


<h1>TNBC</h1> <p>The Natomas Basin Conservancy</p> <p>Web site: www.natomasbasin.org</p>	<h2>Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors</h2>	<h2>Upcoming Regular Meetings</h2>	 <p>June 6, 2007</p>
	<p>4:00 p.m.</p> <p>2150 River Plaza Drive, #460 Sacramento, CA (meeting in Suite 400)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 1 • September 5 • October 3 	

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
1	Call to Order	Call to Order of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors	Admin.	∅	○ The Board President will call the meeting to order if a quorum is present. Announcements by the Board President or Executive Director may be made at this time.
2	Action	Approval of the Minutes	Action	2.1	⊕ The Board President will request approval of the minutes of the Board meeting of May 3, 2007 and May 22, 2007.
3	Action	Authorization of funds for channel clearing on Lucich North (east cell); phase two of four	Action	2.12	<p>⊕ The Lucich North and Fraser North managed marsh complexes are urgently in need of channel clearing in order to insure their full functionality. The Board previously approved \$230,590.00 to conduct channel clearing on phase one (Fraser North) of the planned four-phased channel clearing effort on the Conservancy's Lucich North and Frazer North tracts.</p> <p>Costs for the Fraser North channel renovation effort (phase one of four) will likely come in at approximately \$13.05 a linear foot (for a 22-foot wide channel bottom and sides having a 1.75:1 or 2:1 slope) and approximately \$3.50 a cubic yard. The recently completed Bennett South channel renovation project came in with a final billing of \$9.20 a linear foot. Based on these projects, it is estimated that phase two (Lucich North, west cell) will cost approximately \$225,000.00 to complete. However, because the site has water seepage issues, it is difficult to ascertain a fully accurate estimate. A \$25,000.00 contingency is also proposed, bringing the request for funding to \$250,000.00.</p> <p>If approved, the contractor will be either Cal-Sierra Construction or Jim Fisher (Jim Fisher conducted the work on the recently completed Bennett South channel renovation project), and will be on a time and materials basis. To determine which contractor to engage on this project (that is, phase two, Lucich North, east cell), staff wants an opportunity to obtain final costs on the now nearly-completed Fraser North project (phase one of the four) being completed by Cal-Sierra Construction. This will allow a comparison with the recently completed Bennett North project done by Jim</p>

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
					<p>Fisher. Following this evaluation, the best of the two contractors for the job will be selected.</p> <p>This action requests authorizing the Conservancy's Executive Director to spend \$250,000.00 to conduct channel clearing of the Lucich North east cell (phase two) managed marsh complex. The selected contractor will be either Cal-Sierra Construction or Jim Fisher, and will be conducted on a time and materials basis.</p>
4	Action	Authorization of funds for channel clearing on Lucich North (central cell); phase three of four	Action	2.12	<p>⊕ See discussion above. In this case, the project site is the central cell of the Lucich North tract (phase three of four), the largest of the four proposed project cells. This cell is the largest of the four cells, and thus will cost more.</p> <p>This action requests authorizing the Conservancy's Executive Director to spend up to \$300,000.00 to conduct channel clearing of the Lucich North central cell (phase three of four) managed marsh complex. The selected contractor will be either Cal-Sierra Construction or Jim Fisher, and will be conducted on a time and materials basis.</p>
5	Action	Grant of access easement in favor of the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company	Action	2.19	<p>⊕ The Conservancy's Bennett South tract has been the subject of vandalism and trespassing in recent years, including this year's dumping of a small pile of hazardous waste, which the Conservancy had to abate. In order to secure the site, the Conservancy has systematically stepped up security measures such as sign posting, fencing, gating (all four gates were subsequently stolen but have been replaced with more security) and other measures.</p> <p>In order to further secure the site this year, barriers were erected that constrain how the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company can access its easement that runs across the property. After several years of negotiation with the Water Company, the Conservancy has proposed an extended access easement that would enable the Water Company access to water conveyance structures for maintenance and service purposes.</p> <p>This action requests that the Board authorize the Conservancy's Executive Director to execute and deliver the documents necessary to convey an access easement of 0.02583 acres (11,250 square feet) in favor of the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company. This action conveys a property right from the Conservancy to the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company. No financial consideration will be exchanged.</p>
6	Action	Concluding action to finalize the Ayala exchange, returning	Action	2.23	<p>⊕ The Board earlier approved the Ayala Exchange, the first phase of which was</p>

 ⊕ = More information in supplemental handouts.
 ∅ = No additional exhibits in Agenda Packet.

⊕ = Staff recommends approval.
 ○ = Staff recommendation not needed or indicated.
 ● = Staff does not recommend approval.

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
		48.474 and 47.392 acres (respectively) of the Frazer South and Bianchi West tracts			<p>consummated on November 7, 2006.</p> <p>The transaction involved a special provision which allowed the Conservancy to honor the 800-foot setback from "land designated for urban use by a land use agency," in this case Sutter County's Measure M area. The deal had the Conservancy take possession of the Frazer South and Bianchi West tracts all the way to the Sutter County and Sacramento County line (on the tracts' north boundaries), but that the northernmost portion (containing the 800-foot setback) would be reconveyed back to Brookfield once the County of Sacramento granted a boundary line adjustment which would permit the lot divisions along the 800-foot setback.</p> <p>In keeping with the terms of the agreement the Conservancy entered into with Brookfield, this action requests confirming action by the Board to reconvey the setback areas on Frazer South and Bianchi West to Brookfield Development. Once the reconveyance is completed, the Conservancy will be left with 110.16 acres on the Bianchi West tract and 110.372 acres on the Frazer South tract. It is anticipated, but not guaranteed, that the Conservancy will once again regain title to the setback tract pending certain further action by land use agencies.</p> <p>This action requests authorization for the Conservancy's Executive Director to execute and deliver documents necessary to effectuate the reconveyance of the northernmost portion of the Frazer South and Bianchi North (approximately 48 acres each) to Brookfield Development in keeping with the Exchange Agreement between Brookfield Development and the Conservancy dated February 7, 2006.</p>
7	Action	Disposition of proceeds from land transaction	Action	Ø	<p>⊕ The Ayala tract land exchange calls for the reconveyance of portions of land along the north boundary of the Frazer South and Bianchi West tracts (see above item). If the reconveyance is finalized, the Conservancy will receive a consideration of \$3,152,728.38.</p> <p>This action requests that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) designate the funds as non-NBHCP funds, 2.) deposit the funds in the existing Wells Fargo Bank business account, 3.) begin exploration of the ultimate disposition of the funds with the Conservancy's Finance Committee with a request that the Committee return to the Board with recommendations.
8	Action	Natomas Central Mutual Water Company water supply contingency	Action	Ø	<p>⊕ Staff will report to the Board on a inquiry from the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company as to whether the Conservancy would be willing to forego delivery of water</p>

 ⊕ = More information in supplemental handouts.
 Ø = No additional exhibits in Agenda Packet.

⊕ = Staff recommends approval.
 ○ = Staff recommendation not needed or indicated.
 ● = Staff does not recommend approval.

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
		plan and groundwater substitution			<p>by from the Water Company, and instead irrigate with groundwater produced from the Conservancy's own wells. This is in support of the Water Company's opportunity to sell water to out-of-Basin sources and a concern that the Bureau of Reclamation may declare water deliveries be reduced to 75 percent of contracted amount this year.</p> <p>The arrangement would provide compensation to the Conservancy from the Water Company. This would include full cost reimbursement for energy and power necessary to operate the groundwater wells, an allowance for wear and tear, and other financial considerations yet to be determined. If for any reason the Conservancy's ground water well production fails to deliver adequate water to any preserve, the Water Company would be required to restore water delivery on the same terms and conditions as is published in the Water Company's tariffs.</p> <p>This action seeks authorization for the Conservancy's Executive Director to execute and deliver any documents necessary to effectuate an agreement with Natomas Central Mutual Water Company that would substitute Water Company-provided surface water with Conservancy-provided groundwater to irrigate selected Conservancy preserves for the summer and fall of 2007.</p>
9	Action	Site-specific Management Plans	Action	①	<p>⊕ Staff will present to the Board for approval drafts of Site-specific Management Plans (SSMPs) for the Bolen West, Nestor, Sills (revised), Bennett North (revised), Vestal South, Rosa Central and East and Bolen North and South tracts.</p> <p>Staff anticipates a comprehensive updating of the entire SSMP program this year, and plans to have a Request for Proposal (RFP) before the Board in coming months. The RFP will enable the Board to select a contractor to conduct this work.</p> <p>This action approves the presented SSMPs, contingent upon approval from the NBHCP TAC or unanimous approval by CDFG and USFWS in a manner prescribed in the 2003 NBHCP.</p>
10	Discussion	City of Sacramento report	No action	∅	<p>○ Report from the City of Sacramento regarding HCP-related activity and other topics.</p>
11	Discussion	Financial statement review	No action	2.37	<p>○ A financial statement update will be provided for the period ended April 30, 2007 (unaudited).</p>
12	Discussion	Reclamation Reform Act	No action	2.51	<p>○ Conservancy staff and legal counsel will update the Board of Directors on activity to</p>

 ① = More information in supplemental handouts.
 ∅ = No additional exhibits in Agenda Packet.

⊕ = Staff recommends approval.
 ○ = Staff recommendation not needed or indicated.
 ● = Staff does not recommend approval.

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
					resolve complications with the Conservancy's compliance with Reclamation Reform Act filing requirements.
13	Discussion	Exploration of co-location with the Sacramento Tree Foundation	No action	2.61	○ The Sacramento Tree Foundation has proposed the Conservancy co-locate with it in a proposed new office building that would be owned by the City of Sacramento. The building is tentatively called the "Ecology Center." It would be located on River Park Drive west of the Conservancy's current office location. Staff will discuss this opportunity with the Board.
14	Discussion	Endowment Funds update	No action	①	○ Report from Arnerich and Massena, the Conservancy's endowment funds investment advisor, on the status for the Conservancy's endowment funds.
15	Discussion	Proposed Williamson Act funding cuts	No action	2.63	○ The Governor's Office has proposed to discontinue funding California counties for their Williamson Act contracts. If realized, this will have a very substantive impact on the Conservancy's budget. There will be impacts on the NBHCP Finance Model as well. Staff will brief the Board on this development.
16	Discussion	2007 insurance policy	No action	①	○ Staff will review with the Board the insurance coverage planned for 2007.
17	Public Comments	Public Comments	No action	∅	○ Opportunity for members of the public to address the Conservancy's Board of Directors.
18	Executive Session	Executive Session – Real Estate	Action	①	○ Executive Session for real estate.
19	Executive Session	Executive Session – Litigation	Action	①	○ Executive Session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 for the purpose of meeting with legal counsel regarding litigation on one matter.
20	Executive Director's Report	Executive Director's Report	No action	①	○ Various matters for Board members' general information.
21	Adjournment	Adjournment	Admin.	∅	○ Official adjournment of the meeting.

 ① = More information in supplemental handouts.
 ∅ = No additional exhibits in Agenda Packet.

⊕ = Staff recommends approval.
 ○ = Staff recommendation not needed or indicated.
 ● = Staff does not recommend approval.