

# American River Parkway Plan - Update Citizen's Advisory Committee

## Meeting Highlights—June 27, 2005

### Key Outcomes

- UCAC members provided input on the “special interest area” detailed planning at key access points and intersections in the Integrated Area Planning (IAP) area.
- UCAC members discussed the PMT analysis of bicycle riding on unpaved trails. A large majority of members present supported the PMT analysis that this use is appropriate given certain conditions (yet to be determined). UCAC members added the idea that bicycle riding on unpaved trails should have a sunset clause and be monitored to ensure it is not causing environmental damage. They also supported the idea of having a structured stewardship and education program.
- UCAC members discussed the PMT’s analysis of allowing off-leash dogs in the IAP area. Two thirds of members present agreed that off-leash dogs should not be allowed in the IAP area.
- UCAC members discussed possible uses for the Gardenland Pond, should it be publicly acquired. Members agreed that one function of the pond should be to harbor wildlife. Some members wanted human recreational and boating at the pond, while others felt it should be exclusively for wildlife and wildlife observation.

### Decision Items for August 15 Meeting @ the Library Galleria, 828 I Street.

- Make any desired changes to the IAP Conceptual Plan as a result of public input.

### Announcements

July 18 from 6-9 PM will be the third community workshop on Integrated Area Planning (IAP), Library Galleria 828 I Street.

### Special Interest Area diagrams

Daniel Iacofano (MIG) reminded the group that MIG will be producing special interest area diagrams. These are areas that need to be examined in greater detail, especially near proposed new access points or parking. Currently, MIG plans to create special interest area diagrams for the Woodlake “gateway” area; Ethan Way trailhead; parking off of Garden Highway to east end of Discovery Park; and the proposed parking near Cal Expo.

UCAC comment:

- Add Canterbury Way near REI. This area has good access to Highway 160 and is an opportunity to park outside of the Parkway.

## Unresolved program components

Daniel directed the group's attention to the Project Management Team's (PMT) analysis of three proposed controversial uses, using the PMT's suggested criteria as a framework.

### *Unpaved trail bicycle riding*

Daniel reviewed the highlights of the PMT analysis: The proposal is for bicyclists to share existing or reconfigured unpaved dirt or gravel trails (red trails on the proposal map) with other users, and yielding to all other users. There would be a set of user guidelines and peer monitoring. From the PMT perspective, bicycles can be controlled, instructed to yield, and groups would self-monitor or self-police in conjunction with a bike club education program. This would be aided by trail markers, sustainable trail techniques to minimize trail footprint and enforcement. Competitive bike courses would not be allowed.

UCAC member comments:

- Are narrow trails intended for bike usage? Answer: There could be narrow trails for slower bicycle use, but UCAC could decide this is or is not appropriate.
- Who currently can use the red multi-use trails? The current 1985 Plan prohibits bicycles on these trails. Allowed users include maintenance, law enforcement, the Western Area Power Association (WAPA), power line/utility maintenance, hikers, and the fire department.
- The Sacramento Area Mountain Bike Association (SAMBA) website doesn't mention size of membership, when established, or whether it is an incorporated non-profit. Answer: SAMBA was established a couple of years ago to organize in this area. A number of people have expressed interest. Paid members are about 25 people. It is not a non-profit.
- SAMBA's last handout stated that most of illegal bicycle riding occurs around Woodlake and Cal Expo. I don't think that's correct. There is extensive damage at Watt Avenue, Gristmill, Rossmoor Bar, upper Sunrise, and Goethe park. Photos were attached to Frank Cirril's last handout.
- Many of the photos in Frank's last handout are the same area photographed from different angles.
- On page 7 of SAMBA's comments it says, "BMX tracks have a small footprint and should be encouraged in neighborhoods outside the Parkway." Answer: Yes, we need them somewhere. They do have a small footprint compared to golf course or soccer field. The community needs to provide them.
- How would you establish BMX facilities? Answer: You would place them in small open parcels. For example, the old compost pad at Sutter's Landing would be more than adequate. There probably could also be something in the north area. We need to have BMX facilities within 1-3 miles of where the kids live. I'm not recommending BMX in the Parkway, but it will be hard to keep those kids out if there is nowhere else to go. Take the pressure off the Parkway by making BMX a legal use somewhere appropriate.
- I agree that Sutter's Landing is a large area that could work out well for BMX. There is also a skate-boarding facility there.

- We're not talking about BMX in the Parkway. We're talking about mountain bikes or regular bikes riding on dirt trails. Not jumps. The illegal BMX use in the Parkway is kids coming in from probably less than a mile away. The PMT does not recommend technical courses such as BMX, and no one is challenging that.
- The Save the American River Association (SARA) has a report from a Los Angeles (LA) Mountain Bike access group which states in part, "There is overwhelming evidence from the LA report that responsible mountain biking is not the norm, and that trail etiquette, monitoring, and enforcement are comforting ideas but not reality." SAMBA response: The LA working group majority report is not an official document. I went to the City of Los Angeles Parks Department and tried for a month to get that report. I talked to people on that committee who have never seen the report. I also talked to the Superintendent of LA Parks and Recreation and no one in his office has heard of this report. It is not an official document of the City of LA and has no official standing. That committee met for nine months, not 6 years. They conducted no studies of any kind. The LA Police Department had a mountain bike patrol. A group of equestrians didn't like that. This report was written by a small number of irate equestrians who didn't want mountain bikers, including the police, on the trails. I corresponded with the City and Peter Human who was on the committee. The committee was loaded with 15 people against mountain biking, 5 for. The report was submitted without their knowledge and not at a public meeting. It is not a final report of the committee. As a result of this, the LA Police Department was kicked out of their training ground in Elysian Park and Griffith Park is off limits. I talked with a 15-year veteran of the police force who said these parks have become much more dangerous since the police were kicked out: there are more drugs, sex crimes, etc.
- In the June 13 letter from SARA, page 2, it says that SARA will not oppose the use of bicycles off the paved bicycle trail in the Parkway. The only thing that there might be disagreement is on is whether it is appropriate for bikers to use single track (narrow multi-use trails).
- One of the primary purposes of the Parkway is preservation of natural resources. The issue is whether existing trails will be used responsibly, e.g. bikers will not branch out on deer trails for more challenge and excitement. My concern is based on other park experiences: will trails be used responsibly without having fencing and without expending too many resources? In general we (the California Native Plant Society) have a strong concern and would be opposed to this use. We are concerned that having the policy to allow this use will invite more irresponsible use.
- The Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA) has taken a position. We support the PMT analysis and SARA and the Parkway Foundation. We want unpaved trail bicycle use limited to existing fire and access roads with some modifications to improve alignment and avoid conflicts with other users. No new trails. Bicyclists on unpaved trails must yield to other users at intersections including paved biking. These trails should not share or replace the equestrian trail. This use should not be allowed until a funding source is secured to manage, maintain and enforce the use. Measure A funds are limited to transportation and cannot be used for off-road cycling. The County should have clear authority to close or modify access if there is harm to habitat or wildlife. We support having a plan for funding to restore habitat loss due to the illegal cycling happening now. There are bikes riding now on the decomposed granite shoulder. We would like it to be clear that the shoulder is for pedestrians.
- I live near Gristmill. I see a lot of people using the Parkway, including regular and mountain bikes, and little kids on their bikes. How do you single out mountain bikers? These trails

were created by people riding different kinds of bikes. I agree with the PMT analysis. The PMT said that cycling would be allowed on trails that were signed for that use; other trails would not allow bike use.

- We, the American River Parkway Foundation (ARPF), distributed a letter which pretty much parallels what the PMT and SARA have said. We add an additional recommendation: There should be a structured stewardship program with a self-policing element and promotion of environmental education and awareness. Maybe bicyclists have to take a class to get access to the dirt trails. ARPF could be a part of the education; our volunteer center could be a focal point for all user groups. We are cognizant of the need for eyes on Parkway and we believe that core users will take care of the Parkway and won't want to lose it. The County has the discretion to close the trails to bicyclists if the trails are abused. From a resources standpoint, if we are sticking to existing dirt paths and just re-label them as multi-use, I don't think it will have a significant impact on natural resources. We might even enhance the area by driving out less desirable uses. We say this should only be in one reach of the IAP area, not all three. We could expand the area open for dirt trail bicycling after testing it out.
- Responsible vs. irresponsible use comes down to enforcement, which is unlikely given budget constraints.
- I think the conditions of use that the PMT laid out are a nice compromise. Enforcement is a big concern for me, and also public safety—I do think having more people out there is a good thing. The problem with enforcement is the same with bikers as with illegal campers. We need to deal with enforcement concerns systemically and not put the burden on one group. I like that we are talking about self-policing and the idea of a central volunteer center. I don't think that funding should be an issue for just one use. It should not be used as an excuse to delay or exclude one use, but as an impetus to get public safety for all groups. I think it's great to have a pilot program, let's see how it will work. Will it help to control illegal camping? Then we'll have information that goes beyond other people's experiences in other places or anecdotal evidence.
- This is such an extensive trail system, but it does help with circulation. We've said that this circulation diagram looks good, but have we forgotten the previous discussions about not carving new paths? I have misgivings about mountain biking, but a lot of people ride them like normal bikes. Enforcement will be key. It will be unacceptable if it crosses over to BMX.
- To what extent would bike trails be guided by policy in the Parkway Plan? Answer: All the policies affect this area.
- Will the criteria discussed at the last meeting be criteria for operation? Answer: Yes, if there are violations of the conditions of use.
- Will the criteria seen here be embodied in the updated Plan? Answer: We're not sure how it will be framed but yes.
- Will the updated plan define what sensitive habitat is and map out where sensitive habitats exist? Answer: Yes. An interpretive plan with signage and materials would be the extension of that.
- I think this is a good plan. I like the idea of more access from Downtown, Midtown, and East Sac. I like the proposed trail alignments. There will probably be a zero net increase in trails because some existing trails will be abandoned and restored, and new trails will have better alignments for habitat and safety. I disagree with only having unpaved trail cycling in one reach because you need eyes and ears everywhere. If you just do one reach, you just move the problem around. By doing all three reaches, I think you have a better idea of how

it will work. I agree with the PMT conditions. If you have a patrol, don't be limited to just cyclists. Look at all users. All user groups have people that abuse their rights, and there are people who need help way finding, etc. Patrollers should be people with a radio and a vest whether on foot, bike, or horse.

- I understand the desire for a test case. Would it be acceptable to have a sunset clause like roller bladders did, in other words, have a limited period of time for a pilot? One reach is just a mile and a half long. The ARFP education proposal is also a nice idea. Can you write a sunset statement into the Plan? In that case I'd be supportive. Answer: Yes, this could have a sunset clause.
- The sunset period should have a monitoring program to obtain data on Parkway resources before and after the pilot program.

Daniel took a straw poll of the group, which is not binding or definitive. This information will be taken into the public workshop and reconsidered by the UCAC after hearing public comment. Daniel asked the UCAC to consider the PMT analysis as a starting point as described, and add in the ideas of a sunset clause, structured stewardship, and monitoring. This was called the "PMT plus" concept, and the straw poll results were as follows on PMT plus:

Agree as described: 12

Generally agree but have additional conditions or qualifications: 2

Go along or stand aside (not object): 1

Don't like the use, register opposition: 2

(Is this opposition because it's too restrictive? No.)

MIG clarified that new single track trails fall under the idea of technical trail construction and would not be part of the plan.

Bob Horowitz (SAMBA) will circulate a list of his proposed conditions, which are different from the PMT's. He agreed with the idea that intersection with trails should be signed and that unpaved trail users should yield.

What happens when trails go over the water? Answer: There would be a bridge or platform. There are many attractive solutions to address water crossings which are friendly to the environment.

A member commented that the trail crossing could be accomplished with a simple culvert. MIG responded that culverts channel water and increase velocity and erosion, so they have fallen out of favor in environmentally-sensitive trail design.

## **Public comment**

- I agree with the SARA letter that bicycling be restricted to double wide or wider trails that trucks are currently using. There are conflicts on hiking trails if there is only space for one person. Bicycles should not be on single-wide trails.
- As an equestrian, I see bicyclists in two groups. There are those who stay on the trail and there are those who want an extreme sport experience and go off-trail. Good ones come

with bad ones. I'm concerned that we'll have more illegal off-trail use. I'm also concerned that moving the equestrian trail down would create impact, and I'm concerned about the close proximity of all trails together.

- A strong point from SARA is that none of this should exist until there is sufficient staff to patrol it.
- I think the Update Committee is doing a good job. The paved trails take all kinds of bikes. Off-paved-trail riding will be all kinds of bikes. I second the sunset clause and Parks Department discretion to open and close trails to bicycles. This must be based on an inventory of the whole Parkway and aerial photographs that show all the approved trails and all the illegal trails and say what is in and what is out for monitoring etc. We must have a baseline to benchmark from.
- I have concerns over damage to natural values. I would like to see some kind of environmental analysis for the baseline that might settle any controversy as to the amount of damage. Preliminary studies should be done in advance before allowing the use. This takes away the emotion, gets down to facts.
- The City Parks and Recreation Department intends to open BMX areas in south Natomas and also at Sutter's Landing.
- I have mountain biked all over. Once people have the experience of multi-use it's really no problem. With a trial period, we find out it works just fine. We don't need extensive rules.
- In East Bay Regional Parks where off-trail bicycles are allowed, at all entry points there is signage that bicyclists always yield to horses. That's education that needs to be done.

### *Off-leash dogs*

Daniel reviewed the highlights of the PMT analysis. The proposal for off-leash dog use has been for a 25 acre minimum fenced area or larger areas, some of which could be unconfined. The PMT confined their discussions to a defined area of some size. The PMT concluded that off-leash dog recreation is a valid activity and that it would be desirable to find a location for the use. They discussed impacts to sensitive habitat and species, and were sensitive that being in a floodway brings issues and constraints, especially with fences or barriers that degrade the flood conveyance capacity of the floodway. The PMT does not believe voice control is a reliable way to control dogs. The PMT does not believe that off-leash dog use is appropriate for the IAP area due to the habitat concerns and floodway concerns, but the PMT intends to encourage area governments to look for a site that does not have these constraints.

UCAC member comment:

- SABA supports the PMT position. I can't imagine supporting off-leash dogs in the Parkway under any conditions. Unleashed dogs are unpredictable. I agree there is a need in the area but the Parkway is inappropriate. It is a danger to other users and habitat, and there are fencing issues. Dogs are allowed in the Parkway on a 6-foot leash.
- I agree with SABA.
- SARA's position is clear in its June 13 letter. We have listed in detail why this should not be allowed in the Parkway.

- Much of SARA's position paper was taken from the County Parks Report of 2002. That report had a promise to explore off-leash dog areas at Mather Field and Sutter's Landing. Mather Field has been promised but not realized for over 10 years. The area in Sutter's Landing has become a 2-acre dog park next to railroad tracks. There is no legal off-leash area in the County that provides water access. You won't stop the use by outlawing it. If we have a place we can go, we have a chance to regulate and educate. The PMT are not professional dog trainers so they have no place to say voice control is not reliable.
- Who is currently in charge of the Rancho Secco recreation area? It has a body of water and a recreational component. Maybe that could be an area to pursue. There are other bodies of water that aren't moving that maybe dog owners could focus in on. Answer: the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is in charge of Rancho Secco.
- The American River Parkway Foundation (ARPF) also agrees with PMT position.
- I think it would be wonderful to have dogs off-leash but I also think it is inappropriate for the Parkway. Fencing can't be reconciled with the flood control function. Voice control doesn't always work even if people think their dogs are well-behaved, and not all people have professionally trained dogs. That being said, there is definitely a need. Off-leash dog advocates have been waiting a long time for this to happen. Are there areas being looked at to happen soon, e.g. detention ponds in South Natomas? Answer: Yes.
- The conversations about the detention ponds were in 2002, but that should be addressed now. The energy that goes into trying to get off-leash dog access in the Parkway should go toward other areas. We need commitment from the County and City that they will do that.
- Daniel Iacofano asked the Committee members if they agree there is a need for a facility and need to find a suitable location outside the Parkway. The vast majority of Committee members present agreed. One member said she thought efforts to find another facility were already underway.
- If there is an off-leash dog area at Sutter's Landing, can it have riverfront access, and wouldn't that riverfront be in the Parkway? Answer: Yes, the edge of the river is in the Parkway. It's very hard to put fences in the floodway. There are also a whole range of visitor conflict issues that are of concern as well.
- If there is a position that off-leash dogs have to be out of the Parkway, the edge of the south side is technically in the Parkway but is essentially completely separated from the Parkway. It is possible the City has found a part of Parkway that is so separate that it would be acceptable.
- I have a sense from the reports I've read that the community is in the process of addressing this.
- A lot of us at SacDog are tired and have been fighting so long. This generation of dogs will die. It's painful not to provide adequate recreation for our dogs in this county. We've already waited 10 years.
- I agree in general with the PMT statement but I also acknowledge there is a need. Maybe there is a way to make this happen, maybe by having a pilot program like we're doing with unpaved trail bicycling. Maybe we require a training program where owner and pet have to pass a course in order to allow the dog off-leash. Graduates of the program could be designated with a special collar. Dog owners need to police that to get unqualified dogs out of the area. Have a one year pilot and see how it works. Can it be regulated? If there's a will to make it happen, it can be done safely.

- 25 acres is too big. Is there a compromise size of 5 to 10 acres in the Parkway? I don't have a dog, I'm looking at it from engineering viability of having a park within the Parkway. Fencing within the Parkway seems to be a hang-up. There is a way to do this without fencing. You can depress an area and create a barrier, like a detention basin. A water quality feature is dry for the most part and it could be compatible with this use. Answer: A depression would fill with sediment in a flood and would have to be dug out afterwards.
- With trails and biking we had clearly identified constraints. We have not had that discussion here. Where on the Parkway would you have 25 acres like that? Paradise beach is a popular area for swimming and families etc. But if you're talking about a corridor that runs 25 acres on the edge, there's no area like that. I understand that water is the issue. There could be a lake or a pond in an existing off-leash dog area. If you're looking at sensitive habitat criteria, there's no place on the Parkway where you wouldn't be cutting across habitat. We talk about activation of the Parkway. If I were a parent of young kids and I knew that an area allowed off-leash dogs, I wouldn't bring a kid there. This would decrease use.
- I support the idea of an off-leash dog facility not in the Parkway, somewhere appropriate. There is a legitimate need that the County and Cities should try to address.

Daniel took a straw poll of UCAC members on the PMT analysis which said that off-leash dogs are not appropriate in the IAP area.

Agree as written: 12

Agree with qualifications or conditions: 0

Stand aside: 0

Disagree with the statement: 6

Public comment:

- If I ride a bike on City streets, I expect dogs to be on a leash. I expect that same control and courtesy in the Parkway. That includes a 6 foot leash maximum; I've been clotheslined by leashed dogs. On roadways, my number one enemy is a car. On the trail, it's a dog. Less than one percent of dogs are professionally trained. The rest are pets and need to be under control. We need to have education about dog use on leash too.
- My husband competes in dog trials. Voice control is not 100 percent or else all the dogs would win! The brain spaces out. Dogs don't always know what's good for them. They bother wildlife and horses. We have electronic collars for our dogs. The collars die once in a while like a cell phone. Just build a pond somewhere else. I support the PMT position.
- I support the PMT position.
- I think the one thing left out is that what we as dog owners are looking for is a place to hike with dogs, not just standing and throwing a ball. I don't want my dog to get near the bike trail and get hit. There's a whole lot more to the Parkway than the bike trail. People are upset about illegal camping and trash in Woodlake. It looks like there's a lot of space in that area where 25 acres could have stewards with dog companions help to protect environment. Dogs don't impact habitat. Dogs don't like

to get smashed up by bushes. They stay near their owners. They don't go pulling out shrubs. Dogs are not good hunters, they leave hunting to the coyotes and there are plenty of those. I don't think the off-trail pathways are being created by dogs. They are created by humans and wildlife. When you are moving with the dog, they are exploring and enjoying, not aggressing. We just want a place where it's okay for us to be out there.

- I have 3 rescue dogs and I use the Parkway with my dogs. There are so many hiking opportunities on the Parkway with your dog right now. We use all the trails on leash. I heard a woman tell about her dog off-leash that killed a jackrabbit, and I have seen deer chased by dogs who were chased by their owners.

### *Use of Gardenland Pond*

Daniel reminded the UCAC that the Gardenland Pond is currently a non-operating mine. The goal is to acquire it and integrate it into the Parkway. MIG has talked about using design techniques to make a more ecological edge condition. The UCAC has had discussions about how to use this area. MIG will present a range of possibilities for more feedback at the workshop, such as:

- 1) Use it as a waterfowl area because of the unique still water aquatic resource it presents. Create islands or peninsulas or other niches supportive of migratory bird life. There are examples of that along the edge of East Shore Regional Park. Crissy Field at the Presidio in San Francisco took an airstrip and made a natural aquatic area where birds have returned.
- 2) Provide access by way of the driveway to the Gardenland Quarry house.
- 3) In connection with the proposed California Indian Heritage Center (CIHC), there could be some interpretive programming that uses a portion of the pond for demonstrations and education. This could also be done apart from the CIHC.
- 4) Different types of recreational boating.

Daniel stated that he had assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that some of those uses would be compatible with each other because it's a fairly large area. For example, you could have some sheltered edges or areas just for habitat with no recreational uses.

Daniel reminded the group that there was agreement among the UCAC at a previous meeting that the Gardenland in-holding should be acquired if resources can be found, but the UCAC didn't say what is the preferred use. Part of the CALFED grant that is paying for the IAP process is predicated on restoration along the river's edge. For this project, there will be grading in the Gardenland area to reconfigure the flood plain as it rises on the edge of the pond. This would be graded down for public safety too. There is an opportunity to get water into the pond from Bannon Slough, but the pond would have to be separated from Bannon Slough and there would be no access to the river through the pond since the pond has bass that would eat salmonids coming from the slough and river.

UCAC member comment:

- We need to flesh out the future of the area in order to do planning and the other reason is to establish a range of alternatives. We don't own the land but we have been interested in acquiring it for some time. We have come close in the past. The future of this part of the Parkway is driven by the grant money that might be made available to acquire it, and that money would come with constraints. I would be cautious of defining this area too much because it may constrain our ability to get the grant to obtain the land.
- I've known this property for over 20 years. The owner is anxious to sell. He is over 80 years old. I think the highest and best use would be a bird sanctuary and the best stewards would be the Audubon Society. I have other ideas for how to fund this without relying on the grant. The Parkway has mitigation banks for people who have projects in a different area and are looking for properties to restore for mitigation credit. We could fund the purchase of this based on mitigation bank sales in the Parkway. I think we should recommend the bird sanctuary now. We have Peter Buck and Trevor Burwell as naturalists, and we can use departments at Sacramento State and UC Davis to cut costs and get planning early.
- I agree with the last statement. It would be a wonderful passive use with interpretive possibilities for the public.
- Could boating be compatible? Answer: If it were a type of boating compatible with wildlife viewing, yes.
- I agree with what has been said. I think parking in the Parkway (near Gardenland Pond) seems awkward. Ingress and egress is not good there. There's a dangerous intersection on the Garden Highway. I would be okay with boating and the CIHC interpretive use at the pond, but I don't see it being a big access point. Maybe use the house as an interpretive center. (MIG responded that there would be very limited parking at Gardenland).
- I'm excited about the potential for the County to obtain ownership of Gardenland Pond. I want to hear Tim Washburn (SAFCA) talk about the possibility of mitigation bank funds.
- Tim replied: Yes, it could be realistic. There are many possibilities that are feasible in the near term. SAFCA has a \$1.7 million grant to restore the edge, but we will lose that if we don't get the money for acquisition. Mitigation banking would work whether you did the actual mitigation here or elsewhere in the Parkway. County Parks charges \$8,000 per acre to mitigate in the Parkway. SAFCA and others need hundreds of acres of land for mitigation and will be paying that per acre charge. Those funds go into a Parkway land acquisition fund. There are also other sources besides mitigation money that could be used. I am confident that within the 3 year period, it is likely we will be able to acquire the Gardenland Pond.
- Is there enough money there to do the restoration? Answer: Yes, we go in with a sizeable pot of money for restoration
- What is the size of the lake? 70 acres. After you soften the edges, it will be smaller. It's about 20 feet deep depending on river level.

- I think the potential uses discussion is useful for the agencies who will be doing the reclamation of the pond because you have a goal in mind for future uses.
- The County may look at the mitigation fee and make adjustment.
- Access off Garden Highway is not safe right now, but you would have to put in improvements. I don't think that's an insurmountable concern.
- I support is having at least a portion of the pond as a sanctuary separated from any boating activity. We need to have a still wetland as opposed to a river edge with moving water. It is important to recognize that a preserve or sanctuary has minimal human access. Maybe you could have observation access on the north shore of the pond by the trail system.
- I like the idea of having an open mind for mixed uses of the pond. We have an opportunity here to have a real destination within the Parkway, something unusual and wonderful. I love the idea of maybe having some boating (canoeing/kayaking) in the eastern end where it might be more appropriate.
- I'm an advocate of having some human use here. I thought having parking nearby is what would make it attractive. I don't think it would conflict with a bird sanctuary. You already have perfect access points here.
- I agree with mixed use, boating and sanctuary. Maybe you have seasonal restrictions for nesting season etc., and you have managed use.
- We should get pictures of interpretive signage etc. at Crissy Field.

**Public comment:**

- I think an important aspect of the Parkway is as a sanctuary for species that have been squeezed. I think it's worthwhile to make the lake a sanctuary with no boating.
- I think it should be examined thoroughly in context of the entire Parkway. As a biologist I can tell you the amount of water in the pond is miniscule in relation to the need for still water for the Parkway. Gardenland Pond is only a little bigger than the pond in the William Pond area. The entire pond should be a sanctuary. No other use should limit nesting or permanent residence of waterfowl and their summer use.
- I live almost across from an area that was a former sand and gravel mine around Rio Americano High School. It has evolved on its own into a maze of islands and peninsulas with lots of wildlife and habitat. People canoe in this area regularly and it doesn't seem to bother the wildlife. There are enormous numbers of critters around there. I don't see a contradiction with canoeing and wildlife. Why does it need to be still water as opposed to running?
- As a teacher, I'd like the parking area to be small but be large enough to accommodate a school bus.
- I hope that the pond is studied to see temperature fluctuation and limnology in summer vs. winter. If the water in the pond is based on the river, it won't support a minnow if it is hot enough. Check on getting water flow in there.

## Action Items & Follow-Up

Who	What	When
Staff	Include definition of sensitive habitat and maps showing sensitive habitat in the updated Parkway Plan	For final plan text, subject to UCAC review
Staff	Include the criteria in the updated Parkway Plan	For final plan text, subject to UCAC review
Bob Horowitz	Circulate proposed conditions for mountain bike use	

## Meeting Materials

- Agenda
- Evaluating Unresolved Plan Components for IAP: Criteria and analysis of CIHC, off-leash dogs, and off-paved-trail cycling (Provided by PMT)
- Peggy Berry's position paper (provided by Peggy Berry)
- American River Parkway Volunteer Equestrian Patrol position paper (provided by the Equestrian Patrol)

## Topics for August 15 Update Committee Meeting

- Review of the July 18 Community Meeting.
- Make any desired changes to the IAP Conceptual Plan as a result of the public input.

## Attendance

NOTE: Attendance records for this meeting may be inaccurate. Sunny Williams was absent due to illness and the attendance logs were not otherwise maintained.

### Members: X=Present, Alt=Alternate present

	Name		Representing
	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)
	Dave	Ford	California Fly Fishers Unlimited
X	Al	Freitas	Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)
X	Michael	Gunby	Sacramento City Appointments
	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
X	Eddie	Kho	Dist 5 - Supervisor Notolli Appointment
X	Connie	Miottel	Sacramento City Appointments
	Mark	Murray	Buffalo Chips Running Club
X	Ted	Sheedy	Sacramento City Appointments
Kristen	Janel	Silva	Sacramento Area Dog Owners Group (SACDOG)
	Greg	Speicher	Boating
X	Ron	Stork	Friends of the River

	Peter	Tateishi	Dist 3 - Supervisor Johnson Appointment
	Renée	Taylor	Dist 4 - Supervisor Niello Appointment
X	Frank	Wallace	California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
X	Art	White	Sacramento County Recreation and Parks Commission: ex-officio
X	Melinda	Williams	Sacramento City Appointments

### Others

Leighann Moffit, County Planning

Tim Washburn, SAFCA

**Bob Overstreet, City Parks**

Teresa Haengi, City Parks

**Steve Launey, CalExpo**

Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova

Jim McDonald, Sacramento City Planning

Helen Selph, Sacramento City Planning

Ron Suter, County Parks

Peter Buck,

**J.P. Tindell, Sacramento City Parks**

**Jim Morgan**

Betsy Weiland

**Bert Hodges**

Jackie Kuwarth

**M.H. Amerine**

Steve DeBry

Jim Tison

Richard Price

Ken Laossin

**JoEllen Arnold**

Kevin Regan

Jim Alford

**George Raya**

**John Manjoor**

### 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