

American River Parkway Plan Update Citizen's Advisory Committee

Meeting Highlights—February 15, 2004

Key Outcomes

- Members received materials to prepare for March 28 UCAC design charrette and March 31 Community Workshop.
- Members received information and discussed the following projects affecting the IAP area: City of Sacramento interface with the Parkway; habitat restoration plans, the California Indian Heritage Center; and the DNA-RT light rail crossing.

Decision Items for March 28 Meeting @ 3701 Branch Center Road, Room 128

- Charrette to create preliminary concept plans for IAP areas.

Announcements and Updates

- A new draft of the Natural Resource Management Policies is available. This draft, dated 2/15/05, incorporates feedback from the small group discussion with Update Citizens Advisory Committee (UCAC) members on 1/11/05. UCAC members should provide feedback to Sunny on the new draft by March 18, 2005.
- The second Community Workshop will take place March 31, 2005. UCAC members are requested to help to promote this workshop as they did for the first workshop.
- MIG and staff have prepared materials for UCAC members to review and familiarize themselves with prior to the March 28 UCAC meeting, which will be a design charrette for the Integrated Area Planning (IAP) area. Please see the following: River Corridor Management Plan (RCMP) reference sheet; potential plan program components handout; existing conditions maps; and draft plan framework.

Public Comment on first Community Workshop

- Excellent job. The tour was very impressive. It was well organized and had good exchange of information.

Draft Plan Framework

Daniel Iacofano (MIG) briefly reviewed the draft plan framework, which has changed slightly based on comments at the last meeting. Language has been sharpened in places and a seventh category for regional planning and infrastructure has been added under emerging planning principles.

UCAC discussion:

- Are current land use designations being used in the IAP planning process? Yes. Land use designations will be discussed in more detail during the next series of meetings.
- When do we start actual planning and making decisions about issues? Next meeting.

Public comment:

- A member raised his concern for maintaining habitat and wildlife, which was a priority of the 1985 Plan. Daniel responded that the original Parkway Goals will be maintained, including providing for habitat and wildlife.
- Will the Parkway Concept be brought forward? Yes. The UCAC must also respond to current issues.

City of Sacramento Interface with IAP (Bob Overstreet and Steve Peterson, City of Sacramento)

Bob Overstreet, Director of the City of Sacramento Department of Parks and Recreation, introduced Steve Peterson, Principal Planner for the City of Sacramento Department of Planning and Building. Steve is responsible for the City's General Plan and will be bringing forward recommendations for amendments to community plans.

Bob presented issues that Sacramento City feels are important to the IAP process: He emphasized that the City is not proposing lighted fields or apartment complexes in the Parkway, and that what the City envisions is very much in line with what has been discussed in the UCAC so far. The City is interested in the following:

- Connectivity to the river and other water corridors;
- Security and safety of park users;
- Supporting the founding intent of the Parkway Plan;
- Incorporating resource management principles into the Plan from the RCMP;
- Governance and finance solutions (partnerships must be created involving the City of Sacramento, State, Sacramento County, and other new cities);
- Designating areas in the Parkway where more activities may be appropriate, such as venues and destination attractions in appropriate places to provide "eyes on the Parkway";
- Vegetation management and habitat restoration, getting rid of invasive species;
- Foster a preferred future for the City, including the Parkway, that is achievable and reflects smart growth principles;
- Recognition of differences in different reaches of the Parkway (the Parkway changes character in the urban core);
- Help the City make decisions about adjacent land use—get in front of inevitable development, set forth principles in the City's General Plan to balance the Parkway's needs with needed economic development in the urban core; and
- Flood control.

Bob discussed the regional context of the Parkway and current planning efforts in adjacent areas. He emphasized that the lower reach of the Parkway has a different character due to its urban context. There are 1.5 million people in the Sacramento region. 30,000 live in center of the city plus 100,000 employees commute daily into the downtown area. The Sacramento Area Council

of Governments (SACOG) has released its Regional Blueprint (available at <http://www.sacregionblueprint.org/sacregionblueprint/>). This area will grow to 3 million people in the next 50 years, and planners are thinking about how to contain sprawl with smart growth. This will mean denser development in the urban core, including more intensive urbanization adjacent to the Parkway. Related planning efforts include the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan and the Richard's Boulevard Area redevelopment plans.

Richard's Blvd is currently a mostly industrial area. The Richard's Blvd. Area Plan has been adopted by the City Council. The City's plan is to transition it to residential mixed use and office use, organized around the light rail extension. This will provide benefits to the Parkway such as more eyes on the Parkway and fewer industrial uses around the river. The City has received numerous development proposals for building 4 to 5 stories or more in this area.

The City also envisions additional public access along the river, with a greenbelt on the south bank connecting to Sutter's Landing. They want to protect significant views and view corridors. There is already an existing City skyline visible from the Parkway. The City plans to allow for some setbacks (buffers of open space between buildings and the Parkway), but also needs to provide some opportunity for views of the Parkway from adjacent buildings. The City is interested in considering ways in which adjacent land use can contribute to a feeling of safety and security for Parkway users. For example, new development will face the river, which should add to the feeling of safety.

City project-specific objectives:

- Turn the corner from the Parkway to the Sacramento River waterfront; make a contiguous public space along both rivers. The City has received 1.5 million dollars from the State to create the Two Rivers Trail from 16th St. to Tiscornia. The second phase would be from Sutter's Landing to 16th St.
- New bike crossings on I-5 and DNA-RT (light rail) bridge.
- Acquisition of inholdings in the Parkway including the Riverdale Resort and Mobile Home Park.
- The California Indian Heritage Center (CIHC) is a great opportunity in the City's opinion. The City Council wants to keep the CIHC in Sacramento.
- Major setbacks in the Richard's Blvd area. The City is still talking with Richard's Blvd area property owners, but the City would like to move shops and restaurants closer to river, while keeping private holdings such as residences and office buildings farther from the river. This would allow those farther buildings to be higher. The City will be looking for a community plan amendment to this effect in the General Plan process.
- Make Sutter's Landing a regional park, move boundaries west to the Blue Diamond Almond property.
- Considering taking 6 acres on the levee offered by Blue Diamond.

UCAC comment:

- A member expressed concern that opening access for pedestrians from the City would decrease parking fees which fund the Parkway. He asked if the City plans to help fund the Parkway. Bob replied that the City will possibly contribute to funding, as part of partnerships.
- How big a setback is being considered for the Richard's Boulevard redevelopment? The existing corridor zoning calls for 100-foot setbacks from 10 feet off the toe of the levee.

- Streets can exist within this 100 feet, and in fact the Area Plan proposes a new public street within the setback. This would be an extension of Riverfront Drive, no closer to the levee than that. There are no setbacks currently in the Capitol Station area, a subset of the Richard's Blvd area. The City is developing a concept for a frontage road that varies in depth from 100 to 500 feet setback. Major development would be farther back. There would be some development for public access, and there might be destination attractions or underground parking. This setback area would encompass about 250 to 300 acres and would require an amendment to the community plan. Connie Miottel cautioned that after negotiations with property owners, the resulting frontage road concept will probably look a little different than what Bob discussed at this meeting.
- Some UCAC members had heard that there might be higher setbacks up to 1000 ft required as a trade-off for permission to build higher structures. Bob replied that larger setbacks had been proposed to some developers. These will be negotiated to what property owners can accept. One-thousand foot setbacks are probably not realistic.
 - Many UCAC members want an open space area for the setbacks, making an urban greenbelt. This is in line with City thinking. The City plans to create just such a greenbelt on the City-owned stretch of adjacent land from Sutter's Landing to Highway 160.
 - Will there be an assessment on adjacent property owners to support the Parkway? Bob replied that similar governance and finance questions are being considered on the Sacramento River working with property owners, business owners, etc. The question is what is reasonable? What benefit does everyone get from public infrastructure?
 - Connie Miottel, who represents the Capitol Station district, commented that downtown infill development has to "pencil out" and be financially feasible. She said that as long as there is consistency and knowledge of what the formula will be, people will be willing to talk about it. However, she cautioned that here are already heavy development fees for sewer, infrastructure, flood, parks, etc. A Parkway fee would have to be prioritized in context with other fees. It's a negotiation, but you can work with private land that contributes to public space.

Habitat restoration (Gregg Ellis, Jones and Stokes Associates (JSA)) Gregg's Power Point presentation will be available on the project website at <http://americanriverparkwayupdate.org>

Gregg reviewed key points about the River Corridor Management Plan (RCMP) which represents a compilation of the most current thinking about managing the natural resources of the lower American River (LAR):

- The lower American River is a unique riparian corridor with history of modifications (mining, levees, dams, ag, etc.).
- The RCMP developed goals and objectives to obtain "healthy riparian and terrestrial habitats to support targeted plan, wildlife, and aquatic species."
- The RCMP aims to protect and enhance willow, cottonwood, and valley oak-dominated riparian woodlands and grasslands that meet RCMP goals and objectives.
- The RCMP also calls for restoring suitable areas that do not meet RCMP goals and objectives.
- Restoration should provide a diversity of native habitat types.

Gregg reviewed maps of where existing good habitat is located and where there are areas that are not meeting current habitat potential. He discussed that land surface elevation plays a large role in what types of restoration are possible and appropriate in different areas, since elevation is related to how much water is naturally available.

Gregg presented maps showing proposed and approved restoration projects, including the significant Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) restoration sites. He listed the Corps restoration objectives, which are in line with the RCMP:

- Restore LAR floodplain habitats and functions.
- Restore diverse native plant communities.
- Restore native wildlife habitat.
- Establish connectivity between proposed and existing habitats.
- Re-establish hydrologic interaction between the floodplain and the river channel.
- Reduce potential for fish stranding on the floodplain.
- Increase shaded riverine aquatic habitat along the streambank.

Gregg noted that habitat restoration can be compatible with recreational uses such as trails. Areas on the maps shown as restoration/mitigation areas are not off-limits to human use.

UCAC Comment:

- What are the constraints under power lines? Restoration is possible under power lines. Vegetation must not exceed a certain height under the lines and a certain distance from power poles must be kept open to allow for maintenance.
- A member commented that a lot of vegetation was historically removed for farming. Old farms are now dominated by invasives like yellow star thistle and pepperweed.
- A member asked when will the restoration program (RCMP) be incorporated into the Parkway Plan. Answer: starting now. The RCMP work will underlie the planning framework used in updating the Parkway Plan.
- A member asked what about aquatic habitat restoration? Gregg responded that some of the planned habitat projects specifically provide for Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat (SRA), which is high-quality fish habitat along the river edge. Also, some projects will reduce the potential for fish stranding by opening isolation pools where fish tend to get caught when high water flows are reduced. Some projects involve lowering banks, which makes habitat available to fish.
- A member noted that Steelhead Creek, which drains into the Parkway, forms another corridor that extends all the way out to the Dry Creek / Roseville area.
- A member asked what kind of forest is the goal of restoration? Is it possible to restore to oak forest? Gregg responded that elevation above the American River determines what species will be successful. Alder/willow habitat is possible at a low elevation, cottonwood/elderberry thrive in the mid range, while valley oak woodland is a high elevation habitat. Forest density will be determined by each site. Some restoration is planned to create oak woodland.
- A member noted that lowered banks are not ideal for recreation and asked how critical is it to lower the bank? Gregg answered that from a fish perspective it is hugely important. There are many grants targeted to find places to create better habitat to support listed fish species in the river, and lowering banks is one key way to do this. This must be balanced against human use.

- A member asked, what would be the ideal case scenario for restoration in some of these places? Gregg responded that might be one of the alternative concepts that MIG will develop for the UCAC to consider.

California Indian Heritage Center (Larry Myers, California Indian Heritage Center Task Force, and Pauline Grenbeaux, State Parks).

Larry and Pauline discussed the history and vision of the California Indian Heritage Center (CIHC). SB 2063 passed in 2002 creating the CIHC Task Force (TF). The legislation called for identifying a location for a California State Indian Museum and a governance board.

They began by looking for areas with a natural setting of 100 acres or more around it, not urban parks like San Francisco. Ten potential sites from around the state were considered and eventually narrowed down to three in the Sacramento area. The CIHC TF and State Parks put out a Request For Proposals and hired consultants to help evaluate the three sites and give a feasibility assessment. The TF made an initial decision to look at the American River Parkway at Northgate site as the preferred site, although they knew there would be complications. The Northgate site was preferred out of all the Sacramento-area sites because it is a beautiful natural location, situated downtown near the state Capitol, is close to transportation corridors, and it has a peaceful quality that the CIHC would value and want to protect. Larry and Pauline emphasized that the proponents of the CIHC want to be good neighbors and work with the community for whatever site is chosen.

One main purpose of the CIHC would be historical and archeological interpretation of the history of California Indians. The goal is to have a facility that is meaningful and serves all the populations of California, including the 109 federally recognized tribes. CIHC proponents would want to create relationships with universities and colleges, with the tribes, and with the State Librarian.

The CIHC would be a heritage center, not just a museum. It would include outdoor elements with a visual connection to the Heritage Center itself, so that the building would be understood in context of the landscape. Native plants would be interpreted and perhaps used. There would be walking trails and interpretive walks as well as cultural demonstrations such as dance and crafts. They envision the opportunity for traditional games in a clearing, and “villages” of traditional structures built by hand e.g. roundhouse or plank house tucked into natural settings. They would like to be able to do traditional watercraft, e.g. at Urrutia pond. This could take the form of tule boats or log dugout canoes, or even models of sea-going vessels. Indoor programs could include traditional museum exhibits, video or film, meeting rooms, curatorial facilities for museum collections, visitor services including concessions, and office support. This facility would serve as the hub of a network that would support facilities all over the state. It would have resources to support other Indian museums in the State, such as computer networks, workshops, and training.

Pauline discussed that the CIHC will be valuable to the State wherever it is located. She listed ways it could contribute to the Parkway:

- 1) Enhanced interpretation in the American River, including pre-gold rush history, indigenous resource management and current resource management, flood control, and hydrology. The CIHC could help interpret cultural resources for the whole Parkway.
- 2) The CIHC could help introduce the Parkway to people who don't already know about it. There would be opportunities for cross-cultural ties, for example inviting the Vietnamese

community to demonstrate traditional fishing techniques as compared to Indian techniques. State and national attention brought to the Parkway could lead to political or economic support.

- 3) Tangible support for operations and maintenance. The CIHC would bring State Parks support to the lower reaches, e.g. archeologists, and historians, planners. If staff is there, it would be a continual presence including overnight, which could help with “eyes on the Parkway.” There would also be potential Indian support for Parkway maintenance and programs.
- 4) The CIHC would contribute to regional planning goals by being a gateway between the urban and natural areas.
- 5) The CIHC would help promote values of environmental stewardship, which are important to Indians.

Pauline mentioned that there would be no fence or gates for the CIHC. The general visitor wouldn't know when they had left the County part of the Parkway and entered the CIHC site. If there is an admission fee, it would be for the CIHC building.

UCAC comments:

- Where are we in planning process? All that has been done so far is to narrow sites down and look at challenges and opportunities in various sites. The TF is aware that the CIHC would have to be compatible with the Parkway Plan. The CIHC proponents are working with the public through the UCAC to see if the values of the CIHC and ARPP can be reconciled.
- A member commented that no physical description of the CIHC has been offered. Pauline responded that they do not have a firm concept of things such as height, architecture, whether it will be separate pieces or one big building, how it would relate to site, and how close to or far back it would be from the river. The CIHC TF is open to suggestions and criteria from the UCAC. Their assumption is that the CIHC entrance would probably come off of Northgate. State Parks and the CIHC TF are selecting a firm this month that will help them confirm what their needs are for master planning.
- Where is funding for the CIHC coming from? State Proposition 40 has given State Parks \$5 million to get started through development of a master plan. State Parks then must fund pieces through future bond measures and federal money. They would approach the Indian community and private foundations too.
- Would the CIHC consider building in the Richard's Blvd area to avoid building in the floodplain? Pauline responded that the area is unsuitable because it is an urban setting. The TF was offered a prominent urban museum site but decided that it is important to have a natural setting. They could consider splitting the CIHC into parts but there would have to be good connections to link the “outside” natural pieces and the “inside” museum and community resource pieces.
- One member commented that there has long been a “threshold question” for determining if something can be built in the Parkway. The proposed use must be something that is specific to the Parkway and cannot be done elsewhere. This member asked, “What about your proposal makes it something that it can be done only in the Parkway?” Pauline answered that the confluence of rivers has a special meaning to Indians. The CIHC has an alternative site in Folsom, but there are things about that site that make it less attractive. It is not by the state capital and doesn't have the rest of the Parkway around it.

- A member asked if the 100 acres proposed for the CIHC would be new purchased land adjacent to the Parkway, or would it be land that is already in the Parkway? Also, where would parking be? Pauline answered that the CIHC property could be a smaller piece of land (less than 100 acres) surrounded by protected area (already in the Parkway). They are focusing on the area between Northgate and Discovery Park, which includes Riverdale Resort and Mobile Home Park and the Urrutia property. The Boy Scouts' Camp Pollock would be adjacent. Parking would probably be split up. There would be some parking right by the building off the street—perhaps the triangle on the other side of 160—and there would be remote parking.
- A member commented that the concept of splitting the CIHC facilities sounds like a good opportunity to keep natural elements in the Parkway. Pauline responded that they will be looking at the redevelopment area by the Northgate site, but there would have to be some kind of visual or spatial connection so that people know that the different pieces are unified.
- A member asked why the CIHC proponents would want to pave over a piece of the Parkway's open space, which is finite. Pauline responded that only a very small piece of the Parkway would be built on, which would open up tremendous opportunities to bring resources, interpretation, and new visitors and supporters to the Parkway.
- A member emphasized that the UCAC needs to see a plan with a schematic of the building. Pauline stated that State Parks is willing to bring in design concepts as long as UCAC members understand that any proposed design is flexible and is just a point of departure for discussion. State Parks is open to principles and criteria to shape what the actual building(s) would look like.
- A member commented that he wants to ensure UCAC members keep an open mind about the CIHC. The City is for it, County Parks is opposed; some members of BOS are opposed some are not. The CIHC should get a fair hearing from the UCAC.

Downtown-Natomas-Airport - Regional Transit (DNA-RT) Light Rail Crossing

(Bryan Porter, Parsons Brinkerhoff) Bryan's Power Point presentation will be available on the project website at <http://americanriverparkwayupdate.org>.

Bryan's presentation addressed the rationale for putting a light rail line through the Parkway and why the Truxel alignment was selected. Bryan also presented the timeline for selecting a final route and constructing the light rail line.

He began by discussing the general need for the light rail line:

- Provide transit facilities to address population and employment growths of 120 and 65 percent respectively.
- Mitigate the impact of 12,000 acres of new development.
- Promote Transit-Oriented-Development in North Natomas to reduce sprawl.
- Reduce mobile emissions.

Timeline:

- Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation published on December 12, 2001.
- Federal Transit Authority review of Administrative draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Report (EIS/R) – Fall 2005.
- Draft EIS/R to public in late 2005.

Criteria Used for Alternative Development & Selection

- Minimize community impacts (Construction impact, property acquisition, Environmental Justice (EJ) impact concerns, visual effects, land use compatibility).
- Minimize impacts to the natural environment (Acres disturbed, effects on water and wetlands, loss of and impact on habitat).
- Engineering feasibility (Cost, ridership, reduction in congestion, operations, travel time, constructability, amount of aerial structure, effects on existing infrastructure).

Three main alternatives were considered, called the I-5 alignment, I-5/Truxel alignment, and Truxel alignment. Each would require a bridge crossing over the American River. The Sacramento Regional Board supports the Truxel alignment. To come to this decision, dozens of meetings were held and RT worked with interested parties such as the Lower American River Task Force (LARTF) and the City and County.

Summary of Findings: Locally Preferred Alternative: The Truxel Alignment

- New bridge over American River
- Double track light rail on Truxel alignment

Alternative 3 has been selected as the LPA because it:

- Best addresses project goals
- Has the highest ridership and reduction in congestion
- Best fulfills community vision
- Represents the best engineering feasibility
- This alternative can be built in cost effective phases.

Tradeoff: Impacts to biological resources higher than other alternatives

Two river crossing options are being considered as part of the locally preferred Truxel alignment. The environmental documents will include four river crossings for environmental analysis purposes. Detailed slides showing comparative impacts of the four bridge crossing locations (I-5, Truxel, 5th St, and 7th St). are available in Bryan's Power Point presentation which can be found on the project website at <http://americanriverparkwayupdate.org>. Bryan mentioned that any of these bridge crossings will create a significant impact to the Parkway, such as impacts to mature cottonwood riparian forest. The 5th street option bisects an existing mitigation site. The 7th St/Urrutia option creates noise and visual impacts on residents. The I-5 option bisects existing use at Discovery Park. This alignment would be elevated above I-5 and would create significant visual impacts. The option to have a station in the Parkway is still on table and has received mixed reviews. The station would only be operational during appropriate times.

RT will be preparing an environmental document to consider all impacts for bridge variations on the Truxel alignment. The next step is to have a DEIS/EIR to the public hopefully late this year, circulated for 60 days). The PE/FEIS (Preliminary Engineering / Final EIS Report) should be out in summer or fall of 2005. Then RT will seek the required permits.

Bryan mentioned that RT examined a tunnel option (going under the Parkway rather than through it with an aerial bridge) at the request of the LARTF. The tunnel feasibility study found that it would be technically feasible to tunnel under the Parkway, but financially infeasible. The DNA-RT must meet certain cost-benefit criteria to be competitive for federal funding, and including a tunnel under

the Parkway would make the entire DNA-RT project non-competitive. Project costs without a station would be \$60-70 million for an aerial bridge vs. \$155 million if they had to tunnel under the river. The cost would rise to \$240 million with an underground station and tunnel crossing.

Measure A will provide \$50 million for engineering and final design of the DNA-RT project, but not construction. The thinking is that RT, the County, and the City will probably go back to voters in 2008 and ask for more support for transportation measures. The DNA-RT line will likely be constructed around 2015 or 2020.

UCAC comment:

- Is preliminary approval of the Truxel alignment binding? It is RT's decision to have Truxel as the locally preferred alternative, but the project must be funded by the federal government.
- Will this involve pilings in the river or river banks? Current plans call for fourteen piers to be built across the Parkway, two of which would be in the water. They could design a bridge to eliminate piers in the river. Bannon slough is spanned.
- Is RT making sure the elevation of the bridge will not be in the way of flood flows? Yes, RT has worked closely with SAFCA for hydraulic analysis.
- Will the RT bridge include a bicycle crossing? Yes, it will have light rail, bicycle, and pedestrian access.
- A member asked is RT aware that this would violate the 1985 Parkway Plan that says no new bridges? Bryan answered that RT is aware of that interpretation.
- A member commented that there was a wide-ranging, large, and contentious group that advised RT for two years on the locally preferred alternative. Not every problem has been solved fully but many of the issues of concern to the UCAC were discussed in detail. The I-5 alignment was not attractive because of low ridership and increased time to get to a destination. One very important thing the group kept in mind was how to get people from houses to jobs and solve some congestion, getting folks off the roads.

Public comment:

- A member of the public commented that noise is an issue from 1/2 to 3/4 mile away from a bridge. A tunnel would be best from a noise-reduction perspective. Having a new bridge next to an existing bridge, or as close as possible, is the next best thing. Bryan affirmed that noise was considered in the alternatives analysis and will be considered for the Truxel bridge options.
- A member of the public suggested that RT get an arborist to do tree counts of California native trees greater than 4 inches, since some areas potentially impacted by the project might have heritage trees.

UCAC wrap-up comments:

- What will happen on March 28? We will have a four hour meeting, 6-10 PM. It will be hands-on meeting and working groups will work with the maps. UCAC members should prepare with all the materials handed out.
- How will the UCAC finalize natural resource policies? How do they relate to what we're doing now? Sunny is looking for comments on the new draft of the natural resource policies that the small group worked on. The UCAC will return to working on policies full time after

the IAP is over, and in the meantime staff are doing what they can to help members work on policies in parallel to the IAP process.

- A member expressed disappointment that it felt to him like many of the projects discussed in this meeting had already been decided. He had a feeling of being told what will happen vs. advising on what will happen. He requested that project proponents return as resources when UCAC members discuss alternatives for IAP mapping. Staff will invite the presenters back for the March 28 charrette.
- Several members emphasized the need for more UCAC member discussion. Members felt that information presented thus far has been useful, but many members are eager for UCAC member voices to be heard more in meetings.
- Will the UCAC hear about the Gold Rush park idea? It should be possible to arrange that if the group wants to hear about that project.
- A member commented that the UCAC needs more information about public safety issues, trail signage, mountain biking, dogs in the parks. The UCAC needs to see research and examples. Staff answered that more information will be brought into the next meeting. This will be interactive, not presentations.
- A member suggested that individuals representing groups could present position papers on where they stand on the issues. Staff asked if this member would be comfortable waiting another meeting or two, since staff do not want things to get positional before group members get to talk and contribute in a hands-on fashion in shaping proposals. The member who brought up the idea of position papers indicated he was comfortable waiting.
- A member commented that the presentations at this meeting did address public safety. For example, the “eyes on Parkway” concept discussed by the City of Sacramento is an important part of safety.
- A member commented that she wants to see overlays of all the visions and ideas for the IAP area. Staff responded that the UCAC is headed there next week.
- A member commented that many of the people who attended the first community workshop were members of organized groups represented on UCAC. He asked how do we get neighborhood people involved? That is a priority.
- A member commented that people need to get out into the Parkway and see what it looks like now. It is not pristine.
- A member emphasized early notification to the public for the second community workshop. People need sufficient lead time. Staff promised to find a location and have a draft agenda for the community workshop to circulate well in advance.

Public comment:

- A member of the public reiterated that information is needed on surface mining reclamation requirements at Urrutia. Tim Washburn answered that this information is being developed. Tim will email out the write-up.

Action Items & Follow-Up

Who	What	When
Committee Members	Review and become familiar with the following: RCMP sections from RCMP reference sheet; potential plan program components handout; existing conditions maps; draft plan framework	Before March 28 meeting

Committee Members	Review and provide feedback to Sunny on Natural Resource Management Policies draft 2/15/05	By March 18
Committee Members	Promote second Community Workshop on March 31 to colleagues and neighborhoods you represent. Contact Laura Kaplan at lkaplan@ccp.csus.edu if you have additional suggestions for groups to contact or other outreach activities	Ongoing
Staff	Find location and develop press release and agenda for March 31 Community Workshop	Well in advance of March 31 community workshop
Staff	Make sure libraries and community centers receive the press release for the tour, work with media and community groups.	As far in advance as possible of March 31 community workshop
Tim Washburn	Email information on reclamation requirements for Urrutia property to UCAC and interested parties list	As soon as available

Meeting Materials:

- Meeting agenda
- Natural Resource Management Policies Draft 2/15/2005
- Integrated Area Planning Community Tour Final Draft Summary
- Hardcopy of Power Point entitled UCAC #3 – Draft Plan Framework
- RCMP Reference Sheet (blue card)
- Potential Plan Program Components (11x17 handout)
- Existing Conditions maps of Discovery/Tiscornia Park, Woodlake, and Cal Expo (three 11x17 color maps)
- Integrated Area Planning Process diagram (buff page)
- Handout: About the California Indian Heritage Center (State Parks)
- Handout: Riverfront Drive Concept from Richard's Blvd Area Plan Public Review Draft (City of Sacramento)

Topics for March 28 Update Committee Meeting

- Hands-on mapping exercise using IAP program components and alternatives

Attendance

Members: X=Present, Alt=Alternate present

Attended	Name		Representing
X	Jerry	Ahlin	City of Rancho Cordova Appointment

X	Katie	Baygell	American River Parkway Volunteer Equestrian Patrol
X	Peggy	Berry	District 2 - Supervisor Collin Appointment
X	Lea	Brooks	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA)
X	Frank	Cirill	Save the American River Association (SARA)
X	Dave	Ford	California Fly Fishers Unlimited
X	Al	Freitas	Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)
X	Michael	Gunby	Sacramento City Appointments
X	Lou	Heinrich	American River Natural History Association
X	Ken	Miller	American River Parkway Foundation
X	Bob	Horowitz	Sacramento Area Mountain Biking Association (SAMBA)
X	Eric	Johnson	Dist 1 - Supervisor Dickinson Appointment
	Eddie	Kho	Dist 5 - Supervisor Notolli Appointment
X	Connie	Miottel	Sacramento City Appointments
X	Mark	Murray	Buffalo Chips Running Club
X	Ted	Sheedy	Sacramento City Appointments
X	Janel	Silva	Sacramento Area Dog Owners Group (SACDOG)
X	Greg	Speicher	Boating
X	Peter	Tateishi	Dist 3 - Supervisor Johnson Appointment
X	Renée	Taylor	Dist 4 - Supervisor Niello Appointment
X	Frank	Wallace	California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
	Art	White	Sacramento County Recreation and Parks Commission: ex-officio
x	Melinda	Williams	Sacramento City Appointments

Others

Leighann Moffit, County Planning
 Tim Washburn, SAFCA
 Sue Wise, County Parks
 Bob Overstreet, City Parks
 Teresa Haenggi, City Parks
 Steve Launey, CalExpo
 Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova

Janet Baker, Sacramento City Parks
 Peter Buck, SAFCA
 Paul Devereux, AR Flood Control District
 Steve Peterson, City Planning
 Helen Selph, City Planning
 Ron Suter, County Parks
 J.P. Tindell, City Parks

Jim Morgan
 Betsy Weiland
 Bert Hodges
 Lisa Owens
 Jackie Kuwarth

Matt Frank, CH2M Hill
 Bill Griffith
 Phillip Guddeni
 Charlie Rice
 John Hervey

Bryan Porter, Parsons Brinkerhoff
 Gail Kara
 Miki Fujitshibo
 Elmer Aldrich
 Randy Smith
 Erik Spiess

Project Staff

Gary Kukkola, Sacramento County Parks
 John Folk-Williams, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy
 Laura Kaplan, Center for Collaborative Policy
 Daniel Iacofano, MIG
 Paul Curfman, MIG
 Rosemary Dudley, MIG
 Chad Markell, MIG