

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY REGIONAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES

Monday, February 7, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Natasha Johnson at 12:31 p.m., via Zoom Meeting ID 820 2417 6588, in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing.

2. ROLL CALL

Board of Directors/Alternates Present

Kevin Jeffries
Karen Spiegel
Chuck Washington
Jeff Hewitt
Colleen Wallace
Julio Martinez
Jeff Cervantez
Larry Greene
Wes Speake
Clint Lorimore
Joe Males

Board of Directors Absent

Lorena Barajas Bisbee
Natasha Johnson
Lesa Sobek
Jonathan Ingram
Kevin Bash
David Starr Rabb
Patricia Lock Dawson
Crystal Ruiz
Maryann Edwards
Ben J. Benoit
V. Manuel Perez
David Marquez

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Board Member Lorimore.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Michele Staples, a representative for the Olsen Canyon property, provided comments for Closed Session Agenda Item 6B. Olsen Canyon submitted an appraisal for review by RCA's appraiser and received substantive comments in response. The appraisal is now in the process of being revised in response to the appraiser's comments. The revised appraisal was intended to be completed prior to today's meeting, but it will not be available until later this week. Olsen Canyon would like to request this matter be calendared for discussion until the February 16th Executive Committee, as RCA would have the benefit of the revised appraisal.

Matthew Ferree, a representative from Murrieta KLC Holdings 130 LLC, provided comments for Agenda Item 7G. There is an existing project, JPR Application #14-10-28-01, that has been in the negotiation process for a fee credit which was rejected based on a technicality in the past. The MSHCP Mitigation Fee Implementation Manual as presented will prevent properties from

pursing a fee credit. Language used in the manual will prevent properties from seeking an appropriate fee credit.

5. ADDITIONS / REVISIONS

There were no additions or revisions to the agenda.

6. CLOSED SESSION

Ed Sauls, a member of the public, reiterated Michele Staples comment regarding the Olsen Canyon property and asked that the Board delay action or discussion until the revised appraisal is received.

Lisa Mobley, Administrative Services Manager/Clerk of the Board, noted that written comments were received from Michele Staples and were distributed to the Board.

At this time, Steve DeBaun, legal counsel, announced the Board would be going in to Closed Session to discuss the three property items on the agenda.

6A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Agency Negotiator: Executive Director or Designee

Item	Property Description	Property Owner	Buyer(s)
1	283-060-001, 283-060-002, 283-100-013, 283-100-021, 283-110-013, 283-110-035, 283-380-002, 283-380-003, 283-380-004, 283-380-005, 283-390-004, 283-390-006, & 390-080-001	Olsen Canyon Properties, LLC	RCA
2	283-210-001	Ron Burek and Heather Burek, Trustees of the Ron and Heather Burek Living Trust	RCA
3	555-130-010 (portion)	Honey Pacifica Holdings, LLC	RCA

6B. REPORT OUT FROM CLOSED SESSION

There were no announcements from Closed Session.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR - *All matters on the Consent Calendar will be approved in a single motion unless a Board Member(s) requests separate action on specific item(s).*

Michele Staples, a member of the public, expressed concern about Agenda Item 7G. Ms. Staples expressed thanks to the RCA for the use of clarifying language on the ability of the county and

cities to accept pre-payment fees. As there have already been two MSHCP fee increases, it is requested that RCA apply pre-payment of fees retroactively to those developers that had asked to pay their fees in advance previously. It is also requested that RCA pull the fee credit section from the MSHCP Mitigation Fee Manual and today's Consent Calendar approval. There are several inconsistencies with the text of the MSHCP, and it is advised that an advisory committee be established including members of the regulated community to re-work the language of the fee credit provisions.

Ed Sauls, a member of the public, expressed a similar request to Ms. Staples, excluding the sections of the manual in Chapter 2 regarding fee credits and standards applied to when a fee credit is allowed to be used. These sections require further thought and discussion. A key issue is if the applicant didn't include the request for a fee credit in the HANs or JPR, RCA is not obligated to reimburse the owner for setting aside the land through fee credits.

Chair Johnson requested Agenda Item 7G be pulled from the Consent Calendar for further discussion.

M/S/C (Benoit/Ingram) to approve the following Consent Calendar items.

7A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JANUARY 10, 2022

7B. AB 361 DETERMINATION

- 1) Reaffirm the findings in Resolution No. 2021-016, *"A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority Authorizing Virtual Board and Committee Meetings Pursuant to AB 361"*. Those findings are as follows:
 - a. The Governor proclaimed a State of Emergency on March 4, 2020, related to the COVID-19 pandemic, which continues to exist today; and
 - b. State or local officials have recommended measures to promote social distancing.

7C. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT

This item is for the Board of Directors to receive and file the Quarterly Investment Report for the quarter ended September 30, 2021.

7D. ACQUISITIONS STATUS REPORT

This item is for the Board of Directors to receive and file the acquisitions status report as of November 30, 2021.

7E. JOINT PROJECT REVIEW STATUS REPORT

This item is for the Board of Directors to receive and file the Joint Project Review (JPR) monthly status report as of November 30, 2021.

7F. SINGLE SIGNATURE AUTHORITY REPORT

This item is for the Board of Directors to receive and file the Single Signature Authority report for the second quarter ended December 31, 2021.

7G. MSHCP MITIGATION FEE IMPLEMENTATION MANUAL UPDATE

Chair Johnson noted that there was three separate pieces of correspondence that was forwarded to Board Members. This manual update for consideration, is not a policy direction, this is to provide the member agencies an update. The Board can make additional recommendations or direction to staff based on policy items, if necessary. This discussion could also take place at the upcoming Stakeholders Committee in March.

Aaron Hake, Interim Regional Conservation Deputy Executive Director, confirmed that the purpose of this item is to update the manual based on the comments received from member agencies after the 6-month review process. This is an administrative document that was adopted by the Board along with the Nexus Study. At any time, the Board can direct staff to review any individual component of the manual and bring it back to the Board for approval. The elements raised in public comment today are not new, in one form or another, they have been in place since 2016 when the Board first adopted the fee credit policy.

Board Member Ingram asked general counsel if it was possible to separate out elements of the manual. Steve DeBaun, general counsel, noted at this point, the entire manual is before consideration for the Board, there aren't significant changes to the fee credit portions, so if it was removed there wouldn't be any substantive changes to the way the fee credits are handled by the member agencies.

Board Member Ingram wanted to know how RCA would address the public concerns expressed while moving forward. Mr. DeBaun noted there are several different options. The first option being to approve the changes presented today, and the Board could then direct further review of the manual or the fee credit verbiage to other committees in the agency. Another option would be to send the entire manual back including updates to another committee for consideration.

Board Member Ingram expressed not wanting to hold up the approval of the manual, but the issues brought forward by the public should be addressed, they are legitimate concerns. Mr. DeBaun recommended that the item should move forward as presented and if requested by the Board, staff can review the fee credit language through subsequent actions through committees or the Board.

Board Member Ingram asked what the timeline would be for review of the fee credit portion. Anne Mayer, Executive Director, noted that if the Board was to approve the manual today as is, then RCA and all member agencies would have a working document upon which to make decisions. Based on the letter and comments received yesterday and this morning, RCA can evaluate those comments, specifically whether a developer needs to identify a fee credit request at the JPR stage of the process over the next month. There is also a Stakeholders Committee meeting scheduled for March. RCA staff would be able to discuss the issues presented today to have a full understanding, bring this topic to the Stakeholders Committee meeting in March, and then come back to Board in April with input and feedback on what was discussed.

Board Member Ingram wanted to clarify that rather than 6 months to review this, the turnaround could be 90 days, as alluded to previously, this policy has been in place since 2016 so there shouldn't be a rush other than the fee structure portion that this is being amended. Ms. Mayer noted that the 6-month timeline was the committee effort with member agencies to address their administrative comments. With respect to being asked to review this policy today, it can certainly be done in less than 90 days, as the Stakeholders Committee in March would be a great jumping off point.

Ms. Mayer clarified regarding the pre-payment of fees; RCA allows for the pre-payment of fees only if the member agency allows the pre-payment of fees. If member agencies do not allow the pre-payment of fees, RCA cannot accept the payment. If the Board is asking RCA staff to review that portion, it would take longer than 90 days, because not all member agencies are willing to accept pre-payments.

Board Member Hewitt is concerned with the sequence of events, as in a few items we could be talking about an issue that goes against what was just passed. Ms. Mayer acknowledgement the comments and noted that even if the Board provided direction in the subsequent item that is different from the current manual, RCA staff would have to reconcile those and come back to the Board. If RCA staff is given direction to proceed on the fee credit item coming up, it will take months to evaluate the process and acquisition. In the meantime, a fee manual is needed for the member agencies to be able to operate. If this item isn't adopted today, then RCA isn't adopting the administrative changes that the cities and the county have requested for their own benefit.

Lisa Mobley, Administrative Services Manager/Clerk of the Board, noted that the RCA did receive three written comments on Agenda Item 7G from Greg Lowther, Geoff Willis, and Michele Staples.

Board Member Ingram asked that a timeline be added to the subsequent motion to let the Board know when this item would be coming back.

M/S/C (Johnson/Speake) to:

Approve the update to the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Mitigation Fee Implementation Manual as presented and give direction to the Stakeholders Committee to start to look at the subsequent items to start the process, providing an update to the Board in April.

Abstain: Males

7H. STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

This item is for the Board of Directors to receive and file an update on state and federal legislative affairs.

8. INTRODUCTION OF STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair Johnson reminded Board Members during the management transition last year, one of the top priorities was expanding resources and communication, as well as relaunching the Stakeholders Committee. The Stakeholders Committee will be used a tool and resource for the Board. The committee is intended to bring the community together, serving with various experience. The Stakeholders Committee members were invited to introduce themselves.

Dan Silver from the Endangered Habitats League.

Allison Renck from the Anza Aguanga area.

Cara Lacey representing The Nature Conservancy.

Michael Viramontes from the Rivers & Land Conservancy.

Bruce Colbert the Executive Director of the Property Owners Association of Riverside County.

Nicole Padron from the Rivers & Lands Conservancy.

Pam Nelson from the local Sierra Club.

Tuba Ebru Ozdi representing the Pechanga Band of Indians.

Ed Sauls the President of The Sauls Company.

Matthew Liesemeyer from 4M Engineering and Development.

Teri Biancardi representing the Meadowview Homeowners Association.

Julie Beeman representing the Building Industry Association.

Brian Bush the Vice President of Diversified Pacific.

Ileene Anderson a Senior Scientist at the Center for Biological Diversity.

Rick Neugebauer the President of the Santa Ana Watershed Association.

Chair Johnson expressed gratitude on behalf of the Board to the members of the Stakeholders Committee for their service. The diverse group should lend to serving RCA well.

Board Member Speake thanked the selection committee for a great job in choosing the Stakeholders Committee members. It's important to see the many names and faces that were around when the MSHCP was first formed.

Board Member Sobek welcomed the members of the Stakeholders Committee and thanked them for wanting to be part of this process.

This item is for the Chair to introduce the members of the RCA Stakeholders Committee.

At this time, Board Members Spiegel, Jeffries, Wallace, Males, and Ruiz left the meeting.

9. CITY OF MORENO VALLEY FEE CREDIT REQUEST FOR WORLD LOGISTICS CENTER

Lisa Mobley, Administrative Services Manager/Clerk of the Board, noted that six letters regarding this agenda item were received from George Hague, Greg Lowther, Drew Feldmann, Dan Silver, Susan Nash, and Gary Washburn and forwarded to the Board.

Steven Quintanilla, Interim City Attorney for the City of Moreno Valley, agrees that the implementation manual should be working and living document to accommodate changes in land use strategies regarding development, land conservation, and habitat conservation. It's important to be flexible and open minded when an opportunity is presented that would help meet RCA's policy goals and mission. This opportunity to set aside a little more than 2,700 acres of land in perpetuity, could be beneficial in the perspective of the MSHCP. The Board should ask staff to explore this opportunity with city counterparts, colleagues, Highland Fairview, and other local stakeholders. While the RCA does not have any obligations under the settlement agreement, that should not be the determining factor as to whether the provisions would be beneficial to the MSHCP.

George Hague, Conservation Chair of the Moreno Valley Group of the Sierra Club, expressed concern with the MSHCP and concept of internal buffers when it comes to protecting major reserves like the San Jacinto wildlife area. Based on the provided staff report, the opportunity to provide real buffers in habitat on the eastern side of the San Jacinto wildlife area, and even some real external buffers, from the World Logistics Center on the northern side. The City of Moreno Valley has plans for The Quail Ranch to be commercial, this in turn would cause Hot Springs to eventually follow suit, especially with Gillman Springs Road improvements.

Now is the time for the RCA to make it possible to acquire large continuous plots under single ownership, allowing for several Gillman Springs under crossings and linkages to Mystic Lake and other areas of the San Jacinto wildlife area, as well as providing important connections to local mountains. These donated lands will also provide significant habitat to the eastern part of the San Jacinto wildlife area. The Sierra Club hopes the Board will support staff's alternative two, to explore alternative mechanisms to make the donations happen while honoring the commitment to the MSHCP.

Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League, noted that while it is a unique opportunity to acquire large parcels under a single ownership, there are major problems with the fee credit approach. The Board is urged to direct staff to explore alternative mechanisms for bringing these parcels into the system. The alternative approaches can be consistent with current RCA policies and practices regarding payment of mitigation fees and with continued RCA discretion over which properties are to be acquired. Highland Fairview and other parties should be part of the discussion in a collaborative approach.

Susan Nash, President of The Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley, suggested that because the original HANs was under Section B, which does not allow off-site lands to be acquired and receive a fee credit, that the process be changed or re-filed by Highland Fairview as an evaluation for which a developer application is not intended to be filed. That process wouldn't have a restriction in the MSHCP or the policy regarding what incentives may be offered. This would give structure to the negotiations under a joint project acquisition review process.

Ed Sauls, a member of the public, noted that it was appropriate that full consideration be given to the proposal from the city and the landowner.

Iddo Benzeevi, Highland Fairview, noted his support of the City of Moreno Valley's request to consider the contribution of land for conservation in lieu of MSHCP fees. These properties provide a valuable addition to conservation within Riverside County and support RCA's mission. This is a unique opportunity to add much needed land in Western Riverside County for conservation that otherwise would not have been obtainable.

Garret Sauls, a member of the public, noted that this is a unique opportunity for the RCA to acquire a significant amount of land all under one ownership. This land is approximately 3% of the additional reserve lands that are necessary for RCA. The pros outweigh the cons on this proposal, however, there are significant challenges proposed to RCA including fiscal impact. It would be extremely difficult for RCA to complete Core 3 and complete the linkage without this acreage. RCA staff and Board are strongly suggested to look at potentially acquiring this acreage by fee credit or other means.

Ileene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity, notes there is a great benefit in bringing these lands into the reserve system. There should be ways to make this happen and staff should be directed to find ways to bring these lands into the system.

Tom Paulek, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (retired), noted due to his experience with the San Jacinto wildlife area, he was very knowledgeable concerning the wildlife resources in Western Riverside County, the County Wildlife Program, and the MSHCP. It is important for RCA Board Members and the public to understand and recognize that the MSHCP is an incidental take permit, pursuant to the Federal and State Endangered Species Act. The MSHCP permits or allows the killing and destruction of the habitats of 146 species of plants and animals throughout Western Riverside County. In return, for the granting of the incidental take permit, Riverside County, the cities, state, and federal wildlife agencies are obligated to acquire 153,000 acres of land to affect wildlife habitat connectivity between the already existing public land conservation reserves. The San Jacinto wildlife area is the most diverse of the existing conservation reserves in the MSHCP system, providing habitat for 65-70 of the 146 MSHCP species subject to incidental takes. Whether the RCA or the Department of Fish and Wildlife are the grantee of the donation lands, the RCA would be able to credit the full 2,737 acres of donation to the land acquisition obligations under the MSHCP incidental take permits.

Aaron Hake, Interim Regional Conservation Deputy Executive Director, provided a presentation on the City of Moreno (City) Valley Fee Credit Request: World Logistics Center. The Board had previously considered this item at the December Board Closed Session under property negotiations and had declined to negotiate for the properties. Last month, it was requested this item be revisited in open session. The City has now updated their request with additional acreage proposed for conservation and some additional details on how the City would like the transaction to occur.

The City's request is that RCA approve a fee credit for the World Logistic Center in exchange for approximately 2,700 acres of conservation land. In general, the properties proposed for conservation have potential conservation value to the MSHCP, through much due diligence is still needed as some properties may have management issues that will require vetting and features that may not be suitable for the reserve. The City has proposed this fee credit because of a settlement agreement between the applicant Highland Fairview and Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley, RCA is not party to the settlement agreement or the litigation that proceeded it, therefore this Board is not bound by the terms of the settlement agreement. The City's formal request letter makes numerous assumptions that public agencies such as the RCA will take actions to implement the settlement agreement and makes several claims about the conditions of the properties.

The City's request is not compliant with the RCA Fee Credit Policy in two aspects, and therefore staff recommends denial of the City's request. The two aspects of the policy that are the basis of the staff recommendation are not new and have been part of the policy since 2016. The two requirements are the on-site conservation for the project and that the fee credit be requested as part of the Joint Project Review (JPR). The purpose of this policy is to provide incentives to landowners who are looking to develop their property and are dedicating some of the property on the project site for conservation, it's a financial incentive the MSHCP contemplates.

The RCA Board has also adopted fiscal policies, including a budget and the 2020 Nexus Study, that puts the organization on a more sustainable and responsible financial footing. It's an

important reminder to the Board that the fees that are paid by developers to the City or the county, don't just pay for land acquisition for RCA, but also the long- and short-term management cost for the properties that have been acquired. One of the most significant aspects is the permanent endowment which is supposed to take care of the perpetual management of the habitat acquired during the acquisition period over the next several years. When a fee credit is offered, that credit would take from the endowment and the near-term management costs.

Based on the Board's adopted policies, staff recommends the City's request be denied, however, if the Board would like to entertain this transaction, staff has come up with two alternatives. The first alternative is to direct staff to develop a new fee credit policy and bring it back to the Board for consideration. The second alternative is to negotiate a transaction for the ~2,700 acres aside from what the policy is today.

Steve DeBaun, general counsel, noted that this is a limited item for discussion, and made it clear that the purpose of this agenda item is only for the Board to direct staff whether to further consider the fee credit request from the City of Moreno Valley. Any further action on the fee credit request, has not been agenzized for this meeting.

Board Member Washington noted that since this issue was first visited in December, his position has not changed. The input from the environmental community is valued, out of respect for the process and Board policy, this does not adhere to the process and the fee credit would take a bite out of the bottom fiscal line. Consequently, giving a fee credit to this project would further exacerbate the problem with more trucks on the already congested freeways adding to poor quality and harming the environment.

Board Member Ingram noted his advocacy in lieu of fees in anyway possible. The Board has made exceptions to that policy in the past. Projects throughout the County have already gotten entitlements and are able to build if they choose to. The concern is, there is a need to conserve this property. The purpose behind the plan was to assemble the linkage in total, to ensure there was a synergy between environment and development. This property is a critical piece of land, that's extraordinarily expensive. This needs to be reviewed, and where there are opportunities for land that already have entitlements, the Board should be able to come back and see the value that it brings. As the plan is being assembled, RCA is creating value around islands. This is something that should come back for discussion, not for just this project, but any project.

Board Member Sobek appreciated all the public comments received on this item. It may be in the best interests to continue this item for further discussion, perhaps even with the Executive Committee. There are several questions and concerns surrounding this including the endowment, the sustainable long-term costs of the project, determining what would be financially feasible for RCA, the time and effort required of staff, and who would pay for that time. The decision on this shouldn't be hurried and should be continued.

Board Member Nash reflected on the bigger picture, where on the freeway there are sometimes two to three lanes of back-to-back trucks. While it's understandable the RCA wants to have this

land, and some environmental groups are trying to protect the land, it does feel like there is some picking and choosing when it comes to areas of conservation. The most upsetting part of this is the trading of 2,700 acres, that RCA does want, with hundreds of miles of congestion.

At this time, Board Member Bash left the meeting.

Board Member Hewitt stated he tends to get nervous whenever there are this many conservationists in the same meeting as he is on the opposite side in favor of more houses and bringing jobs to the Riverside County. Although, this item is not about whether the RCA approves of the World Logistics Center, that has already been litigated. This agenda item is about fulfilling the main objective of the RCA, to acquire suitable land so the County isn't one paved over parking lot. Gillman Springs Road is very dangerous and if this property is let go it will be purchased by someone else, if it is brought into RCA, it would help keep the traffic down. The newly built wildlife undercrossing by the 60 trucks lanes would feed into this property, which is a great way to go. The total added acreage in the last two years is probably less than the 2,700 acres offered. The RCA is behind the goal and the cost of land in Southern California isn't going to be getting any cheaper going forward. The RCA has a city and a property owner in total agreement, as well as a host of environmental advocates saying they'd love to see the lands added to the system.

Board Member Hewitt made a motion for Alternative #2, negotiate for the ~2,700 acres outside of current policy.

Board Member Speake thanked staff for the report, it was very clear and concisely laid out the issues. Past experiences show the value in acquiring a large piece of land. However, the financial deterrent that could fall to the RCA is substantial. Just as land isn't going to be getting cheaper, managing these lands won't get cheaper. The RCA needs to protect its' endowment and how the lands and projects are funded going forward, is as important.

Board Member Speake wanted to confirm that the agreement stipulated that this land is to go into some sort of protection, whether through the RCA or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Mr. Hake confirmed that was correct.

Board Member Speake also wanted to confirm that the agreement between the two parties had some sort of endowment for these lands to be taken care of in perpetuity. Anne Mayer, Executive Director, noted that the settlement agreement had a lot of requirements in respect to what happens to the land when and if it receives a fee credit and to whom it goes. It should be noted that RCA is not responsible for implementation of the settlement agreement, so there is caution in speaking about what the agreement requires. The focus of the RCA would be on the City's request related to acquiring the property through a fee credit or alternative #2. Any lands that the RCA would acquire, would go into conservation in perpetuity.

Board Member Ingram thought it would be important to allow the attorney who drafted the agreement to weigh in. Chair Johnson noted before that, it was important to get to all the Board Members as it was their time to speak.

Chair Johnson was impressed with the public participation and the comments provided. Understanding that this is a vital part of the RCA's acreage allocation and how the success of the plan is formulated. At face value this appears to be something that the RCA should jump on based on the size, but there is also a focus on changing the reputation of the RCA and the way it does business following the policies and procedures. The RCA shouldn't be making decisions on what is attractive to the agency. If the policy needs to change so this type of action is incorporated, that's what should be done.

Chair Johnson made an alternative motion that the RCA deny the City of Moreno Valley's fee credit request for the World Logistics Center, with the addition that this does need to be brought back to the Stakeholder Committee and policy going forward. Board Member Washington seconded the motion.

Board Member Ingram noted that while he had no other comments, the Board is aware how he has felt about this subject for some time about the policy itself. There are some inaccuracies in what is being stated here today as the property can be developed, which is why he asks that the attorney who drafted the settlement is allowed to speak prior to making a motion.

Chair Johnson noted that if there is a subsequent motion, and the Board would like to make it, a call for the vote has not been made.

Board Member Washington thanked the Chair for following protocol, noting that typically in a meeting like this, input is taken from the public first and then elected officials make their comments. The public has already had their opportunity to speak, this is not a town hall meeting. Going back to the cost of this, the City did not request a fee credit when this project was approved back in 2013/2014. The City approved this project with their eye on economic development that would benefit their city, but the rest of the County is paying the price for the potential development. The RCA shouldn't undertake this for the sole benefit of the City of Moreno Valley while the rest of the County pays the price.

Board Member Lock Dawson wanted clarification on whether the denial of the fee credit request today would in any way take away the ability to go back and purchase the lands later. Ward Simmons, general counsel, noted that this was correct and the issue of purchasing the lands could be brought back later.

Board Member Hewitt noted that he had made a motion earlier and no one had asked for a second for it. The substitute motion offered by the Chair was made afterwards and got an immediate second.

Chair Johnson appreciated the comment, but hearing a motion causes a pause and a question for further discussion. As there was no second motion, the meeting moved on.

Board Member Sobek asked Chair Johnson to clarify her motion. Chair Johnson stated the motion is to deny the City of Moreno Valley fee credit request for the World Logistics Center,

as recommended by staff, and to bring back the fee credit policy to the Stakeholders Committee and staff.

Board Member Ingram noted when appropriate, he would like to make a counter motion.

Board Member Ingram made a motion to bring this item back for discussion and not denying the City's request at this time.

Board Member Washington noted that Board Member Ingram's motion was not one of the three items brought forward by staff. The options are to direct staff to develop a new fee credit policy, to negotiate outside of current policy, or deny the City's request.

Board Member Ingram amended his motion to direct staff to amend the policy regarding the fee credit.

Chair Johnson asked for general counsel's clarification on the item. Mr. Simmons noted that the Board would need to act on the motion on the floor.

Board Member Washington wanted clarification if the Board policy was to allow subsequent motions without acting on the original motion.

Mr. Simmons asked the Chair if she would accept the amendment made by Board Member Ingram to her original motion. Chair Johnson noted that she was not in acceptance with the amendment.

M/S/C (Johnson/Washington) to:

Deny the fee credit request from the City of Moreno Valley for World Logistics Center and bring the fee credit policy to the Stakeholders Committee and staff for discussion.

No: Hewitt, Cervantez, Ingram, Edwards

10. BOARD OF DIRECTORS / EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Anne Mayer, Executive Director, introduced Sergio Vidal the new Chief Financial Officer for RCA/RCTC. Mr. Vidal comes from the City of Santa Ana serving multiple different roles.

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business for consideration by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority Board of Directors, Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 2:43 p.m. The next meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled to be held on **Monday, March 7, 2022.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lisa Mobley". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Lisa Mobley
Administrative Services Manager/
Clerk of the Board