

# **WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY REGIONAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY**

## **STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 20, 2023**

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Stakeholders Committee was called to order by Executive Director Anne Mayer at 2:00 p.m., in the March Field Conference Room at the County of Riverside Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, Third Floor, Riverside, California, 92501.

### **2. ROLL CALL**

#### **Members/Alternates Present**

Teri Biancardi  
Bruce Colbert  
Pam Nelson  
Tuba Ebru Ozdil  
Nicole Padron  
Edwin Sauls  
Dan Silver  
Michael Viramontes

#### **Members Absent**

Ileene Anderson  
Julie Beeman  
Brian Bush  
Cara Lacey  
Matthew Liesemeyer  
Rick Neugebauer  
Allison Renck

### **3. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no requests to speak from the public.

### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – OCTOBER 19, 2022**

**M/S/C (Biancardi/Ozdil) to approve the Minutes as submitted. There were no objections to this motion.**

### **5. PRESENTATION – RABBIT AND BONNY FIRE UPDATE**

Zack West, Manager of Reserve Management and Monitoring, provided a presentation on the Rabbit and Bonny fires and their effect on RCA owned lands.

The Rabbit Fire burned from July 14<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup>, burning 8,283 acres officially, and approximately 850 of those acres were RCA owned conserved lands. This did not affect federally owned MSHCP conserved lands. The impacted RCA owned lands consist of the Wolfskill-Driscoll and Tax Sale Parcels 2019 Detail 3 properties, and less than a 2-acre portion of the RCA CalMat property. Based on communication from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, who is the adjacent landowner to the ignition source, the fire started on private property south of the intersection of Gilman Springs Road and Jackrabbit Trail near Mystic Lake.

The Bonny Fire burned from July 27<sup>th</sup> to August 9<sup>th</sup>, burning 2,322 acres officially per Cal Fire, including roughly 459 acres of RCA owned reserve lands. In addition, 1,087 acres of federally owned MSHCP conserved lands were also affected. Impacted RCA-owned lands consist of the Santos, Reden, JPR Inc, Tax Properties 2009 Detail 6, and the Jennings properties. The fire started on private property near the intersection of Bonny Lane and Short Street in Aguanga. For both fires, the causes remain under investigation by Cal Fire.

Vegetation was cleared on the RCA Reden Property to create a fuel break for the Bonny Fire. The RCA actively coordinated with Cal Fire during both fires. During the Rabbit Fire, the RCA MSHCP Parks Unit opened gates for responders and coordinated access with Incident Command. Similarly, during the Bonny Fire, the RCA MSHCP Parks Unit was present at Incident Command daily and supported by providing information on access to RCA lands.

MSHCP Parks staff has performed post-fire assessment of the affected properties.

- The affected RCA lands associated with both fires support several rare species and their continued presence is needed to meet the MSHCP species objectives.
- For plants this includes Jaeger's milk vetch and Coulter's goldfields in the Rabbit Fire burn scar; and peninsular spineflower and Payson's jewelflower in the Bonny Fire burn scar. Some of these species may benefit from the fire in that they are "fire following species."
- There are several areas that burned during the Rabbit Fire where coastal California gnatcatcher, loggerhead shrike, and northwestern San Diego pocket mouse have been documented. The Rabbit Fire appears to have burned quickly and with lower intensity over RCA lands, and many cactus patches and riparian areas are expected to recover.
- There are several areas where Quino checkerspot butterfly (Quino) and Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR) habitat is documented in the Bonny Fire burn scar, which burned with greater intensity.

It will be important to support the repopulation of native plants in the burn areas so that non-native plant species do not invade. RCA will be reaching out to burn and restoration ecologists to determine best steps and what grant opportunities may support the rehabilitation needed.

Aaron Hake, Deputy Executive Director, noted that this was the second year in a row where a significant amount of RCA lands were damaged due to fires. This calls to attention RCA's wildfire management policy and coordination with dealing with fire authorities. It was discovered that while there is an efficient response system with the Parks Department, there is a Board policy that was adopted in 2009 on fuel management suppression that has not been updated since. Now is the time for RCA to take a fresh look at that policy and ensure it is up-to-date, compatible with the MSHCP, and includes input from Cal Fire to make sure any new plan would be consistent.

Dan Silver wanted to know if there were any post-fire practices that RCA was considering in areas that were burned or bulldozed for the fire break.

Zack West noted that RCA does work with Cal Fire when the dozer lines are cut to have the material chucked up as opposed to leaving it flat to contain erosion. The two biggest items are to go through and look at how the host plants are responding in the winter and spring, to see if they are passively restoring or if additional invention is required and staying on top of the non-native plant species so they do not become invasive.

Ebru Ozdil recommended that any fire management policies are also consulted with the local tribes and identification of the species and local plants that the tribes may be gathering. Even after the fires, there are a lot of resources that can be gathered to help with non-native species. Some of the species are culturally significant and there are cultural resources as well.

Anne Mayer, Executive Director, added that part of RCA's outreach will be for Cal Fire, but also, depending on the incident and where the fire is, coordination may be needed with multiple different state and federal services. RCA is doing its' due diligence to understand the issues for firefighting prevention and things that can be done upfront to erase barriers in advance of fire.

## **6. PRESENTATION – LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Tyler Madary, Legislative Affairs Manager, provided a presentation on the Legislative update. Last Thursday, RCA was awarded \$8.9 million in Section 6 grant funds from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for MSHCP land acquisition. The award was the largest made in California and represented over 22% of the \$40 million awarded nation-wide in this cycle. These funds will go towards the acquisition of ecologically significant areas including key wildlife movement linkages, key priority conservation areas, and parcels that support key populations of MSHCP protected species.

This award was in part made possible by close coordination between RCA staff and the wildlife agencies field staff regarding which habitats to propose for acquisition, as well as the work that was done last year with the National Habitat Conservation Planning Coalition and USFWS to streamline the program guideline in a manner that improves its' effectiveness for plans like the MSHCP.

The legislature and the Governor continue to hold discussions regarding potential legislation for a Natural Resources Bond Measure on the November 2024 general election ballot. RCA supports two Natural Resources Bond proposals proposed to the legislature AB 1567 (Eduardo Garcia) and SB 867 (Ben Allen). AB 1567 and SB 867 have varying faultline spending and programmatic spending, but RCA supports the proposed infusion of funding to the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) for habitat conservation and the proposed funding for nature-based solutions to climate change which would balance cuts made in this years' budget cycle.

However, both bills are currently stalled in the legislature as they continue to negotiate with the Governor on the proposal for placement on the ballot in November 2024. RCA staff will

continue to advocate for the infusion of funding for the WCB for projects such as land acquisition and support of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and habitat conservation in general.

As with all RCA goals and legislative actions, the goal is to ensure the long-term success of the MSHCP, which is tasked with acquiring 153,000 acres of additional reserve lands. One of the challenges that the MSHCP faces is limited Section 6 funding slows progress towards the federal commitment to the MSHCP. As a competitive program, RCA must dedicate a lot of staff time to secure these limited funds that are not guaranteed. Establishing a National Wildlife Refuge in Western Riverside County was intended to provide a new pot of funding for land acquisitions outside of the competitive process.

Utilizing the wildlife refuge this way was carefully considered by the RCA Board in 2017, resulting in the adoption of a resolution supporting the establishment of one in Western Riverside County. Thereafter, three bills were introduced including the efforts of Representative Ken Calvert and Senator Diane Feinstein. RCA was differential to the bill authors and generally supportive of any effort that would result in a refuge. H.R. 972 by Representative Calvert proposed a process by which the Department of the Interior would establish a refuge within the MSHCP boundary. Senator Feinstein took a narrower approach in S. 4669, by proposing an acquisition boundary which in there were three sub-regions in the MSHCP that would limit where the refuge could be established. Consequently, the publishing of the map with Senator Feinstein's bill promoted a lot of strong and negative comments from stakeholders in the region. Ultimately, the congressional session concluded without either bill passing, and the legislation is now dead.

The efforts of the last few years have been very instructive for RCA staff. RCA has taken note of stakeholder response through the process and have renewed the discussion in 2023 with a new draft composition map. One of the many takeaways from 2022, was that the USFWS requires a refuge acquisition boundary map to determine where the final refuge would be established. To be clear, having a map is a requirement for any future bill and staff took the initiative to create a draft map so that it was not completed for us. This also gave the RCA the strategic advantage of conducting stakeholder interviews firsthand.

This year, RCA was given the charge by Representative Calvert, offices of Senator Feinstein, Senator Padilla, and Representative Issa to take a leading role in conducting stakeholder outreach to ensure a thorough understanding of the proposal and to incorporate feedback from the map. Thereafter, RCA staff began engaging permittees and those that engaged in the process last year, as well as those that could have overlapped or adjacent interests. The outreach grew organically over time.

As staff began the stakeholders outreach effort, there was a set of guiding principles to focus the discussion and ensure the best possible outcome from the RCA, the MSHCP, and the surrounding communities. These concepts incorporated feedback as well as lessons learned from previous efforts. They were:

1. The focus of the refuge is to meet the federal land commitment to the MSHCP.
2. Downsize acquisition boundary to criteria cells for ease of USFWS management, focus on high-value habitat, and maintaining MSHCP compromises.
3. Land must be acquired from willing sellers and donors of land.
4. Property owners within acquisition boundary experience no change to rights or title.
5. Properties incorporated into a refuge maintain existing easements and access rights.

There was a great deal of feedback received from the various stakeholders. In summary, local stakeholder feedback on the refuge efforts included:

- Respecting the sovereignty of our tribal partners.
- Ensuring refuge land acquired from willing sellers and donors.
- Refuge land contributes to MSHCP and federal land commitments without moving the goal posts of how much land must be acquired.
- Preserving rights and access for future utilities infrastructure not just existing.
- Allowing wildfire response and suppression.
- Preventing material expansion of refuge acquisition boundary.

This feedback was in alignment with the guiding concepts identified and RCA staff shared these concepts and stakeholder draft bill language with Senator Feinstein and Representative Calvert's offices for their review. Introduction of legislation is not a forgone conclusion, but frankly, RCA does not anticipate it to proceed this year. This is based on differences being encountered in the region and, in particular, uncertainty about whether the refuge would have the resources.

The intent of establishing a National Wildlife Refuge from 2017 to present was to open a new pipeline of federal funding for land acquisition for the MSHCP and to reduce some of the future land management burden from the RCA. RCA's leadership role in the stakeholder outreach was done at the request and requirements of Senator Feinstein and Representative Calvert before they would consider introducing new legislation this year. While staff has completed this work, at the end of the day the goal is to bring state and federal funding to the MSHCP anyway, anyhow, which requires RCA to be nimble in its' strategy.

There is a new opportunity that RCA is pursuing, through the course of the Senate's review of appropriations bills, a \$100 million rescission of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was proposed for unused parks grants distributed by states. This follows the news from earlier this year that the Department of Defense and Department of the Interior announced a joint program that taps into these unused LWCF state park funds. Conservation advocates and boosters of the LWCF program are advocating to the Senate to not rescind these funds or shift them to other LWCF program to preserve the overall funding to LWCF accounts. The National HCP Coalition in coordination with RCA staff see an opportunity.

RCA has a perennial effort to advocate for increased funding for HCP land acquisition programs, the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund. The fund is authorized by Section 6 of the Endangered Species Act and referred to as Section 6 Grants. The program is oversubscribed

relative to applications received from HCPs around the country, particularly from California where development pressures increase the cost of land acquisition. For 2024, \$26 million has been proposed for this program, when the National HCP Coalition and RCA has been advocating for \$85 million a year. Advocacy efforts have gone out to Congress, USFWS, and the Council of Environmental Quality. RCA is supportive of a straight funding increase to the program or by shifting of funds from other programs that are not utilized, like the LWCF funds.

The Coalition and RCA doubled engagement with Senator Feinstein and Senator Padilla in support of reallocating some or all the \$100 million from stateside Parks Programs to HCP land acquisition. If this effort is successful, it could open the doors for increased ongoing federal funding to HCP land acquisitions and improve RCA's prospects for increased Section 6 awards in future years.

RCA staff are going to continue to pursue all angles to increase federal funding to the MSHCP and will keep the Stakeholders Committee apprised of the efforts.

Pam Nelson wanted more details on the \$8.9 million grant that was awarded for French Valley and whether the money would only be used for acquisitions in the French Valley or would be spread across the plan area.

Aaron Gabbe, Regional Conservation Director, noted that there are two sub-regions within Core 2 area of the MSHCP. RCA packaged the ask in the two sub-regions with the goal that each packet is to fill in, expand, and connect the existing cores. There is a need for the reserves to be larger and interconnected so the focus was on one area where there are a lot of little pieces of the puzzle. They were then prioritized because there was no assurance that RCA would receive the full amount requested. RCA had asked for just under \$15 million.

Zack West, Manager of Reserve Management and Monitoring, added that something that was asked of RCA staff from the last round of Section 6 grants was to focus on smaller tighter areas with each ask. RCA staff prioritized areas based on the recommendations received.

Pam Nelson also wanted more information on the bills that were mentioned in the presentations.

Tyler Madary noted that the proposed bond measures are massive and would cover a wide variety of purposes. These bills are for natural resources, but would also go towards water programs, energy, climate resilience, and conservation. The legislation for these has not passed, so there is no bond measure yet.

Anne Mayer, Executive Director, added that if an agreement is reached these bond measures could be on the ballot in November 2024 for California voters.

Pam Nelson asked if the Stakeholders Committee would also have a chance to review the map that was put together by RCA staff.

Tyler Madary explained that staff started out with engaging those that had directly reached out from the map release previously. There were over 30 organizations who were part of the engagement, including permittees, the cities, the County, environmental organizations, utilities, property owner organizations, and the regional tribes. It was an organic process, and the small team of staff could not reach everyone, but it was the most thorough outreach that was conducted to date.

Pam Nelson thought that members of the Stakeholders Committee should be informed of new acquisitions or proposed acquisitions. The Committee could also provide suggestions and feedback on acquisition and restoration.

Ebru Ozdil wanted clarification on the grant money that was received, and if the entirety of the \$8.9 million would be used for all of Core 2 or just acquisitions that would improve the existing land.

Aaron Gabbe noted that there is a conceptual map in which the reserved land is described and the need to acquire 153,000 acres which is really completed one acquisition at a time as pieces of a puzzle. For this grant, RCA staff focused on two specific areas where a handful of parcels could really fix and connect existing conserved areas. These grants need to ideally have willing sellers to make the ask more fruitful. Once the grant is approved, RCA is restricted to buying only the parcels that were described in the proposal.

Bruce Colbert wanted to know what the total amount of Section 6 grant funding that RCA has received since 2004.

Aaron Hake, Deputy Executive Director, stated that would be a follow-up item that staff would need to research and provide to the Committee.

Anne Mayer noted that the Section 6 grant has historically paled in comparison to what RCA needs. The fact that RCA did get \$8.9 million in the last round, which was the largest award, relates to the pressures that have been made by the MSHCP and the commitments that were made. RCA is hopeful the large award means staff put together a package they liked and was meaningful, but also that RCA is being so vocal that we are starting to get more attention than we have in the past.

Dan Silver thought it was disappointing that the \$26 million Section 6 grant cap has not been raised despite ongoing lobbying. It is particularly disappointing because when the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which funds the Section 6 grants, was expanded a few years ago to a mandatory expenditure of \$900 million a year, it was thought that a good chunk would go to land acquisition.

Edwin Sauls wanted clarification on the land requirement from the Federal Government because it was reading like their obligation was 56,000 acres.

Aaron Hake clarified that in that 56,000 acres there are two state agencies, Caltrans and State Parks, who are called for specific acreage requirements of the 56,000. Informally, RCA staff has interpreted it as the 56,000 being split evenly between the State and Federal Governments. There is no further specificity in the MSHCP as to who has what share.

Edwin Sauls wanted to know of the 56,000 acres that are split between the state and federal requirements is still outstanding.

Aaron Gabbe stated that approximately, the state and federal combined have contributed about 44% of their required 56,000.

Bruce Colbert asked if there was a known amount needed to acquire the remaining state and federal share.

Aaron Gabbe did not have an amount and any given would be a guess, but according to the Nexus Study it was \$13,400 per acre which only differed about \$200 an acre from the 2004 study.

Edwin Sauls stated that in the Nexus Study the figure that was used was \$1.6 billion.

Aaron Gabbe thought that amount might be for the total remaining land commitment.

Edwin Sauls asked for the specific recommendation that was shared with Senator Feinstein and Representative Calvert's staff.

Tyler Madary stated that staff did not provide a recommendation for them, and they had only requested staff to outreach and present feedback to their offices. All the information was forwarded and they have started to hear some of the concerns from the region. They have also communicated with the USFWS who has expressed concerns with resources available for a refuge.

Edwin Sauls wanted to know what the expectation was for the Stakeholders Committee relative to the wildlife refuge legislation.

Anne Mayer stated that there was not an expectation for the Committee relative to the wildlife refuge, in that RCA was asked to gather stakeholder feedback. At this point, RCA will be monitoring to see what if anything the offices will do with the information provided. There is currently no bill pending or additional action for RCA to take.

Edwin Sauls wanted to know why RCA was in a holding pattern.

Anne Mayer stated the hold pattern was because neither of the bills mentioned were moving forward. Neither Feinstein nor Calvert have an active bill, nor have they indicated they will be moving forward with an active bill.

Edwin Sauls wanted to clarify that with a bill that was designed to benefit the MSHCP, the RCA made no recommendations for.

Anne Mayer noted that staff shared the principals that RCA were concerned about in connection with a Wildlife Refuge bill, and shared what was important.

Edwin Sauls thought that due to a lack of specificity from RCA there is a lot of misinformation about what is recommended or expected. There is a level of confusion about the maps that were originally distributed and concerns from people that the RCA has not funded the program they already have. There is a vagueness about RCA's position and there are rumors that RCA will grab for far more than the MSHCP.

Anne Mayer stated that in all the meetings that RCA has had with stakeholders, the important guiding principles were shared. The rumors about RCA and MSHCP have not changed since the day the original map was published and have been uncontrollable, regardless of how many meetings have occurred and how many variations of a map have been presented. The imbedded concerns that RCA is hearing were related to many of the guiding principles.

Tyler Madary reiterated the guiding principles to ensure they were clear:

1. The focus of the refuge is to meet the federal land commitment to the MSHCP.
2. Downsize acquisition boundary to criteria cells for ease of USFWS management, focus on high-value habitat, and maintaining MSHCP compromises.
3. Land must be acquired from willing sellers and donors of land.
4. Property owners within acquisition boundary experience no change to rights or title.
5. Properties incorporated into a refuge maintain existing easements and access rights.

Edwin Sauls wanted to confirm that the map RCA was proposing would not exceed the MSHCP criteria cells.

Tyler Madary confirmed that the last several iterations and concepts maps that were circulated with stakeholders in the region and the offices were all limited to criteria cells.

Anne Mayer added that the ease of management for the USFWS was in response to the original map that had scattered areas outside of the MSHCP and throughout Western Riverside County. Ease of management also looked at what lands are adjacent to areas they are already responsible for.

Tyler Madary shared several different iterations of maps that changed as meetings with regional stakeholders took place.

Edwin Sauls wanted to know what RCA's recommendation was.

Anne Mayer stated that RCA did not have a recommendation.

Tyler Madary added that conversations with the author's office have been very thorough, and they have been walked through the RCA's experiences in managing the MSHCP and what is seen as a priority to achieve those goals, the concerns raised by stakeholders, and what the gaps were in-between those.

Edwin Sauls thought it seemed like RCA was unwilling to put anything on the table as a recommendation.

Anne Mayer stated the last iteration of the map represents what RCA has heard from many of the stakeholders, even so this map does not represent everything from stakeholders because there are others out there who would be impacted by the refuge boundary and do not agree with it. RCA is at a point where there are so many stakeholders who would be impacted by the creation of the refuge, who will not ever believe that the overlay of a federal refuge on top of their private property is going to be to their benefit. The wildlife agencies have also expressed that they do not have the resources for the refuge, there is no money attached to this bill. If there was money attached to a refuge bill, it might be worth the turmoil and potential damage to the MSHCP, but there are no resources and no money. At this point, neither Representative Calvert nor Senator Feinstein is moving forward with a bill.

Edwin Sauls thought that was due to a lack of leadership. If the head of the RCA is not willing to put on the table specific recommendations about the best map, how could they be willing to do anything. The Board should take a position.

Anne Mayer reiterated that staff has done what was asked of them and have provided the map and language that works with RCA and the MSHCP. RCA has also provided language that was passed on by other stakeholders. The offices are currently reviewing all that information. If either office came back that they thought the timing was right, RCA would re-engage. They are not moving forward with either bill. The RCA Board has not taken a position on specific language and the map, but they have been provided to the author's offices.

Dan Silver thought that while this is disappointing if the offices have decided not to move forward after receiving the requested input what were their reasons.

Anne Mayer noted that RCA had done extensive outreach with the tribal partners and even with the reduced map it is not clear that they would support the map, which borders two sides of their tribal properties. There are a lot of other stakeholder partners including the water district, infrastructure, flood control activities, and private property rights. While the final map presented works for the MSHCP, it is unlikely there will ever be consensus about the refuge. The damage done by the initial map is hard to come back from.

Pam Nelson agreed that the public opinion is that the federal government is going to be taking private property.

Anne Mayer agreed that no matter how many conversations have been had with details, the same level of confusion continues. The concern also becomes will this damage the MSHCP.

Dan Silver mentioned the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge as an example, this was established administratively, not by an act of congress. It has been successful even with surrounding tribal areas and property right concerns. While the offices have decided now is not the time to take a bill forward, there are other options to achieve the goal to get federal funding and management.

Bruce Colbert shared the beauty of the Stakeholders Committee was the forum it presented to work out and discuss these types of issues. This helps in lessening confusion and could help diffuse some situations.

Dan Silver wanted to know if RCA staff thought that a bill would not be able or possible to address all the concerns and guiding principles that were brought forward.

David Knudsen, External Affairs Director, stated to put this process in perspective, crafting legislation is tedious and time consuming. To deal with some of these concepts requires clauses and exemptions. In this piece of legislation there is something called a savings clause. A savings clause is what is carved out in the process to provide access to future or existing infrastructure, property rights, or cultural access for tribes. There was an author who stated they were not going to be precedent setting in the savings clause, which would leave using whatever exists in current statute for the savings clause. If the savings clause is not comprehensive enough to accommodate the requests of utilities, property owners, and other stakeholders, that is a line in the sand that RCA may never be able to get through.

Aaron Hake added that the author's office is also taking into consideration what the administration will accept and what assistance they can get from the agency that will be part of the implementation.

Anne Mayer stated that the first two Calvert bills did not include a map. USFWS stated that a map was required. The creation of the map is what caused a lot of consternation. Currently, both bills that were presented are dead, but if a bill comes back, RCA has the guiding principles and the feedback received as a starting point.

Bruce Colbert thought that any new bill language should start with the Stakeholder Committee rather than something showing up in a bill after it is too late.

Anne Mayer appreciated the intent, language coming from this group could be helpful, but there are a lot of stakeholders who have interest in language that would completely be different from the RCA.

Tyler Madary noted that this should not be seen as a loss for the RCA. The author's offices are vested in the mission of the MSHCP, and conversations are continuing, and this has opened the door to other discussions and opportunities for RCA to explore.

Dan Silver thought it would be helpful to know why the decision has been made to not pursue a wildlife refuge.

Anne Mayer stated it was likely because there was no consensus amongst stakeholders.

Anne Mayer noted that action items for staff were to send the Stakeholder Committee a draft letter for consideration, and a summary of all the Section 6 grants that have been awarded to RCA since 2004. The PowerPoint presentation will also be provided to the committee, and the members are asked to look at the guiding principles and let staff know if something is missing.

## **7. COMMITTEE MEMBER / EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORTS**

Anne Mayer, Executive Director, stated that the RCA Board Chair has asked staff to kick-off the Stakeholder Committee recruitment again. It will open for additional applications and current members are also encouraged to reapply. The RCA Chair would like to have this completed prior to her term being up in December.

David Knudsen, External Affairs Director, noted that an email with a link to the application will be sent to the current committee members and those interested need to apply again.

Anne Mayer added that RCA will also be reaching out to those who expressed interest after the committee was formed and selected.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business for consideration by the Stakeholders Committee, Executive Director Anne Mayer adjourned the meeting at 3:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Lisa Mobley'.

Lisa Mobley  
Administrative Services Director/  
Clerk of the Board