

<p>TNBC</p> <p>The Natomas Basin Conservancy</p> <p>Web site: www.natomasbasin.org</p>	<p>Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors</p>	<p>Upcoming Regular Meetings</p>	<p><i>t h e</i> NATOMAS BASIN <i>c o n s e r v a n c y</i></p> <p>August 1, 2007</p>
	<p>4:00 p.m.</p> <p>2150 River Plaza Drive, #460 Sacramento, CA <i>(meeting in Suite 400)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 5 • October 3 • November 7 	

Agenda

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
---	---------	------	------	-----	------------

Agenda format and readings tips.

This agenda is prepared in order to facilitate understanding of the Conservancy’s Board of Director’s agenda packet. On each page, there is a “header” (see above). This header lists how each agenda item is presented. Each agenda item is numbered (see far left hand column). Then, as the reader moves from left to right, more information is provided.

If the reader wishes to simply get a general idea of what will be presented at the meeting, a quick look at the first three columns on the left will provide that. In the example below, the first three columns provide the agenda item number, what segment of the meeting the item will be heard in, and the brief description of the agenda item. Ultimately, the far right-hand column presents a discussion of the agenda item.

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.
---	---------------	--	--------	---	---

Exhibits attendant with agenda item. In some cases, there is no supplemental information that accompanies an agenda item. In this case, there will be a “∅” symbol in the “Pg.” column of the agenda. A “Ⓞ” symbol means that there is more information in supplemental handouts. This most often means loose information that is sent along with the agenda packet (meaning it is not directly incorporated into the agenda packet itself). It also may mean that there are displays, posters or audiovisual information that will accompany the presentation.


Staff agenda item recommendations. In the “Discussion” column, there are a series of symbols used, also in order to facilitate quick understanding (see legend at bottom of each page). These indicate the status of staff recommendations. An “○” symbol tagged to the agenda item discussion means there is no staff recommendation on the matter. Other symbols used include a “⊕” (staff recommends approval) and “●,” which means staff does not recommend approval.

Agenda packet sections. Agenda packet #1 is the official agenda itself.

Agenda packet #	Section name	What’s included
①	Agenda	This is the main agenda. If the reader reads this, they will have a very good understanding of the meeting and its component.
②	Supplemental materials	On some agenda items, there are handouts that are more extensive that can be provided in the “Discussion” section of the official agenda. These materials are included in agenda packet #2.
③	Executive Director’s packet	The Executive Director includes item of general interest to the Board of Directors in agenda packet #3. The items in this packet are for general information, not action.
④	Executive Session	Material in this packet is for Board members’ information in closed, executive session. It is confidential and not made public.

 Ⓞ = 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.

<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 5 • October 3 • November 7 	 <p>August 1, 2007</p>
	<p>4:00 p.m.</p> <p>2150 River Plaza Drive, #460 Sacramento, CA (meeting in Suite 400)</p>		

#	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 June 6, 2007.
3	Action	Authorization of funds for channel clearing on Lucich North (west cell); phase four of four	Action	∅	<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 funding to conduct channel clearing on phase one (Fraser North), two and three (Lucich North) of the planned four-phased channel clearing effort. The projects details to date are as follows:</p> <p>Phase 1 cost: \$166,393.00 (vs. \$230,590 authorized),</p> <p>Phase 2 cost: \$135,547.50 (vs. \$250,000 authorized)</p> <p>Phase 3 cost: \$193,338.00 (vs. \$300,000 authorized).</p> <p>On this item, staff requests that the Board authorize \$200,000.00 for the Phase 4 of 4 channel restoration projects. The contractor is the same contractor that was selected for the other three phases, CalSierra Construction.</p> <p>It is important to note that Phase One has been flooded up and is functioning beautifully. The biological monitoring team has already captured and assessed a very pregnant female giant garter snake well inside the marsh.</p>
4	Action	Bennett North restoration and enhancement construction project	Action	2.9	⊕ The Bennett North restoration and enhancement (r&e) project is moving forward. The Board earlier authorized Wildlands, Inc to conduct design work on this marsh r&e project. Construction of the project went to competitive bidding, a process which, as before, was managed by Wildlands, acting in behalf of the Conservancy under contract.

#	Section	Item	Type	Pg.	Discussion
					<p>Previously, the Board authorized Conservancy staff to select the bid submitted to the Conservancy by Wildlands following completion of bid notification, bidders' conference, submittal of sealed bids on a date certain and Wildlands' review of all bids, analysis of those bids and recommendation to the Conservancy. The bids received came in over staff's spending authority.</p> <p>All bidders were consulted and asked if each would verify that their bid was good until the Conservancy's Board could meet again to discuss the project and award a contract. All did, and some adjusted their final bid.</p> <p>The Bennett North r&e construction project includes mitigation for the County of Sacramento's Regional Sanitation Lower Northwest Interceptor Project. Wildlands is managing this for Regional Sanitation. Construction expenses will be paid in proportion to the portion of the acreage allocated between the Regional Sanitation project and the Conservancy's project. Approximately 11 percent of the project will be funded by the Regional Sanitation project.</p> <p>Staff requests that the Board authorize Conservancy staff to execute and deliver a contract for the construction of the approximate 65-acre Bennett North managed marsh restoration and enhancement construction project after a review of the competitive bids has been discussed and a recommended contractor has been designated by the Board.</p> <p>See attached analysis of competitive bids.</p>
5	Action	Approval of Bolen South managed marsh construction drawings and bid package	Action	2.23	⊕ The Conservancy's Bolen South tract is the next in line for managed marsh restoration and enhancement. This item authorized staff to execute and deliver a contract between the Conservancy and Wildlands, Inc to prepare managed marsh construction drawings and manage a bidding process for an approximate 55 acre managed marsh complex on Bolen South.
6	Action	Land leveling of newly-acquired properties, Elsie and Bolen West	Action	2.24	⊕ The Conservancy's Elsie and Bolen West tracts are next in line for precision leveling. Both make up a key component of the Conservancy's obligation to commit 50 percent of mitigation land to rice production. A total of \$45,000 is sought for the Elsie leveling project (\$260 / ac) and \$25,000 for the Bolen West tract (\$160 / ac). In the past, the Board has authorized leveling projects that have averaged in the \$200 per acre range. The Elsie tract is substantially higher. This is explained

 ⊕ = 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
					<p>by the fact that it has not been leveled in recent history, and some accounts have it never being leveled.</p> <p>Leveling aids in efficient farming, reduction of water use, reduction of farm chemical use, reduction in resistant weeds and in general, far greater sustainability.</p> <p>Staff requests authorization to spend an amount not to exceed \$45,000 for the Elsie tract leveling project and \$25,000 for the Bolen West leveling project. The contractor is Sopwith Farms.</p>
7	Action	Revised budget for 2007	Action	2.47	<p>⊕ The 2007 budget approved by the Board last December is in need of revision. The primary events leading to the need for revision include substantially lower fee income receipts and a substantially higher maintenance expense cause by the need to conduct more channel maintenance than expected. The lower fee revenue is a result of the general downturn in the real estate market. The added increase in maintenance is caused by a determination that more marsh complex channels were not as functional as first believed, and there was a need to restore them to full functionality in order to minimize temporal loss of the marsh complexes by the giant garter snake.</p> <p>Key numbers are as follows:</p> <p><u>Income</u></p> <p>--fee income is proposed to be reduced from \$8,236,400 to \$4,920,960</p> <p><u>Expenses</u></p> <p>--property maintenance budget is proposed to be increased from \$150,000 to \$1,194,000</p> <p>--administrative expense is proposed to be reduced from \$405,536 to \$373,615</p> <p>The revised budget proposes total revenues for 2007 to be \$5,959,454 and total expenses to be \$4,318,528 (cash basis).</p> <p>The Board is asked to approve the revised 2007 budget.</p>
8	Action	Transfer of mitigation credits from Tufts tract	Action	2.53	<p>⊕ Opus West's remaining and unused mitigation credits on the Conservancy's Tufts tract either have been or are proposed for sale to Brookfield California Land Holdings LLC. The unused credits total 32.1075 acres. The Conservancy owns the Tufts tract in fee, but Opus West used the majority of mitigation credits on the tract for the shopping center on the northeast corner of Truxel and I-80, and a</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
					<p>portion of the remaining mitigation credits was later sold to Griffin Industries for a housing subdivision on the southwest corner of Truxel and I-80.</p> <p>Brookfield has requested that the Board accept the transfer of credits to it from Opus West.</p>
9	Discussion	Natomas Central Mutual Water Company water supply contingency plan and groundwater substitution	No action	2.54	<p>⊕ Staff reported to the Board at the last Board meeting a proposal from the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company as to whether the Conservancy would be willing to forego delivery of water 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. (However, it appears water delivery reductions are less likely as summer has progressed.)</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>The Board authorized staff to execute and deliver a contract that would effectuate this action. In order to keep the Board fully apprised on the matter, the draft proposed contract is presented to the Board for discussion.</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	2.61	<p>○ A financial statement update will be provided for the period ended June 30, 2007 (unaudited).</p>
12	Discussion	Exploration of co-location with the Sacramento Tree Foundation	No action	∅	<p>○ 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.</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
13	Discussion	SAFCA presentation	No action	∅	○ Representatives from the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) will discuss with the Board its overall plans to strengthen levees in and around the Natomas Basin. Some of the actions proposed will directly impact Conservancy lands.
14	Discussion	Livestock report	No action	2.73	○ Staff will review with the Board the current situation regarding livestock based on the Board's request that it be provided updates periodically.
15	Discussion	Accounting treatment on non-HCP proceeds	No action	2.76	○ Staff follows up on a discussion at the last Board meeting to discuss treatment of assets derived from non-HCP functions.
16	Public Comments	Public Comments	No action	∅	○ Opportunity for members of the public to address the Conservancy's Board of Directors.
17	Executive Session	Executive Session – Real Estate	Action	Ⓢ	○ Executive Session for real estate.
18	Executive Director's Report	Executive Director's Report	No action	Ⓢ	○ Various matters for Board members' general information.
19	Adjournment	Adjournment	Admin.	∅	○ Official adjournment of the meeting.

 Ⓢ = 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.