventually evolve into greater public access.

Dr. Single stated that the proposed easement was a relatively straight-forward, benign, standard kind of agreement. The limitations are very clear, and the Board has thoroughly discussed any implications. A future action of the Board would be required to expand use or access.

Mr. Tutelian cautioned the Board that the City's easement on his property cannot be used for construction (remediation) access to the River Parkway Trust's parcels. He emphasized that diesel trucks would interfere with patrons and customers of his tenants. He expressed concern that some stakeholders and the Board seemed to be hedging toward using the Palm Nees access road and easements for construction and public access, contrary to the terms and limitations of the existing easements, and requested that this line of thinking halt, including any possibility of exercising eminent domain to secure access. He continued with comments about his concerns and proposals regarding River West access alternatives, Item G-2. He expressed his support for remediation of the parcels, and noted that he provided some fill at the inert disposal site parcel.

Mr. Gibson responded that the Conservancy doesn't have any authorities or rights to grant access on the Palm Nees access road. The proposed access easement is on Conservancy property, and the Palm Nees road is not part of the consideration for this agenda item. He requested the Chairperson to entertain a motion and vote.

Chairperson Brandau asked if there were additional members of the public that wanted to comment; there were none.

Mr. Gibson stated that the easement is appropriately limited, does not allow public access, and allows a very long-standing and faithful Parkway collaborator to remediate problems that to date no one has been willing to take on. **Mr. Gibson moved, and Mr. Donnelly seconded, a motion to approve the easement as recommended by staff. The motion was unanimously approved by the following vote:**

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Steve Brandau, Chair	X		
Mr. John Donnelly	X		
Dr. Jeff Single	X		
Mr. Michael McKown	X		
Ms. Bryn Forhan	X		
Mr. Paul Gibson	X		
Ms. Carolyn Nolan	X		
Mr. Carl Janzen	X		

## H. ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

### H-1 Organizations

H-1a San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust

H-1b RiverTree Volunteers

Due to the length of the meeting and desire to maintain a quorum, Ms. Marks suggested that reporting organizations might postpone their reports to the next meeting. There were no objections.

### H-2 Deputy Attorney General

None.

### H-3 Executive Officer

H-3a Committee Reports

None.

### H-4 Board Members' Reports

In the interests of maintaining a quorum through the end of the action items, Chairperson Brandau proceeded to Executive Session.

## I. EXECUTIVE SESSION

### Public Comment:

Prior to convening in Executive Session, members of the public may address the Board on Executive Session agenda items.

None.

### I-1 Government Code Section 54956.8

Consultation with real property negotiators concerning terms of negotiations, including price and terms of payment.

Property: Jenco Farms  
Fresno County (APN 576-010-11)

Negotiating Parties: Rodger and Doug Jensen, Jenco Farms

Agency Negotiators: Melinda Marks, San Joaquin River Conservancy  
Heidi West, Wildlife Conservation Board

**Mr. Crow reported out of Executive Session that with regard to item I-1, the Board approved making an offer to purchase the property.**

### H-4 Board Members' Reports (resumed)

Chairperson Brandau entertained additional informational reports from Board members. He reported that the City of Fresno draft General Plan includes a proposed policy that would limit the Riverview Drive access

to the Parkway to bicyclists and pedestrians due to traffic concerns on Audubon and Del Mar avenues; therefore, the City is trying to locate public access at Palm and Nees avenues, and studying alternative alignments in that vicinity (including the existing access road, a parallel road, and a road at the cul-de-sac).

There were no further Board reports.

**J. NOTICE OF BOARD, ADVISORY, AND PUBLIC MEETINGS**

None.

**K. NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE**

The October 15, 2014, meeting was canceled in the meeting notice. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board was November 19, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. (The November and December meetings were subsequently cancelled, with proper noticing.)

**L. ADJOURN**

Chairperson Brandau adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:15 p.m.

Board meeting notices, agendas, and approved minutes are posted on the Conservancy's website, [www.sjrc.ca.gov](http://www.sjrc.ca.gov). For further information or if you need reasonable accommodation due to a disability, please contact Rebecca Harris at (559) 253-7324 or [Rebecca.Harris@sjrc.ca.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Harris@sjrc.ca.gov).

Respectfully submitted,



Melinda S. Marks, Executive Officer