**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**
September 16, 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
Dave Oppenheim, Deputy Controller, for the State Controller
John Sheldon, Deputy Treasurer, for the State Treasurer

**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 11:08 a.m. Angela Noland, Secretary of the Board, called the roll. A quorum was established.

**BOND ITEMS**
The first order of business was to consider three Bond Items.

Bond Item 1:
Sydney Tanimoto Corley, Executive Director, stated that the requested action would adopt resolutions authorizing the sale of the 2026 Series C lease revenue refunding bonds in connection with the issuance, sale, and delivery of the bonds.

The 2026 Series C bonds had an estimated par amount of approximately $414.6 million. The transaction was expected to achieve a net present value savings of $21.4 million, approximately 5.2 percent of the par amount of the refunded bonds. Ms. Tanimoto Corley noted that the numbers may change based on market conditions.

The bonds would be sold through a competitive sale, as described in the Notice of Sale. Proceeds would be used with other lawfully available moneys, to establish irrevocable escrows to refund and defease the Board's outstanding 2014 Series E, 2015 Series B, 2016 Series C, and 2016 Series D Bonds. The departments and projects were specifically described in Appendix B of the Preliminary Official Statement.

Ms. Perrault asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board, or from the public.

Mr. Oppenheim, on behalf of the State Controller, thanked the Department of Finance for the dedication to finding solutions that benefit the State and taxpayers.

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

**A motion was made by Mr. Oppenheim and seconded by Mr. Sheldon to approve Bond Item 1. The motion passed unanimously through a 5-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Binns, Mr. Oppenheim, and Mr. Sheldon all voting aye).**

Bond Item 2:
Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that the requested action would adopt an amended and restated resolution to provide for interim financing and authorize the sale of lease revenue bonds for the Delano Field Office Replacement Project in Kern County for the Department of Motor Vehicles. The resolution would amend and replace the previous resolution approved by the Board in 2025, and increase the interim financing authority by $6.1 million to account for an augmentation and supplemental appropriation. Bonds would be issued in an amount not to exceed $25 million.

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 Bond Item 2. The motion passed unanimously through a 5-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Binns, Mr. Oppenheim, and Mr. Sheldon all voting aye).**

Bond Item 3:
Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that the requested action would adopt a resolution to provide for interim financing and authorize the sale of lease revenue bonds for the Bieber Forest Fire Station/Helitack Base Facility Relocation in Lassen County, for CAL FIRE. Bonds would be issued in an amount not to exceed $3.9 million for an augmentation related to the working drawings phase of the project, which was approved at the July 30, 2026, State Public Works Board meeting.

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. Oppenheim and seconded by Mr. Kenney to approve Bond Item 3. The motion passed unanimously through a 5-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Binns, Mr. Oppenheim, and Mr. Sheldon all voting aye).**

Ms. Perrault thanked and excused Mr. Oppenheim and Mr. Sheldon.

**MINUTES**
The next order of business was to approve the minutes from the August 19, 2026, Board meeting.

Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that staff had prepared and reviewed the minutes from the August 19, 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 Mr. Binns 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:**
The next order of business was to consider one item on the Consent Calendar.

Consent Item 1:
Ms. Tanimoto Corley stated that the requested action would approve an augmentation of $5.8 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the Southern Region: Emergency Operations Center in Orange County for Cal OES.

The augmentation was needed for the design-build phase of the project to address cost increases for audio-visual, information technology, and telecommunication equipment procurement and installation. The original cost estimate for the equipment was based on using conceptual information from projects like the California Highway Patrol area offices and as a result the estimate did not reflect the technical complexity associated with a regional emergency operations center.

Ms. Tanimoto Corley noted that the item required a 20-day Legislative Notice to the Chairs of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the fiscal committees in each house. The letter was sent on August 15, 2026, and the 20-day notification period had expired 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 the Consent Calendar. 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 stated 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. Bakersfield Properties Property (Kern County)
2. Clinica Sierra Vista Property (Fresno County)
3. Calportland Property (Fresno County)
4. Hurst Property (Kings County)
5. Lamar Advertising Leasehold (Kern County)

The Authority notified the Board's staff that between March 2026 and May 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 at this time.

Between August 18, 2026, and August 20, 2026, Notices of Intent to adopt a Resolution of Necessity were mailed by Board staff to the owners. The notices were sent in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 1245.235.

Ms. Tanimoto Corley noted that the Board members' briefing packets contained the Resolutions of Necessity, surveyor maps for the properties, and an objection letter for Property #2, the Clinica Sierra Vista Property in Fresno County, and the Authority's response.

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, but that it be considered separately from the Resolutions of Necessity which did not receive objections.

Additionally, Ms. Tanimoto Corley noted that Board staff were informed late on the day prior to the meeting that Property #3, Calportland, had settled and therefore the request for adopting a resolution of necessity authorizing the use of eminent domain was no longer necessary. As a result, Property #3 was not presented. The unopposed Resolutions of Necessity for Properties #1, #4, and #5, were presented first, with a separate vote.

Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity:
Ben Chandler, counsel to the Board on Eminent Domain items, presented the Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity for Properties #1, #4, and #5.

Mr. Chandler stated that the Resolutions of Necessity that was 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. This evidence does 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 Public Works Board when determining if the Board should adopt a given Resolution of Necessity. Specifically, the Resolution provide:

1. The public interest and necessity require the Project.
2. That the proposed Project was 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 Resolution 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 Resolution of Necessity, prima facie evidence for these factors was present such that the Board may adopt the Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity. If the Board agreed and determined these factors were present, the Board may move to adopt the Resolution of Necessity. In conclusion, Mr. Chandler noted that the Board's adoption of the Unopposed

Resolutions 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. Binns and seconded by Mr. Kenney to approve the Unopposed Resolutions of Necessity for Properties #1, #4, and #5. The motion passed unanimously through a 3-0 roll-call vote (Ms. Perrault, Mr. Kenney, and Mr. Binns all voting aye).**

Opposed Resolutions of Necessity:
Mr. Chandler presented the Opposed Resolution of Necessity for Property #2, the Clinica Sierra Vista Property.

Mr. Chandler stated that in a letter sent to the Board on September 2, 2026, counsel to the property owners objected to the acquisition and requested that the property be removed from consideration at this meeting.

Specific concerns included:

1. The Project was not planned or located in the manner that would be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury.
2. Deferral of the adoption of the RON while parties remain in Active Negotiations.

Mr. Chandler continued that the Resolution of Necessity, owner's objection, and the Authority's response had been reviewed, and it was counsel's opinion that High-Speed Rail's written response adequately addressed 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 were present.

As noted earlier, 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 Opposed Resolution of Necessity. The Board's adoption of the Opposed 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, from the property owners or their counsel, or 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 for Property #2, the Clinica Sierra Vista Property. 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:**
Ms. Tanimoto Corely presented the Reportable Items for the period of August 13, 2026, through September 9, 2026.

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

**NEXT MEETING:**
Ms. Perrault stated that the next Board meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 14, 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 11:25 a.m.