

American River Parkway Plan - Update Citizen's Advisory Committee (UCAC)

Meeting Highlights—October 3, 2005

Key Outcomes

The Update Committee revised and made recommendations on aquatic and terrestrial resource policies for the American River Parkway Plan.

Next Meeting: October 17, 2005 Meeting at Library Galleria

➤ Discuss and review water flows, quality and flood control policies.

Welcome and Announcements

Sunny Williams (County Planning) welcomed Update Committee (UCAC) members and others to the meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to review and provide feedback on aquatic and terrestrial resource policies in Chapter 3 of the American River Parkway Plan (ARPP). Staff continue to conduct research on aesthetic resources in Chapter 3 and will present it to the UCAC at a later date.

The Update Committee will have an additional **meeting on Monday, October 17, 2005**, to discuss water flows, quality and flood control policies. Sunny reminded UCAC members to send her homework as soon as possible.

Facilitator Sharon Huntsman reviewed the agenda and guidelines for working together. She emphasized that the group will discuss the UCAC's priority issues (identified via the homework assignment) and will provide comments between meetings or "offline" on remaining topics. The goals of UCAC discussion are to find common ground on substantive concerns with policies and to reach closure on issues.

Aquatic Resources (Chapter 3, Section 3.0)

(Draft 9/28/2005, Reviewed and Discussed at Meeting, Page 13)

Leo Winternitz from the Water Forum reviewed the materials mentioning that the 1985 ARPP has no policies related to aquatic resources. Inclusion in the revised plan acknowledges that fish and aquatic resources are valuable in the Lower American River and Parkway. Federal, state, and local agencies recognize aquatic resources as a beneficial use. After reviewing the proposed policies, the group discussed them.

Policy 3.2--UCAC Discussion and Recommendations

- Discourage **introduction** of invasive non-native aquatic plants and **animals**¹
 - UCAC discussed making language, “prohibit introduction” of invasive...
UCAC decided against it because some non-native species can be beneficial.

- Remember to cover *existing* in text.

- Leave in general language with exact species.
 - Listing specific species generated discussion about the need for brevity, the degree of specificity that is appropriate for a policy plan and the role of the Parkway Plan as a management plan.
 - One member emphasized the importance of listing anadromous fish under the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act because the ARPP ultimately becomes a management plan under that act and this specificity is useful in guiding management actions.

- Move “fall-run Chinook salmon” to end of sentence so it doesn’t look like “fall-run” is modifying other species.

- Include small-mouth and large-mouth bass in narrative discussion.

- **Using “Shall” and “Should” in policy** :The group had a hearty discussion on the use of “shall” versus “should” in this policy on flows, and generally in the updated plan. “Shall” implies that policy is legally binding. The County may meet with County counsel again to discuss the use of “shall”. “Should” is appropriate when ARPP lacks authority, such as policies applying to federal agencies. County counsel generally prefers the use of “should.” County Planning explained that shall is often used in the County General Plan and the UCAC can use shall when it feels it is appropriate. The ARPP is related to the Water Forum and the Legislature adopts the Parkway Plan, making it legally binding. Several members expressed support for using “shall” because of its strength. “Shall” also forces elected bodies to fund efforts and really heed to the policy recommendation. The UCAC will revisit this topic when it reviews Chapter 4 to ensure consistency between the policies on flows.

Public Comment on Aquatic Resources policy 3.2

- History of 1985 Plan has lots of “shalls.”
- Support adding specific species.

¹ Recommended new text is added in bold.

Terrestrial Resources (Chapter 3, Section 2.0)

(Draft 9/28/2005 Reviewed and Discussed at Meeting, Pages 3-4)

Sunny Williams reviewed the proposed policy text presented to the group. These policies reflect UCAC direction from discussions last fall regarding the River Corridor Management Plan and the professional judgment of staff. Staff are still researching the issue of aesthetic resources and will bring that to the UCAC for review at a future meeting.

Policy 2.1 UCAC Discussion and Recommendations

- Add **pipelines** and **overhead lines** to list of development.
- Add: ...including, **but not limited to**, ... (line 1)
- Keep "compelling regional needs"
 - UCAC discussed this extensively. The DNA-RT and Regional Sanitation's Arden Parallel Force Main were sited as examples of compelling regional needs. At least one member expressed concern regarding the subjective nature of "compelling" and the possible vulnerability this might present to the Parkway. Others felt this language set a high standard and that policies exist throughout the plan related to this issue and an effective process is in place for reviewing projects, ultimately going to the Board of Supervisors. This review process necessitates that proponents be able to demonstrate that projects are compelling.
- Policy 2.1.2 meant to say development of facilities not necessary for operations.
- Add **provide mitigations and enhancements**
 - Enhancement is meant to convey that if a project needs to go through the Parkway, it should give something back to the Parkway for the privilege of doing so. The word "**enhancements**" provides broad policy guidance that could include an impact fee. This language would be useful to managers in ensuring future projects give back to the Parkway.
- UCAC supports simplifying this language so it is more straightforward. Staff will modify language based on feedback received, which included:
 - 2.1, remove last sentence, "facilities within the Parkway..." (redundant)
 - 2.1.1 Parkway facilities are those necessary for the operations, management, etc.
 - 2.1.2 Development of non-Parkway facilities...
 - 2.1 All facilities developed within the Parkway...must minimize and mitigate...
 - 2.1.1 Facilities not necessary for the operations, management...have to enhance the Parkway's...
 - Numbering is confusing, 2.1.2 follows 2.1, what about 2.1.1?

Public Comment on Policy 2.1

- After reviewing revised language presented on the presentation screen, suggest mentioning “native vegetation” in 2.1 and adding parallel language that is at the end of 2.1.2 on permitted uses. For 2.1.1, parkway dependent could include Parks administrative offices.
- Concern that Parkway dependent could mean facilities like parking for County Parks’ trucks. This policy should be clear to address facilities’ criteria that could be placed outside of ARP, such as truck maintenance.

Policy 2.2.5-- UCAC Discussion and Recommendations

The UCAC found this policy statement confusing and recommends that staff revise the language as well as reference the existing ARPP policy on limiting turf (in the land use section). Discussion and suggestions include:

- Assumes turf areas may be adjacent to immature trees
- The intention of this policy is not to add turf in ARP
- “Provided they are not damaged” is confusing
- Consider replacing “can” with “may”
- Trees may be permissible where you have turf
- Consider dropping second sentence

Public Comment on Policy 2.2.5

- Consider statement referencing the existing limitation on turf—As a result of this comment, the UCAC recommends a reference to existing turf policy in the land use section (see above).
- New trees are being planted in turf at William Pond.
- What about agricultural lands? (these policies are in the land use section).
-

Policy 2.3--UCAC Recommendations and Discussion

No change. The UCAC briefly discussed modifying the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle reference in the policy, but ultimately decided against it after understanding that this reference proves valuable for funding and overcoming flood agency resistance to its placement in floodway. No public comments.

Policy 2.4--UCAC Recommendations and Discussion

- Keep “shall” for the management plan.
- Several stated that language is unclear.
 - One person recommended clarifying monitoring with additional language while another suggested striking “and an evaluation” since it’s covered by monitoring.
- Remove “management” from “A Management Plan” because it is confusing whether this refers to ARP or another document.
- The River Corridor Management Plan has monitoring, but does not have criteria standards or overuse.

Public Comment on Policy 2.4

- ə Plan should be developed.
- ə Need “shall”—UCAC agrees because it encourages funding prioritization.
- ə “Clear criteria to allow...”
- ə Good to include general standards so public understands.

Human Historical and Interpretive Resources

(Draft 9/28/2005 Reviewed and Discussed at Meeting, Page 18)

Gary Kukkola summarized development of Section 4.0 Human and Historical and Interpretive Resources. Additional comments should be submitted to Gary Kukkola outside of the meeting. Lou Heinrich, Gary and the interpretive resource director Marilee Flannery met to develop these policies and add value to the 1985 ARPP. Gary emphasized that nothing in the language would preclude an interpretive center on the current mobile home park. Policies 2.8 and 2.9 (page 18) were added as place holders to deal with an additional interpretive center in the Parkway regardless of location.

Comments have suggested that the Plan expand language on Native American culture since more is known now than was understood in 1985, and staff plan to do so appropriately. Staff are currently wrestling with how to be informative and relate the information to policy. The charge is to interpret Native American history and other periods of history.

Bin—For Future Discussion

Funding of management plan from policy 2.4 should be discussed with funding. One way to communicate this as a priority would be to include it in the Action Plan in Chapter 11.

Wrap Up

Facilitator Sharon Huntsman summarized the agreements reached and closed the meeting.

Attendance

Members: X=Present, Alt=Alternate present

	Name		Representing
X	Jerry	Ahlin	City of Rancho Cordova Appointment
X	Katie	Baygell	American River Parkway Volunteer Equestrian Patrol
Alt	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
	Al	Freitas	Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)
X	Michael	Gunby	Sacramento City Appointments
X	Lou	Heinrich	American River Natural History Association
Alt	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
X	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
	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
 Teresa Haenggi, Sacramento City Parks
 Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova

Peter Buck, SAFCA
 Becky Victorine, Army Corps
 J.P. Tindell, Sacramento City Parks
 Leo Winternitz, Water Forum

Jim Morgan
 Betsy Weiland, Peggy Berry alternate
 Anne Marie Vincent, Parkway Foundation alternate
 Bert Hodges
 Jackie Kuwarth
 Tom Meagher
 Kristin Arnold

Kevin Reagan
 Maxine Clark
 Rick Bettis
 Elmer Aldrich
 Ed Cox, Sacramento City
 Patty Kleinknecht

Project Staff

Sunny Williams, County Planning
 Gary Kukkola, Sacramento County Parks
 Sharon Huntsman, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy
 Gina Bartlett, Recorder, Center for Collaborative Policy