

SAN DIEGO RIVER CONSERVANCY (SDRC)

Minutes of May 3, 2012 Public Meeting

(Draft Minutes for Approval on July 12, 2012)

SDRC Board Vice Chair, **Ruth Hayward** called the May 3, 2012 meeting of the San Diego River Conservancy to order at approximately 2:02 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present

Brent Eidson	Mayor, City of San Diego, Designee (arrived 2:04 pm)
Dianne Jacob	Supervisor, County of San Diego, Second District (arrived 2:11 pm)
Todd Gloria	Councilmember, City of San Diego, District 3 (arrived 2:06 pm)
Lorie Zapf	Councilmember, City of San Diego, District 6
Bryan Cash	Natural Resources Agency, Alternate Designee (via phone)
Karen Finn	Department of Finance, Alternate Designee (via phone)
Clay Phillips	Department of Parks and Recreation, Designee
Ruth Hayward	Public at Large
Andrew Poat	Public at Large
Ann Miller Haddad	Public at Large
Gary Strawn	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Absent

Ben Clay, Chair	Public at Large
John Donnelly	Wildlife Conservation Board

Staff Members Present

Michael Nelson	Executive Officer
Hayley Peterson	Deputy Attorney General
Julia Richards	Administrative Services Manager
Ann Van Leer	Consultant

2. Approval of Minutes

Ruth Hayward asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes. **Ann Miller Haddad** moved approval of the minutes of the March 1, 2012 public meeting. The motion was seconded by **Andrew Poat** and the minutes were adopted unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Any person may address the Governing Board at this time regarding any matter within the Board's authority. Presentations will be limited to three minutes for individuals and five minutes for representatives of organizations. Submission of information in writing is encouraged. The Board is prohibited by law from taking any action on matters that are discussed that are not on the agenda; no adverse conclusions should be drawn by the Board's not responding to such matters or public comments.

No public comment.

4. Chairperson's and Governing Board Members' Report (*INFORMATIONAL*)

Ruth Hayward said that the workshop with the Governing Board and the San Diego River Park Foundation was successful and hoped that similar meetings could occur because she felt both Boards learned a great deal about what each organization does.

5. Deputy Attorney's General Report (*INFORMATIONAL*)

No report.

6. San Diego River Conservancy's Strategic Plan 2012-17 (*INFORMATIONAL/ACTION*)

Ann Miller Haddad will introduce Peter MacCracken, who will facilitate a discussion with the Governing Board that will guide the development of SDRC's 2012-2017 Strategic Plan.

Ann Miller Haddad, San Diego River Conservancy
Peter MacCracken, APR, Strategic Communications

Ann Miller Haddad recalled that SDRC had initiated the updating of the Strategic Plan last year when the Chair asked her and Mike Nelson to review current projects and determine which projects that were "shovel ready" for financing opportunities that may occur. She said at the January meeting the Board approved a two step process that would allow SDRC to update its Strategic Plan for 2012 – 2017; Step One would comprise an analysis of existing objectives and projects including a performance evaluation, which would be useful to revise, eliminate or refine SDRC's Plan. She advised that Peter MacCracken from Strategic Communications had been retained to assist SDRC with Step One. And, Step Two would focus on financing and development of a Five Year Capital Outlay

She concluded her remarks with a status review of the planning process and proposed timeline for completion. She said at the March meeting Peter MacCracken had presented a Scope of Work and Outline; and, he had prepared a draft outline for the Strategic Plan Update that he will use today to seek input from the Board. She further advised that a draft final would be presented at the July meeting for final approval, which reflects their input and considers comments from the San Diego River Coalition.

Peter MacCracken. said that he would be collecting input and comments from SDRC Board members on a two page Working Draft of the Strategic Plan Update for 2012-2017, which had been distributed. He stated that considerable effort had been made to keep the update brief and he would conduct a discussion that would emphasize the key strategic goals which drive the organization. He said that the draft was built upon several foundation documents that incorporate the principles and recommendations of the San Diego River Park Conceptual Plan (2002) including: San Diego River Conservancy Act (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 32630-32661); SDRC Five-Year Strategic and Infrastructure Plan 2006-2011; Strategic and Infrastructure Plan Analysis; Addendum to the SDRC Five-Year Strategic and Infrastructure Plan; and SDRC Annual Work Plans.

He added that the Update also incorporated the original four program areas found in the 2006-2011 Five-Year Strategic and Infrastructure Plan; however Program Three had been split into two subprograms, and had added a 5th program that will be important to their discussion today. He indicated that the format he employed was similar to the Strategic Objectives developed by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

Before seeking input from the Boards input on each the five programs and priorities, he asked the Executive Officer to provide a quick review each program area summarizing accomplishments, setbacks and current activities .

PROGRAM 1: CONSERVE LAND ALONG THE SAN DIEGO RIVER

Michael Nelson began his summary by acknowledging that the original goal was to preserve 1,450 acres and that SDRC had participated in the conservation of 740 acres with an investment of \$9 million in seven properties. He observed that even though the 2006-2011 Infrastructure Plan had estimated \$73 million for this task, SDRC had achieved 50% of the goal at 12% of the cost estimate. He said he felt this progress could be attributed to SDRC providing grants to local governments and non-profit organizations who would ultimately manage the properties, as well as, a decision to target its land conservation efforts below El Capitan Reservoir and Dam.

He noted that SDRC delayed implementing land management protocols; since SDRC had focused principally on conserving land and working with partners, not managing property.

Peter MacCracken observed that SDRC has been quite successful given its resources, suggesting that it was obvious that every success does not need to be accomplished directly by the Conservancy alone. What had been done successfully was often accomplished through partnerships, which he believed would continue to be important in the future.

He asked for comments, additions, questions, regarding the draft 2012-2017 recommendations for Program 1:

Secure Key River Properties

- Develop estimated range of costs by reach/area/parcel
- Develop scenarios with and without \$20 million from state water bond
- Conserve 739 additional acres (to meet original goal) with partners
- Link to Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) implementation

Develop and Implement Land Management Protocols

- Redefine as a partner priority (?)

Ruth Hayward said she agreed with the premise that SDRC should do land management through its partners, unless the volunteer members of the Board want to manage land, SDRC staff is not large enough to manage property. It looks to her like the membership of the San Diego River Coalition, the Foundation and local governments may work best.

Andrew Poat agreed with an emphasis on linkage with partners, particularly with MSCP, because he felt the majority of SDRC acquisitions could occur through implementation of park plans, traffic mitigation and other activities in various jurisdictions. He added that there would be a number of critical transactions in Mission Valley over next several years, so it is important to know the objectives SDRC seeks to accomplish through the mitigation or other and other development agreements

Ruth Hayward said she understood that funding and a financial strategy was integral, but it is not necessarily part of today's assignment based on Ann's testimony and the Chair's earlier statements.

Andrew Poat said he was convinced that the majority of the resources that will be guided towards accomplishing our various objectives are not going to be controlled by this Conservancy.

Dianne Jacob commented that at the risk of over simplifying the task, she felt that once properties or trail segments had been identified, SDRC should recruit as many partners as it can to build, manage, implement or acquire.. Each jurisdiction in and of itself does not have the ability to complete the entire San Diego River Park or the San Diego Trail. SDRC can play an important role as a coordinating body which helps define the "how" and the "what". SDRC brings to partners together to implement the plan.

Ruth Hayward added that funding partners need to have an idea of what our goal is. As an example, she said a lot like a non-profit doesn't ask a funder for money and then tell the funder later how the money will be spent.

Dianne Jacob referenced the MSCP (Multiple Species Conservation Program) as an example of a program that SDRC should incorporate, because some of the key properties might be within both the MSCP and San Diego County's jurisdiction. If that is the case the county has budgeted money for the acquisition of MSCP land.

Gary Strawn emphasized that in many cases partners particularly non-profits are in a better position for implementation. He referenced SDRC's successful role with Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP), where SDRC served as a pass through vehicle for these funds.

Andrew Poat commented the most important thing is consensus regarding where the Board wants SDRC to go. He suggested that a link to the MSCP and other public planning processes should be referenced.

Dianne Jacob expressed a desire to include private property owners as part of the emphasis on partners, because it is important to cultivate property owners who share our vision. She said the property in Santee, (Hanlon-Walker) was a good example of a private landowner working with SDRC to create opportunity. She said she thinks the property owners should be added to the list of partners as well as funding partners because there may be property that can be acquired through donation.

Program 2: Complete the San Diego River Trail

Michael Nelson began his summary by stating that the principal objective of the 2006-2011 Strategic Plan for the Recreation and Education Program was the completion or enhancement of 32 miles of the San Diego River Trail. He noted that today more than ten miles had been completed, comprising twelve projects and an investment of \$6,400,000. He stated that the focus for this program has been on the trail corridor and working with partners to identify and address trail gaps.

He advised that this decision and funding limitations had delayed a number of components of the original Strategic Plan: Project 2. Make the River Park Real, Project 3. Make it Safe and Make it Visible, and Project 4. Ask the Public to Help and Help them Help.

He added that the Board recognizing that the trail was the backbone of the San Diego River Park concept took formal action to establish it as a civic imperative and a regional collaboration. It created an Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG) comprising key staff for each jurisdiction to address technical issues; funding and construction priorities; and construction and management. A San Diego River Trail Gaps Analysis was completed which identified functional and physical barriers to the trail's completion. All jurisdictions recommended priorities identified in the San Diego River Trail –Gaps Analysis. These priorities were subsequently endorsed by the Governing Board following presentations by members of the IWG. Moreover, SDRC encouraged that these priorities be included in each jurisdiction's Community Plans and Capital Improvement Programs (C.I.P.) As a consequence of this collaboration SDRC and jurisdictions have begun to fund and complete priority projects to close the most critical gaps and linkages. He said SANDAG's inclusion of the trail in the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan was very significant.

Peter MacCracken then initiated a discussion and asked for comments or suggestion on the recommendations for Program 2:

Complete the Trail

- Based on Gaps Analysis and jurisdictional priorities
- Develop a comprehensive, collaborative approach to obtain permits

- Coordinate to resolve regulatory and resource agency issues
 - Accommodate multiple users (pedestrian, bicyclist and equestrian)
- Develop Recreation and Education Programs***
- Collaborate with partners to make completed trail real, safe, visible (?)

Ruth Hayward stated that she believed that SDRC should not concentrate on any trail acquisitions nor improvements above El Capitan Dam, she said that the property should remain as wild as possible and felt Dianne Jacob might agree, recognizing SDRC's experience with the River Gorge Trail.

Dianne Jacob agreed with Ruth's statement that land above El Captain should remain as is, SDRC has enough to focus on west of the dam.

Michael Nelson observed that there was agreement at the Board of Director's Workshop that working to develop a relationship with regulatory agencies regarding San Diego River Trail was important to make certain a focus on protecting and restoring habit was observed, while pursuing the completion of the trail.

Dianne Jacob agreed, informing the Board that from the County's standpoint, regulatory agencies at times demand things that make absolutely no sense at all.

Ruth Hayward recommended that that a map which demonstrates and overlays trail alignments with MSCP maps should be prepared.

Dianne Jacob said that the County of San Diego did not have jurisdiction within the City of San Diego, so any overlay map should include the city's MSCP and the county's.

Michael Nelson stated that the City of San Diego as part of overall program had established a Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Interestingly, both the MSCP and MHPA identify the San Diego River as a biological corridor that provides linkage to these plans.

Program 3A: Preserve and Restore Natural Resources

Michael Nelson said the 2006-2011 Strategic Plan recommended 990 acres of non-native, invasive plants be targeted for removal and habitat restoration. SDRC adopted a strategy to address that would concentrate on the worst infestations on private and public property. SDRC secured regional permits from federal, state, and local regulatory authorities for approximately 350 acres and launched its Watershed Control and Restoration Program with a \$2.2 million dollar investment, which established a comprehensive regional habitat enhancement effort with local jurisdictions and non-profit partners at eight locations.

Peter MacCracken initiated a discussion on the recommendations for Program 3A, stating that the Working Draft split Program 3 into two sections.

Remove Invasive Non-Native Plants and Restore the Land

- Complete restoration of 350 acres already permitted
- Form additional partnerships to use SDRC permits
- Link to MSCP by making habitat a programmatic emphasis

Bryan Cash asked how many acres were currently permitted.

Michael Nelson answered that the permit was for 350 acres west of the El Capitan Dam.

Bryan Cash asked if additional partnerships were being formed for restoration that would allow the program to expand into new areas.

Michael Nelson responded that was the case and explained that the program had expanded to include a lower, middle and upper river component that includes additional acreage. He also said SDRC new partnerships had been formed in the lower and middle sections, one of which involves Lakeside River Park Conservancy for a project at Los Coaches Creek in the upper river.

Gary Strawn added to that the folks in Lakeside have set up a partnership that has enlisted volunteers to remove invasives on private property.

Michael Nelson said that the project he was referring to is the SDRC project in Los Coches Creek

Clay Phillips inquired about the maintenance costs these projects will require for a long periods of time.

Michael Nelson explained that maintenance is typically the responsibility of the private or public property owner. In fact it has been SDRC's practice not to pursue or recommend a project for which the management capability is not available to protect the investment.

Dianne Jacob suggested using the term "ongoing maintenance"

Peter MacCracken said somehow we should find a way to address that in the overall strategy and implementation.

Program 3B: Protect and Preserve Cultural and Historical Resources

Michael Nelson stated an analysis of funding decisions provides evidence that the principle program emphasis had been for land conservation and trail development. He said SDRC had not offered a great deal of attention nor money on protecting and developing cultural and historical resources; however, he pointed out that SDRC has recently made progress and said SDRC's work with the San Diego History Center is a good example. SDRC and the History Center are working to rebrand the Serra Museum at the History Center using the San Diego River and its ecological history as a theme. The museum overlooks the Presidio and the river and represents a \$150,000 investment. He also said SDRC had established a dialogue with San Diego State University (SDSU) about a river center, which would pursue multidisciplinary projects that challenge students and faculty, especially anthropology and archaeology. He observed that many conservancies boast exceptional natural resources within their project areas, but few can compare to the historic and cultural resources found in the watershed of the San Diego River.

Peter MacCracken initiated a discussion on the recommendations for Program 3B.

Pursue National Heritage Site designation

- Form intergovernmental working group to develop and implement plan

Develop partnerships to expand cultural and historical resource education efforts

- Link to SDSU Center (also see Program 4)
- Link to Serra Museum
- Link to other regional museums (e.g., Old Town, Cuyamaca College's Heritage of America's Museum) for education
- Form intergovernmental working group, including tribal governments

Dianne Jacob testified that she would like to establish a partnership with the tribal governments, especially Barona and Viejas, which could have a positive influence in this program area.

Peter MacCracken asked if that was that specifically for a heritage site designation.

Dianne Jacob said that was not what she meant and stated that she was referring to forming in an intergovernmental working group to develop a partnership with tribal governments.

Clay Philips said when speaking of linkages to other regional museums, he would like to add “historic sites” to include Old Town State Historic Park. He said he would actually go further with maybe a 3rd section that acknowledges the fact that Department of Parks and Recreation recognizes the need to enhance its relationship to the river and the story the park presents. He also stated that he would like to see a stronger physical connection between Old Town and the San Diego River, perhaps even a trail connection.

Ann Miller Haddad asked if it would be sufficient to add it as a bullet under the partnership category; if SDRC is creating partnerships for historical and cultural resources, links to State Park’s educational efforts might fall under this category.

Dianne Jacob recommended inclusion of another museum in east county, Cuyamaca College’s Heritage of America Museum.

Program 4: Enhance Water Quality and Natural Flood Conveyance

Michael Nelson said that compared to the other programmatic investments, the Water Quality Program is by far the smallest, but important to realize that SDRC investments in other programs have made improvements in water quality; particularly land conservation, habitat restoration and invasive control. He said that he felt the role of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board was critically important. He commented that during the general obligation bond freeze Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP) were a principal fund sources that helped maintain the momentum on an array of projects such as: installation of remote sensors with SDSU; river blitzes, stream surveys and cleanups with the Park Foundation, and invasive control and habitat restoration on private lands.

Peter MacCracken initiated a discussion and sought comments on the recommendations for Program 4:

Help establish the San Diego River Research Center at SDSU

- Continue collaboration with partners (including SDRPF and SDSU)
- Grow the San Diego RiverNet Data Collection and Restoration Program

Support the SDRWQCB SD River Watershed Monitoring Program (?)

Continue to identify and collaborate on projects consistent with both agencies’ strategic plans.

Andrew Poat asked what SDRC water quality goal these tactics would address.

Ruth Hayward asked Gary Strawn, as the representative for the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) to attempt to answer the question.

Gary Strawn suggested that there was no easy answer to Andrew’s questions, but a goal he felt deserved consideration was a greater emphasis on bio assessments to measure and monitor water quality than the more traditional reliance on chemistry. He added that he felt that it could lead to a biological baseline of what constitutes a healthy river.

Ann Miller Haddad responded that as part of the process of evaluating SDRC's performance and accomplishments, we realized that there were areas where performance was strong, but other areas where we let others take the lead, and in this case support a water quality mandate or policy by providing assistance or support, such as the SDRWQCB.

Andrew Poat stated he generally agreed but wondered whether SDRC could support the development of a river wide water quality goal and enumerate some objectives such as adequate to support species restoration, healthy human uses, etc.

Michael Nelson suggested that there a number adopted watershed plans that established standards and measurable goals and benchmarks for water quality for the San Diego River.

Peter MacCracken questioned whether it was more appropriate for SDRWQCB to take the lead on developing baselines and SDRC partner with them to develop and accomplish a measurable goal.

Gary Strawn responded that he thought that that the SDRWQCB had already established those goals and we should get them in here to provide the Board with a briefing.

Michael Nelson said perhaps we should look at the benchmarks they have been adopted in their watershed plans; and, if financing was available, we could agree or disagree, then endorse and support projects and objectives the Board feels are most consistent with a particular plan and goal.

Dianne Jacob said the key word is "support" because we are not the primary entity implementing the Clean Water Act. The federal government has its rules on the Clean Water Act, and the state has their rules. The Regional Board is the principal organization to set the goals the county and city must live by. She restated that she felt SDRC should be supportive, because we don't have capacity or authority and we might jeopardize SDRC ability to do key acquisitions and build the trail if we began to overreach.

Andrew Poat thinks SDRC should have some water quality goals because goals are aspirational.

Dianne Jacob returned to Gary Strawn's observation that SDRC should ask the SDRWQCB to provide us with guidance on water quality goals.

Gary Strawn suggested that he and the Executive Officer should meet with the Executive Officer of SDRWQCB and ask them to help us define a water quality goal and a supportive role SDRC could play.

Dianne Jacob agreed that was the best approach and that SDRC should review what they feel would be the appropriate way for use to support programs and projects that improve water quality.

Program 5: Ensure a Sustainable Organization and Extend Its Reach

Peter MacCracken stated that Program 5 was a new program which was the result of an examination of what was accomplished and what wasn't and how will SDRC do more. It acknowledges that SDRC is dependent on dwindling funds, a water bond that may or may not be on the ballot; yet despite these challenges has accomplished great things. This program is about creating a sustainable organization that can extend its reach through partnership.

Michael Nelson provided a summary which described the fiscal the fiscal reality confronting SDRC. He presented the five financial circumstance that SDRC faces:

- 1) SDRC has secured \$22 million in funds from a variety of sources but primarily the General Obligation Bonds.
- 2) The Board had approved approximately \$18 million for projects.
- 3) \$3.6 million remains.
- 4) \$942,000 is available today; \$2.7 million must be re-appropriated.
- 5) Insufficient funding to complete projects approved in the 2012 Work Plan

Peter MacCracken initiated a discussion and sought comments on the recommendations for Program 5:

Develop and implement a funding strategy

- Develop and execute a Sacramento (education) strategy
- Link to MSCP implementation for land acquisition and conservation
- Develop a strategy for additional (non-state) funding
- Develop a collaboration with partners to seek additional funding

Develop and implement a partnering strategy

- Conduct priorities-setting workshop with SDRC, SDRPF Boards (4/20/12)
- Assign roles and responsibilities according to capacity and authority, primarily financial and other resources as well
- Coordinate with relevant master plans and master plan updates within various jurisdiction
- Develop collaboration with partners to overcome regulatory and resource agency issues as Supervisor Jacob referred to earlier.

Lorie Zapf made the point that all these programs would require a great amount of work and asked two questions: Who does all this work? What staff is available?

Michael Nelson responded that there was a staff of two and a consultant.

Ann Miller Haddad commented that she looked at Program 5 as the launching point for the Second Step of our two-step process, which will engage Andrews's expertise and address many of the questions he has raised.

Andrew Poat said from where thing stood today this is fine for now.

Dianne Jacob asked if this organization will be funded and whether the 2 ½ person staff is in the state's budget.

Michael Nelson that SDRC was in the State's budget and for the last the 5 years SDRC's operating or support budget though small has been relatively stable and has not received a substantial budget reduction. He said that he felt the small size of the support budget and the fact that it relied on "special" not "general" funds were the principal reasons SDRC remains. He remarked that Ruth Coleman said to him that SDRC was budget dust. He added that though SDRC \$300,000 operating budget has been sustained, its capital outlay is a much bleaker picture; the fact that SDRC has never received a direct allocation of bond funding means that it must compete with other non profits for scarce capital funding or seek budget language on other agencies bond allocations.

Andrew Poat said the key issue is once a clear vision and a plan is established SDRC is much more likely to get funding.

Clay Phillips added he thinks the outline for Program 5 captures the uncertainty and the need for sustainability. He said this program is not simply about project specific funding alone, but is also about moving SDRC from budget dust to a budget particle.

Ruth Hayward asked if the Board was comfortable with the proposed Strategic Plan Update as presented.

Ann Miller Haddad said she felt the title for Program 2 "Complete the Trail" should remain as "Recreation and Education".

Andrew Poat asked who was technically responsible for restoration of species in San Diego County because when it comes to those species who use the San Diego River as habitat, it seems to him that is one of the goals of the habitat is not ours but someone else's, like the County's MSCP?

Ruth Hayward said it behooves us to help establish the habitat so the species can return, which is implied in the title of MSCP, Multiple Species Conservation Program.

Michael Nelson reminded the Board that Ann at the beginning of our discussion on the Strategic Plan Update, that the goal is refine the document and bring it to the Board in July to consider final adoption.

7. Executive Officer's Report (INFORMATIONAL / ACTION)

The following topics may be included in the Executive Officer's Report. The Board may take action regarding any of them:

City of San Diego/ Carlton Oaks Golf Course: Proposed Sale / 68 acres

Michael Nelson said the Land Use and Housing Committee, chaired by Councilmember Zapf unanimously approved a recommendation to lease, not sell 68 acres of public property at Carlton Oaks Golf Course. The recommendation enjoyed a strong endorsement from conservation constituencies and the golf course operators. The proposal to retain public ownership and provide a 40 year lease must next receive the approval of the City Council. He reminded the Board that SDRC had negotiated with TY Investments, the golf course owner, and proposed buyer, a conservation and trail easement that would connect the San Diego River Trail to Mast Park in Santee and West Hills Parkway at Mission Trails Regional Park; and, advised that an easement for this purpose was included in the proposed lease.

Department of Transportation: Auction / Former Old Town Office

Michael Nelson said that there had been no new developments regarding the sale of the Caltrans Office Complex in Old Town and that the auction had not been rescheduled.

SDRC/ SCC/DGS: Transfer of Administrative Services

Michael Nelson said that the transfer of administrative services from the State Coastal Conservancy to the Department of General Services was proceeding without difficulty. He said he could foresee no reason why the transfer would not occur and the new fiscal year, July 1, 2012

SDRC / SDRPF: Board of Director's Workshop

Michael Nelson said the Governing Board of the San Diego River Conservancy and San Diego River Park Foundation held a Board of Directors Workshop, April 20, 2012. He stated that it was a productive meeting, which provided guidance that could improve the effectiveness of the two organizations

Office of State Audits and Evaluations: Audit on Proposition 40 grants

Michael Nelson said that four of SDRC's Proposition 40 grants had received an audit by the Office of State Audits and Evaluations at the Department of Finance (DOF). He testified that a final report has not been prepared but should be available in a couple months. However, he did say that the exit interview conducted by the auditor with SDRC staff went well; and the auditor found no issues with SDRC's administration of its grants.

He advised that he would provide a copy of the final report to the Board when it is received.

Ruth Hayward thanked everyone, advised that the next meeting was July 12 at 2:00 pm, and adjourned the meeting.

Meeting adjourned 3:35 p.m.