EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor
NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, California 94244-2090
www.wcb.ca.gov
(916) 445-8448
Fax (916) 323-0280

Meeting Minutes

Lower American River Conservancy Program
Advisory Committee
March 15, 2018
9:00 - 11:00 a.m.

Sacramento County Board Chambers
700 H Street, Suite 1450
Sacramento, California 95814

1. Welcome and Introductions- John Donnelly
   Committee Chair Jeff Harris called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call
   John Donnelly performed the roll call and observed a quorum was established.

   Present were:

   Tina Bartlett, Department of Fish and Wildlife, for Secretary John Laird, Natural Resources Agency

   Kelly Fong-Rivas for Sacramento Mayor Darrell Steinberg

   Phil Serna, Supervisor, Sacramento County

   Jeff Harris, Councilmember, City of Sacramento

   Donald Terry, Mayor, City of Rancho Cordova

   Karen Finn, California Department of Finance

   Stephen Green, Senate Appointee to the Committee and President of the Save the American River Association

   Jennifer Lucchesi, Executive Officer, State Lands Commission

   Don Nottoli, Supervisor, Sacramento County

   Corey Brown, Speaker Appointee to the Committee

   Also Present:

   Liz Bellas, Sacramento County Regional Parks

   Dale Steele, Friends of Sutter Landing Park

   John Walsh, WCB

   Peter Perrine, WCB

   Elizabeth Hubert, WCB

   Colin Mills, WCB

Jessica Schroeder, WCB

Scott McFarlin, WCB

Heidi West, WCB

Mary Delaney, WCB

Cara Allen, WCB

John Donnelly introduced new staff members Liz Bellas, county, and the WCB Cara Allen and welcomed them to the program.

At Chair Harris' request, Donald Terry led the Pledge of Allegiance. He then queried and Director Donnelly confirmed that a quorum was present. Chair Harris asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak, seeing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the October meeting of the Committee. Thanked the WCB for developing and making available Program Guidelines and a Charter for the Committee.

3. Approval of Minutes – Action
October 24, 2017, Meeting Minutes (PDF)

Motion to approve- Phil Serna
Second- Stephen Green
Opposed- none

4. Lower American River Mapping Efforts - Discussion
- Boundary and ownership Maps

Chair Harris invited Director Donnelly to lead the discussion on this topic. Director Donnelly stated that at the October 2017 meeting, the Committee had concluded that maps would be helpful and requested that they be made available at today's meeting. Working with the Committee, State Lands Commission, and Liz Bellas, staff provided maps today; one showing ownership and jurisdiction along the river, another showing areas that have been impacted by fire. Chair Harris asked if there were any questions from Committee Members, there were none. Chair Harris noted that the maps were self-explanatory and that landholders along the parkway are quite numerous and recognized how that can affect projects. He stated that the maps will be helpful when considering new projects.

5. Report – Liz Bellas
The Committee will receive an update and status report of the Natural Resources Management Plan being contracted by the County of Sacramento.

Liz Bellas, Deputy Director of Regional Parks, stated that a request for qualifications (RFQ) of potential vendors was complete and that she anticipates a March 21 announcement of candidates who will be invited to submit proposals. Chair Harris asked if Regional Parks has full funding to create the plan. Liz Bellas responded that Regional Parks has $600,000 identified for the Plan in their budget. She added that they may ask for additional money from the Conservancy but would first negotiate a final price with a provider. Chair Harris asked when Ms. Bellas anticipates work will begin. She responded that Regional Parks will seek approval for the Plan from the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors in May and hope to begin work in June.

Chair Harris asked if there were questions. Supervisor Serna asked for clarification on the status of funding, specifically the suggestion that only partial funding is in place and whether the scope of work in the RFQ was adjusted proportionally. Ms. Bellas stated the

budgeted $600,000 is equal to the estimated cost of this part of the process. That this piece is only planning and does not include implementation.

Chair Harris asked if there were more questions. There were none.

6. General Discussion –
The Committee will engage in a general discussion regarding the possible release of a Proposal Solicitation and timeline to seek high quality grant proposals using currently available funding.

Chair Harris opened the discussion with the observation if SB 5 passes on June 5, the Committee will have that $10 million more to work with. One thing we want to discuss is whether the Committee should begin to engage and use the amount we currently have available, approximately $960,000, or wait until the outcome of SB 5 is known. Also projects that do not serve an underserved community require a 20% match. He asked Director Donnelly to talk about what that means, adding that he had inquired whether the Committee could use the non-SB 5 $960,000 as matching funds and Director Donnelly said that was not an eligible match.

Director Donnelly explained that Disadvantaged Communities and severely Disadvantaged Communities are usually defined in a specific geographic area that a project will serve. The Conservancy Program should look at other funding opportunities, Federal funding, state funding, and private funding foundations are sources that we typically use for the work we do now. Frequently, those matches come in at more than 20%. We don't expect a real impediment to being able to roll this money out. Director Donnelly believes there are stretches along the Parkway that we could demonstrate are disadvantaged areas.

Chair Harris asked if there is a way to move forward to identifying those areas.

Director Donnelly yes, we will identify.

Chair Harris- that would be very helpful, to bring that back to the next meeting.
Serna – are all three or one definition acknowledged by way of CalEnviroScreen?
Corey Brown volunteered that CalEnviroScreen is not used by SB 5. He continued saying that SB 5 defines "disadvantaged community" as a community with a median household income less than 80% of the statewide average, and defines "severely disadvantaged community" as a community with a median household income less than 60% of the statewide average. He explained the measure is crafted so that, in each Chapter, it states that 20% of funds have to be allocated for severely disadvantaged communities. Our funding for the Lower American River Conservancy Program is one element in a much larger Chapter so it will depend on how the state administers the Program, whether they say each of the different elements get 20% requirement, or they say some elements may get more and some get less, as long as the projects combined result in 20% for severely disadvantaged communities.

Phil Serna- requested we get a memo on this. It seems like there are a lot of moving parts and I would like to be sure we have reliable information.

Director Donnelly, we will provide a memo.

Chair Harris agreed a memo would be helpful. He asked Corey Brown if there are undetermined aspects of how SB 5 might be administered.

Mr. Brown replied that there is flexibility in the Chapter that these funds are in, as well as throughout the measure, as to how to calculate the 20%. There are two different

requirements; the match requirement- any project not in a disadvantaged area requires a 20% match, and the disadvantaged requirement, though the requirement is waived when the project meets the disadvantaged community threshold.

Donald Terry confirmed the understanding that a 20% match is not required for projects that meet the disadvantaged community requirement.

Corey Brown asked if land can be used as a match. Director Donnelly said he will have to look into it. He said the WCB has a program that has allowed the California UC System to use land over which they have ownership as a match for restoration dollars. We will have to look at the specific language in SB 5 to determine what would constitute an actual match. It would be hard to justify allowing the property as an actual match and you would have to record some kind of document against that property, tying not only the project to the grant, but also the property.

Chair Harris asked if there were questions.

Donald Terry asked if funds a city has already spent on planning could qualify as match funds for the implementation of that project. Director Donnelly said he did not think so.

Committee member Kelly Rivas suggested that the Committee delay taking action on projects until the fate of SB 5 is known, and the Committee has an opportunity to review the forthcoming memo Supervisor Serna requested and the Natural Resources Management Plan.

Liz Bellas clarified that the Natural Resources Management Plan will not be complete for two years. Chair Harris suggested the motion be restated omitting the reference to the Natural Resources Management Plan.

Chair Harris said his preference is to wait until after the outcome of SB 5 is known before acting on projects. He suggested that the development of the actual Request for Proposal (RFP) be completed.

Director Donnelly replied that the draft Solicitation WCB has provided would be a piece of the RFP, which would also include scoring criteria and an application. He stated the RFP could be pulled together fairly quickly and that a solicitation period is typically open for 30-days.

Chair Harris asked for thoughts on whether the committee wants to have the community suggest types of projects or should the committee develop a preference for project type.

Supervisor Serna asked if the Committee would score projects. Director Donnelly replied that WCB staff would score projects, provide the Committee with a list of the proposals submitted and the score each of those proposals earned. The Committee would then evaluate and make their recommendations. The Director invited the Committee to be part of the scoring process if they so desired. Supervisor Serna asked if the Committee would have the opportunity to make recommendations on scoring criteria. Director Donnelly replied that he would welcome the input. Chair Harris and Director Donnelly agreed the next meeting should not happen prior to June.

Chair Harris asked if anyone on the Committee had any thoughts on specific types of projects, there were no suggestions.
Corey Brown suggested that it would be good to hear what other government entities that own land adjacent to the Parkway see as priorities, and good to see what projects have been done. He added that he had two suggestions for the draft Solicitation to ensure it is consistent with the creating legislation; He observed that the second to last sentence in the first paragraph reads "within the Lower American Parkway" and should read "within

and adjacent to". Also, the second sentence of the last paragraph reads "projects should be consistent with the American River Parkway Plan" and it should read "shall be consistent with". He added that otherwise, the draft Project Solicitation Document looks good.

Supervisor Serna expressed approval of Committee members joining WCB staff in the application of scoring criteria and proposal evaluation and requested that the process be an agenda item at the next Committee meeting. He suggested it be stated "the Committee Chair and two Committee members."

Ms. Rivas stated she would like to have the third bullet of the draft Solicitation changed to read "The enhancement and expansion of" rather than only "enhancement", and she recommended the deletion of "Design, implement," from the fourth bullet. Supervisor Serna suggested the sentence read "Make available grants". Supervisor Nottoli suggested leaving the reference to "design and implement" but preface it with "make available".

Ms. Rivas asked Director Donnelly how the required WCB approval of the Guidelines and Solicitation will affect the Committee's timing. Director Donnelly explained that the WCB would have the opportunity to approve the documents before this Committee meets again, so the Committee's timing should not be affected.

Director Donnelly asked if the Committee would like to have the revised Solicitation distributed at, or before the next meeting. Chair Harris suggested distributing ahead of the meeting. Chair Harris asked if there were further comments on the Guidelines or Solicitation. There were none.

Chair Harris asked Ms. Rivas to formalize the motion discussed earlier. She moved that the Committee not enter into project consideration until after the June Primary and the outcome of SB 5/Proposition 68 is known.

Supervisor Serna seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Chair Harris asked for a motion to accept the Solicitation with changes as requested, and emailed to the Committee prior to the next meeting. Supervisor Serna made the motion. Mr. Green seconded the motion. Motion passed.

7. Form 700 – Informational
   This item is provided for informational purposes and no formal committee action is recommended.

   Chair Harris asked if anyone had any questions about the Form 700. There were none. He asked that everyone observe the deadline.

8. Next Steps-
   The Committee will discuss next steps and provide direction to staff regarding the Program and project implementation. Introductory Proposal Solicitation- Overview

   Chair Harris suggested that the next steps had been discussed.

   Director Donnelly reported that his staff is developing a page devoted to the Lower American River Conservancy Program on the WCB website. He also invited Committee input on future agenda items. He stated that he hopes that everyone is using what they have available to share information about the program. He then reported that he had recently been in touch with the Governor's office regarding an appointment to the Committee and received word they are working on it.

Chair Harris revisited Cory Brown's suggestion that the County and the City bring suggestions for projects and asked Director Donnelly to use the new webpage to ask stakeholders to begin to think about projects. He stated that the development of priorities is very important.

9. Adjourn-
Chair Harris adjourned the meeting at 9:46

Respectfully Submitted,

John P. Donnelly
Executive Director
Wildlife Conservation Board