STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD
May 20, 2026

FINAL MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Michele Perrault, Chief Deputy Director, for the Department of Finance
Jason Kenney, Chief Deputy Director, for the Department of General Services
Cory Binns, Chief Deputy Director, for the Department of Transportation
Bryan Cash, Assistant Secretary, for the Natural Resources Agency

MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:
Michele Perrault, Chairperson of the State Public Works Board (Board), called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m. Angela Noland, Secretary to the Board, called the roll. A quorum was established.

Ms. Perrault noted that Mr. Cory Binns, on behalf of the Director of the Department of Transportation, joined the meeting remotely. Mr. Binns, required by Government Code 11123.2, confirmed that no one over the age of 18 would be in the room with him and that he would remain on camera for the duration of the meeting.

BOND ITEMS
None.

MINUTES
The first order of business was to approve the minutes from the April 22, 2026, Board meeting.

Sydney Tanimoto Corley, Executive Director, stated that staff had prepared and reviewed the minutes from the April 22, 2026, Board meeting and recommended approval of the meeting minutes.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board, or from the public. There were none.

A motion was made by Mr. Kenney and seconded by Ms. Perrault to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously through a 3-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, and Mr. Binns all voting aye).

CONSENT CALENDAR A:

The next order of business was to consider Consent Calendar A, which included one item for a department within the Natural Resources Agency. Assistant Secretary Bryan Cash joined as a voting member.

<u>Consent Item 1:</u>
Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that the requested action would authorize the acquisition of real property and execution of a Property Acquisition Agreement and other such documents as may be required to complete the acquisition, for the Intermountain Conservation Camp: Replace Facility project in Lassen County for the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

The requested action would authorize the acquisition of a vacant site totaling approximately 111-acres for the Intermountain Conservation Camp: Replace Facility project, which includes site work, in addition to the construction of a combination of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation buildings, including but not limited to, administration buildings, captains quarters, a dormitory, kitchen/mess hall, recreation building, laundry building, physical fitness building, multipurpose building, a warehouse, and a maintenance shop.

The property acquisition cost is $330 thousand, and the anticipated close of escrow was June 2026.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board, or from the public. There were none.

A motion was made by Mr. Cash and seconded by Mr. Kenney to approve Consent Calendar A. The motion passed unanimously through a 4-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Binns, and Mr. Cash all voting aye).

Ms. Perrault thanked and excused Mr. Cash.

<u>CONSENT CALENDAR B:</u>
The next order of business before the Board was to consider two Consent Items on Consent Calendar B.

<u>CONSENT ITEM 1:</u>
Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that the requested action would authorize the execution of an Agreement for Option to Purchase and Acquisition of Real Property and any such documents as may be required to complete the acquisition, for the Nevada County: New Nevada City Courthouse in Nevada County for the Judicial Council of California.

The requested action would authorize the acquisition of approximately five acres of developed land for the construction of the Nevada County: New Nevada City Courthouse project, consisting of a new, six-courtroom courthouse of approximately 77 thousand square feet in the city of Nevada City. The project also included solar, secure parking for judicial officers, and surface parking for staff and public.

The property acquisition cost was $2,827,500. The initial installment payment of 20 percent, or $565,500, was anticipated to be paid within 90 days of the Board's action.

The second installment of 10 percent, or $282,750, was anticipated to be paid in 2027. The remaining balance, or $1,979,250, would be paid in 2028, contingent upon the Board's approval of the Judicial Council's request for authorization to exercise the Purchase Option and fully acquire the property at that time.

Consent Item 2:
Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that the requested action would authorize an augmentation of $3,125,000 (4.2 percent incremental and 19.2 percent cumulative) Public Building Construction Fund, for the New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse in Riverside County for the Judicial Council of California.

The augmentation was needed to address issues that caused schedule delays, which resulted in additional project costs through November 2026.

Ms. Tanimoto Corley noted that the item required a 20-day legislative notification to the Chairs of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and fiscal committees in each house. The letter was sent on May 5, 2026, and the notification period would expire on May 25, 2026. Ms. Tanimoto Corley concluded that approval of the item was contingent upon expiration of the 20-day legislative notification period without adverse comment.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board, or from the public. There were none.

A motion was made by Mr. Kenney and seconded by Mr. Binns to approve Consent Calendar B. The motion passed unanimously through a 3-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, and Mr. Binns all voting aye).

ACTION ITEMS:
The next order of business was to consider one Action Item.

Ms. Tanimoto Corley states that if approved, the requested action would adopt five Resolutions of Necessity authorizing the use of eminent domain by the High-Speed Rail Authority, to acquire the following properties or interests in properties for the High-Speed Train System:

1. Tos Land Company Property (Kings County)
2. Tos Land Company Property (Kings County)
3. Taylor Property (Madera County)
4. 521 Shafter LLC Property (Kern County)
5. Helena Chemical Company Property (Kern County)

The Authority notified the Board's staff that between September 2025 and January 2026 the respective property owners were provided with a first written offer to purchase the subject properties, as required by Government Code section 7267.2. The Authority informed the Board's staff that negotiations to acquire the properties were continuing; however, to keep the project on schedule, the adoption of a Resolution of Necessity to authorize the use of eminent domain was required.

On April 30, 2026, Notices of Intent to adopt a Resolution of Necessity were mailed by Board staff to the owners. These notices were sent in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 1245.235.

Ms. Tanimoto Corley noted that for Property #5, the Helena Chemical Company Property, an objection letter was received. Board counsel had reviewed the objections raised in the letter, and based on that review, staff recommended that the Board move forward with the adoption of the Resolution of Necessity for the property. However, Ms. Tanimoto Corley recommended the Board consider the opposed Resolution of Necessity separately from the Resolutions of Necessity which did not receive objections.

As a result, the unopposed Resolutions of Necessity for Properties #1 through #4, were presented first, with a separate vote.

<u>Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity:</u>
Ben Chandler, counsel to the Board on Eminent Domain items, presented the Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity for Properties #1 through #4.

Mr. Chandler stated that the Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity that were before the Board had been reviewed to ensure there was prima facie evidence that the factors set forth in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.230 were present. Specifically, the Resolutions provide:

1. The public interest and necessity require the Project.
2. That the proposed Project is planned and located in a manner that would provide the greatest public good with the least private injury.
3. The acquisition property described in Exhibit A of the Resolutions was necessary for the project; and
4. The offer of just compensation required by Government Code section 7267.2 had been made to all owners of record as required by the statute.

Mr. Chandler continued that it was counsel's opinion that for the unopposed Resolutions of Necessity, prima facie evidence for these factors is present such that the Board may adopt the Resolutions of Necessity. If the Board agreed and determined these factors were present, the Board may move to adopt the Resolutions of Necessity. In conclusion, Mr. Chandler noted that the Board's adoption of the Resolution of Necessity did not preclude continued negotiations as part of an effort to secure a mutually agreeable acquisition of each subject property.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board, or from the public. There were none.

A motion was made by Mr. Kenney and seconded by Mr. Binns to approve the Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity for Properties #1 through #4. The motion passed unanimously through a 3-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, and Mr. Binns all voting aye).

<u>Opposed Resolution of Necessity:</u>

Mr. Chandler began by stating that in letters sent to the Board on April 17 and May 15, counsel to the property owners objected to the acquisition and requested that the property be removed from consideration at the meeting. Specific concerns included:

1. *High-Speed Rail had failed to extend a legitimate precondemnation offer.*
2. *High-Speed Rail had failed to negotiate in good faith.*
3. *High-Speed Rail's proposed project was not planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury.*
4. *The entirety of the subject property sought to be acquired was not necessary for the project.*
5. *High-Speed Rail and the State Public Works Board were incapable of conducting a fair, legal, and impartial hearing on the proposed adoption of the Resolution of Necessity.*
6. *No relocation assistance had been provided.*
7. *In addition, the property owner's counsel requested the reservation of rights to take challenges and incorporate newly discovered information into the administrative record for this agenda item as well as inclusion of the objection letter and exhibits into the formal record.*

The Resolution of Necessity, owner's objection, and High-Speed Rail's response had been reviewed, and it was counsel's opinion that High-Speed Rail's written response adequately addresses the objections made on behalf of the property owners. In addition, prima facie evidence that the factors set forth in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.230 are present.

Mr. Chandler emphasized that the evidence did not include concerns regarding the amount of compensation to be paid or the value of the property to be acquired, and such concerns were not considered by the State Public Works Board when determining if the Board should adopt a given Resolution of Necessity.

Mr. Chandler concluded that if the Board agreed and determined these factors were present, the Board may move to adopt the Resolution of Necessity. The Board's adoption of the Resolution of Necessity did not preclude continued negotiations as part of an effort to secure a mutually agreeable acquisition of each subject property.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board, or from the property owners or their counsel.

Anish Baker, counsel to the property owners, stated that in Fall of 2025, High-Speed Rail approached the property owners requiring only a portion of the property for the locally generated alternative from 2014. In December of 2025, they received a full take offer for all 17 acres. The property owners and their counsel attempted to obtain information as to why the change was necessary. The day before the meeting, High-Speed Rail provided two plan sheets, one from 2016 and one undated, that indicated it was 15 percent complete. High-Speed Rail also indicated that the plans were subject to further refinement. Mr. Baker emphasized that High-Speed Rail and the Board were required to make legal findings that all 17 acres were required for the project and planned in a way to ensure most public good with least private injury, which he stated they could not do.

Mr. Baker concluded that negotiations were ongoing between the City of Shafter and High-Speed Rail on how to build the rail within city limits, and until that was settled, it would be impossible for High-Speed Rail to know how much of the Helena Chemical Company Property would be needed.

Brennon Christopher, plant manager of Helena Chemical Company, gave background on the business. The Helena Chemical Company had been in the community for 30 years servicing Kern County and would like to continue to do so for the years to come. Mr. Christopher stated that when High-Speed Rail reached out in late 2025 for the initial partial acquisition for the retention basin, they were prepared to work with High-Speed Rail. Mr. Christopher echoed Mr. Baker's comments on the lack of evidence for the necessity of a full acquisition, and that the City of Shafter and High-Speed Rail were still in dispute on how to complete the segment within city limits. Mr. Christopher emphasized the effects the community would feel, with the loss of jobs and revenue if the Helena Chemical Company closed or relocated, which would be an extensive, lengthy, and costly endeavor. Mr. Christopher concluded by asking the Board not to adopt the Resolution of Necessity at that time.

Ms. Perrault thanked Mr. Baker and Mr. Christopher for their comments and asked if there were comments from High-Speed Rail.

Allison Post Harris, attorney with the High-Speed Rail Authority, stated that the property was needed for the High-Speed Rail alignment, a right of way, and a runoff basin adjacent to the right of way. Ms. Harris stated that while negotiations were ongoing with the City of Shafter, no changes had been made to the segment, and the design-build phase was moving forward. Funding milestone requirement deadlines were pressing.

Don Grebe, Right of Way Agent with the High-Speed Rail Authority, stated that he met with Mr. Christopher prior to December 2025 when the appraisal was taking place. Mr. Grebe stated that it would be a tremendous undertaking and communicated at the time that plans had changed and a full acquisition would be necessary. The first written offer was sent which included relocation assistance and a request to access the property for assessment. Mr. Grebe noted that no response was received after multiple inquiries.

Bartt Gunter, Supervising Transportation Engineer with the High-Speed Rail Authority, showed maps for the segment and stated that the location was chosen due to natural topography for the basin and because the property adjacent was contaminated and could not be used for the basin.

Ms. Perrault stated that receiving the maps late and the lack of explanation made it difficult to understand what the plans were and urged the High-Speed Rail Authority to provide responses in a more timely manner.

Mr. Kenney questioned if High-Speed Rail's response letter to the owner's objection letter was entirely dependent on the 2014 environmental documents (the Environmental Impact Report [EIR] and the Environmental Impact Statement [EIS]) and asked if those documents took into account the full 17 acres.

Ms. Harris corrected that the EIR/EIS was actually dated from 2018/2019 and indicated closer to a full acquisition. Ms. Harris noted that the environmental reviews are based on a very early review and the design is refined over time. Due to federal funding timelines, the designs must be completed by this year, and they are in the final stages of completion.

Mr. Kenney noted that the property adjacent to the Helena Chemical Company property was not being considered, and questioned if the Helena Chemical Company property had been evaluated for contamination. Mr. Gunter confirmed that based on a phase one review, it had been evaluated and cleared for use.

Mr. Binns questioned if the footprint for the basin from the 2018 documents was consistent with the footprint for the basin today.

Mr. Gunter answered that the extent of the drainage was unknown in 2018, but the footprint was relatively close. Ms. Harris confirmed Mr. Gunter's statement and added that the environmental reviews are done early in the process and not something typically relevant by the design stage of the project.

Ms. Perrault stated that the changes, while not necessarily unanticipated, pulled into question how final the plans were, and if the full property was actually required.

Mr. Binns questioned if the property southwest of the Helena Chemical Company Property had been evaluated for use. Mr. Gunter answered that they aim to stay within their original plans.

Ms. Perrault asked for clarification on whether the property was necessary at this time or if this was something that could be acquired at a later time. Ms. Harris answered that due to the size of the Helena Chemical Company's business and the relocation assistance process, they were ensuring ample time for that process. She concluded that construction was scheduled to begin by September 2027.

Ms. Perrault asked if negotiations would continue with the property owners and that the City of Shafter and High-Speed Rail's ongoing negotiations would not change the plan or acquisition amount for this property. Ms. Harris confirmed both points.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any additional comments from the public. There were none.

A motion was made by Mr. Kenney and seconded by Mr. Binns to approve the Opposed Resolution of Necessity. The motion passed unanimously through a 3-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, and Mr. Binns all voting aye).

OTHER BUSINESS:
None.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT:
None.

REPORTABLES:

None.

NEXT MEETING:
Ms. Perrault stated that the next Board meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, June 24, 2026. The time and location of the meeting would be posted on the Board's website.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Board or from the public. There were none. The meeting concluded at 11:59 a.m.