

**11/7 UCAC Drafting Workshop
Meeting Notes**

Draft 11/10/05

Note: Our meeting recorder Laura Kaplan was injured and unable to record and as a result these notes are not the extensive notes typically provided but are still a helpful summary of comments and questions.

Issue #1 Chapter 5 Enlargement/Overhaul

Put the permitted recreational uses into context of the whole plan:

- All permitted recreational uses need to be discussed in the proper context e.g.—land use designations and other policies in the plan that are relevant.
- City of Rancho Cordova desires soccer and rugby fields. The section on participation in games states that these are permitted uses. How do these types of uses fit with policies?
- Be clear about benefits of recreational uses and put recreational uses into the context of the Parkway's purpose e.g. If soccer and turf are permitted, does this mean that a group could put chalk on the turf to outline the field?
- Policies have too much ambiguity, too short, e.g. Page 5-2 Description too brief—need to expand, update, clarify recreational uses
- Proposals for activities must meet vision and policies—if they don't, then not permitted focus on Parkway/river as a vision e.g. CIHC vs. Interpretive Center

Clarify activities that are permitted/desired vs. not permitted/undesired:

- Soccer fields can be built outside Parkway
- Illegal activities are taking place—clarify illegal activities in Plan, e.g. off-road cycling, off-leash dogs, are these happening because the Plan is not clear?
- Camping—why some areas and not others? Clarify where camping is allowed and under what circumstances
- What activities are people unclear or confused by? Policy 4.14.1 clearly states prohibited uses
- It is OK to talk about things that may not be currently permitted – for example, it is not permitted currently to have a permanent stage but we have considered one in Discovery Park.
 - Note that a potential benefit of the amphitheatre is possible revenue source for parks department
- The Plan does not expressly prohibit users from going off trail, would have thought that this would be in the Plan that users must stay on designated trails—this is an example of legal/illegal uses that need to be clarified.
- Need to distinguish between people who are engaged in uses that are not permitted, and people who are engaged in permitted uses but are still breaking the rules.

More detail/clarification needed

- Define “large groups” and sites for activities

- Need to address inconsistencies, e.g. is the equestrian trail an equestrian-only trail?
- ADA accessibility needs to be reflected in recreation policies and planning. Greater buy-in/ownership of Parkway if access expanded for people with disabilities.

Concerns about the process for updating this chapter:

- Lacks assessment of recreational user needs, framework for goals and policies, including projections for next 10 years
- Assessment and framework should be done at beginning of the process

Ideas to resolve concerns:

- Chapter 2 spells out permitted uses clearly, combine the policies from chapter 2 into Chapter 5 so that the policies and narrative are in one chapter.
- Lottery to decide conflicts in uses?

Questions before moving forward:

- What is the history of camping as a permitted use, e.g. campfire, scouts, etc.
 - Pre-existing use, non-conforming use not inconsistent with mission—provides education
- How to resolve conflicts between users when permitted uses clash? Especially in light of population growth. This needs to be addressed.
- How to plan for increased recreational use in light of population growth.
- Policy to allow only one competitive event/ month—where did this come from?
 - Intent: minimize impact on other users
 - Eppie's Great Race is a considerable conflict for others, therefore use limited to one month.

Issue #2: Kayaking Recreation

- Definition of kayaking in 1985 Plan does not make sense anymore—use has changed. Also, there is increased kayaking since 1985 and therefore people's use of Parkway has changed. With increased use of the river for recreation, it raises the question of whether there need to be more safety patrols, there are no toilets, trash receptacles, and water. This has an impact for other recreational uses too.
- Nimbus Shoals is part of State Parks—above Hazel Avenue—this needs to be brought to them for general plan update.
 - Outside County jurisdiction? Needs clarification
 - However, there are links and overarching authority of the Plan, how it will apply to State Parks; difficulties getting clarity from State.
- Concern—conflict between uses, Kayaking as a “new” use, may interfere with fishing—how to resolve.
- Conflict regarding whitewater, dam, fish hatchery: how to design.
- Amenities needed to support recreational users, especially as population grows.
- Would this mean floating toilets? These have been controversial in Folsom Lake.

- Concern: creating recreational opportunities by altering the river rather than allowing “natural” opportunities.
- Address conflicts among user groups, for example if parking becomes scarce.
- Establish clear boundaries that define what the Parkway is, what land is included and what portion the Parkway Plan intend to regulate.
- Use information from RCMP as discussions continue.
- Approach with attitude of inclusion , get as many stakeholders involved; look at other places (e.g. Reno) where whitewater features have been included in the river —activity meets criteria.
- Address facilities for all recreational users.
- Prior to 1985 Plan—there was an idea to design a whitewater play area. County said no, too much liability.

Questions:

- Who sets policy? Determine whether the intent of the Parkway Plan is to intrude on State Parks management authority in non-County owned portion of the Parkway.
- How to develop adequate framework to address huge increase in users, changing uses—can’t prohibit “navigable waterway” of users.
- How to plan needed facilities (toilets, etc).
- How is the 2002 RCMP being incorporated into this update?
- Will the land uses support activities on the water? e.g. parking
- Where are the rafters? Big user group, not engaged in this process.

Issue #3

Multiple-day (Overnight) Interpretive Activities at CIHC or other facilities

- This includes overnight—term “multiple-day I.A.” isn’t “forthright” as a typical activity included in these programs.
- Idea: CIHC partner with Boy Scouts to allow use of their facility for overnight camping (Big Time is the appropriate term, not pow-wow).
- It is too early to discuss an issue that is primarily associated with the CIHC proposal.
- Concerns—these activities must be consistent with overall purpose/goals e.g. locations for people to learn.
- Discuss this issue in “global” (generic) sense rather than specific to CIHC.
- Define interpretive center, types of activities.
- Concern: how will “interpretive” activities be defined? Overnights will likely happen most nights.
- Need to better define appropriate overnight camping /purpose.
- Chapter 5.1 addresses overnight camping already.
- Concern: don’t want to have one entity rely upon Boy Scouts camp every time they want to hold an overnight event.
- Question: Can homeless people apply for an overnight camp permit? What criteria are used to grant permits?

- Get clear about what constitutes educational camping? And appropriate location (Already in 1985 Plan).
- Need list of camp sites.

Issue #4: Parkway Connections

- Big gap between Watt and Goethe—Grist Mill (3 miles)—
 - dead end, go to surface streets, unsafe
 - 15-20 access points, no connections
- Similar situation in Carmichael—must use surface streets to access South side though can use Sunrise Bridge.
- Possible solution: pedestrian bridge at Grist Mill and Harrington downstream from William B. Pond. Harrington already has developed access.
- There is a crossing at William B. Pond but no way to get there without going out to Folsom Blvd.
- Concerns about neighborhood acceptance of a new bike/ped bridge.
- The lack of an ability to access the Parkway safely is a legitimate concern, need safe streets for bikes; coordinate with bike master plan, City of Rancho, etc.
- Access is an important component of maintaining the Parkway. City of Sacramento needs to be involved in making streets safe for biking.
- Connections bring communities together.
- Where will the money come from for a new crossing?
- Might invite a lawsuit, this is what happened with the William B. Pond bridge.
- Idea: What about a bridge connecting Cordova Park to Ancil Hoffman—another possible place for connection would allow bike access to other side; would increase amenities available to Rancho Cordova which is a concern they have without duplicating services.
- Levee/hydrologic issues to need to be considered. (What about Jim’s bridge? Is that in the floodway?)
- Concern: bridges don’t fit with overall goal of maintaining natural aspects of the Parkway; each new bridge impacts wildlife.
- New Crossings—policy is and should be to expand what we have to reduce impacts.

Parking Lot (issues not on agenda to address later)

- Lack of interpretive activities/public access on “fallow” land in Rancho Cordova, adjacent to Parkway that is currently under lease for a sustainable farm and could provide a significant interpretive/educational opportunity.
- Area Plan Issue: Fallow land adjacent to Cordova Park—possible recreation uses lack of interpretive activities.
- Interpretive aspects “buried” in other areas of the Plan. The word “interpretive” isn’t clear to all, prefer the word “education”.