

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

Meeting Highlights—December 6, 2005

Key Outcomes

- *UCAC members agreed to several changes to priority policies in Chapter 5: Recreational Use of the Parkway. Substantive policy changes affirmed by the Committee as a whole are listed below with exclamation point bullets and bold type. These changes will be made by staff. Additional UCAC comments and suggestions are listed in normal type with round bullets. These will be reviewed by staff in developing a final draft of this chapter.*
- *The UCAC approved a policy change by vote for the first time. The following direction on off-paved-trail cycling was approved by a 16 to 4 vote (members Frank Ciril, Peggy Berry, Lou Heinrich, and Al Freitas in opposition). This agreement will be used by staff to create new policy language for Chapter 5:*
 - *Permit off-paved-trail bicycling on designated maintenance and emergency roadways at the discretion of the Parkway manager, as approved on locally adopted area plans –which requires a public approval process including adoption by the Board of Supervisors.*
 - *Designate off-paved-trail bicycling on Woodlake and Cal Expo area plans per the Integrated Area Planning phase (IAP) and at the discretion of the Parkway manager.*
 - *Further expansion of permitted off-trail bicycling may occur after a three-year trial period and evaluation subject to Parkway manager discretion requiring approval on locally adopted area plans and consistent with conditions A-D in staff proposal 5.14*
 - *Note: Ron Suter, Director, County Parks, requested and received clarification that the first and second bullet points also would include “consistent with conditions A-D in the staff proposal 5.14”*

Decision Items for January 3 Meeting @ 828 I Street, Sacramento Public Library Galleria

UCAC priority issues re: Chapter 8: Public Access and Trails. The policy issues in this chapter the UCAC have prioritized are bike/pedestrian bridge crossings; design standards for boat ramps; signage and wayfinding

Announcements and Updates

Project Manager Sunny Williams (County Planning) welcomed those present. Committee members introduced themselves.

IAP plan forthcoming for review

Sunny announced that the Update Project Management Team (PMT) is currently reviewing the output document from the Integrated Area Planning (IAP) phase. This document was drafted by the consultant for the IAP phase, MIG, Inc., and should be distributed for UCAC and public review in January.

December 6 agenda and materials

Sharon Huntsman, facilitator (Center for Collaborative Policy), reviewed the agenda. She noted that there are over 20 suggested new or revised policies in Chapter 5 for UCAC consideration. The evening's discussion begins with the

Chapter 5 policies prioritized by UCAC members several months ago. Sharon pointed out that Chapter 5 has a close relationship with Chapter 8, the text of which was also distributed for reference. Chapter 8 will be discussed and finalized at the UCAC meeting on January 3.

Refresher on UCAC decision-making process

Sharon reminded the Committee of the decision-making process agreed to in the UCAC Charter.

1. Consensus: The UCAC seeks consensus first. Consensus does not imply unanimity, but it does require clear direction on a recommendation that members can live with.
2. Vote-to-vote: If a workable consensus position cannot be achieved, there is a "vote to vote" option. The vote to vote can be called for by any member or suggested by staff or facilitators. If 50% of UCAC members present agree that voting is desirable, the full Committee will take a vote on the proposal. 3/5 of the voting members of the UCAC have to vote in affirmative to recommend a change to the Parkway Plan (14 of 23 voting members).
3. No change: If there is no clear direction either through consensus or a vote, there will not be a recommendation from the UCAC to change the status quo of the 1985 Parkway Plan.

Recent BOS action on homelessness

Ron Suter (Director, County Parks) informed those present that the Board of Supervisors, earlier in the day, approved a ten-year plan to reduce homelessness in the County and enacted a ban on shopping carts in the Parkway.

Recreation (Chapter 5) Policy Issues

Gary Kukkola (County Parks) gave an overview of the logic behind staff's proposed updates of Chapter 5. He affirmed that staff were focusing on a balance between preservation of open space and recreational use, and sought to clarify things in the Parkway Plan that were not clear in the 1985 Plan. Staff have tried to capture what they've heard from UCAC to date, though some issues still require closure. In response to a member question, Gary agreed that details of policy implementation that are not appropriate for a General Plan-level document (which the Parkway Plan is) are left to Parkway managers' discretion or are covered in County Parks' administrative regulations.

Sunny Williams briefly described three format changes from the 1985 Parkway Plan.

1. In this redraft, staff have attempted to co-locate all the pieces of policy that pertain to the same subject (e.g. one type of use or facility), which were previously scattered in different chapters.
2. Staff created specific numbered policies from existing language that was previously part of a narrative description.
3. Staff added language to clarify what permitted groups of activities (e.g. Nature Appreciation activities, Trails Recreation activities) are allowed in which land use categories (e.g. Protected Areas, Developed Recreation Areas).

UCAC priority recreation issues:

Pedestrian and Equestrian trails:

Sharon Huntsman reviewed proposed changes in draft Chapter 5. She pointed out that the decomposed granite shoulder of the bike trail has been interpreted to be the pedestrian trail promised by the 1985 Parkway Plan. This was done for reasons of cost-efficiency and also for safety reasons to keep users in close proximity. The paved trail

surface (Jedediah Smith Trail) remains designated for bicycle and in-line skating use. The Plan also clarifies that use of the equestrian trail is allowed by pedestrians too, which has occurred informally. This gives pedestrians an additional maintained trail, along with the decomposed granite shoulder.

- ! On policy 5.11 regarding the pedestrian trail, there are sections of the decomposed granite shoulder that are not wide enough for pedestrians. The 1985 Plan promised a separate trail, and an off-pavement trail is desirable. Buffalo Chips' members are split on whether a separate trail is needed—some prefer running by the paved trail for safety and convenience, while some prefer a more natural experience. **UCAC agreement:** Staff will transfer the language in the 1985 Plan regarding a pedestrian trail “the entire length of the Parkway” to apply to the equestrian trail, which will be renamed the equestrian/pedestrian trail and signed appropriately. Signage will specify that horses have the right of way. Language on the decomposed granite shoulder will indicate that it will be “separate where practical” from the paved trail.
- ! On policy 5.11, will renaming the equestrian trail to equestrian/pedestrian imply that it must be ADA compliant? Staff's intention is that the decomposed granite shoulder would be the Parkway's ADA compliant trail. Staff will check with the ADA coordinator to ensure there will be no problem with renaming the equestrian trail even though it is not ADA compliant.
- ! In policy 5.12, language on “avoiding conflict with other modes of recreational transportation” will be clarified to indicate that pedestrians are welcome.

Bicycle use of trails

- ! 5.13 currently designates the bicycle trail for in-line skating. UCAC members found this confusing and prefer that this policy only deal with in-line skating, which shall occur on paved surfaces only. Bicycle use should be address in 5.14. The essence of the policy 5.14 should be that bicycles are allowed where designated, and the policy will spell out the criteria for off-paved bicycle use.

Sharon introduced the staff proposed policy 5.14, which was drafted based on where the UCAC had left the discussion of off-paved trail cycling at the end of the IAP process. UCAC member and off-paved-trail cycling advocate Bob Horowitz expressed his concerns with the staff proposal. His primary concern was that it would require going to the legislature to designate additional maintenance roads outside of Cal Expo and Woodlake for off-paved trail cycling use. He offered an alternative proposal for UCAC consideration.

- Two UCAC members said they felt there had been a “bait-and-switch” as the UCAC was first asked to consider an off-paved-trail cycling pilot in just the IAP area, and now they were being asked to consider conditions for allowing the use in other areas of the Parkway. Bob Horowitz stated that he felt he had been honest with members all along that he would like to see off-paved-trail cycling outside the IAP area, but he had been asked by staff to confine his proposals during IAP to just that area. Staff had asked him to wait until the appropriate time in the Update (the discussion of Parkway-wide policies on recreation) to propose anything outside that area.
- A UCAC member questioned whether it was legitimate for Bob to introduce his own proposal to the Committee, and said she thought discussion should be confined to the staff proposal. Facilitator Sharon Huntsman clarified that according to the UCAC Charter, it is legitimate for members to introduce their own proposals and suggest changes to staff proposals, whether verbally or in writing.
- UCAC members disagreed about 5.14 Condition A. Some felt that one use (off-paved-trail-cycling) should not be singled out as needing to have its own secure funding source, and suggested using volunteers to monitor the use. Others supported the need for secure funding. One member suggested writing into the Plan that Measure A funding would not be used for this purpose. Another disagreed, saying that Measure A is for

transportation uses but does not specify that surfaces must be paved. One member suggested that funding should be secured for an off-paved-trail cycling pilot project and monitoring, but that if the pilot were successful, off-paved-trail cycling should be treated like any other Parkway use or expense.

- A member requested adding "footpaths" as well as maintenance roads and fire breaks to the trails that could be designated for off-paved-trail cycling.
- A member suggested adding to 5.14 that off-paved-trail cycling should avoid user conflicts and protect sensitive habitat.
- A member suggested that the idea of a successful pilot needs measurement standards. What would constitute success or failure?
- A member suggested replacing language "will not displace" other users with "will impact few other users."
- A member suggested that the Urrutia property, if acquired, should be considered for inclusion to the off-paved-trail-cycling designated areas of Woodlake and CalExpo. The Committee opposed this idea. The committee agreed that Urrutia, like the rest of the Parkway could be designated for areas of off-trail bicycling, after the 3-year trial period, consistent with the criteria as listed in the policy, at the discretion of the Parkway manager and pending a public approval process of local adoption of revised area plans.
- A member suggested that commuter bicycling and mountain biking should be separate policies. Another member objected that any type of bike could be used for either activity, and the focus should be on uses instead of bicycle types.
- Several members voiced concern that permitting off-paved-trail cycling would lead to new trail creation. UCAC members agreed that the bicycling policies do not permit creation of new trails, except for needed trail reconfiguration to reduce user conflicts and accommodate emergency use as in the IAP process. Off-paved-trail cycling would occur on existing or reconfigured trails per policy 5.14.
- A member suggested putting in a width standard for trails suitable for off-paved-trail cycling, for example a 60 inch minimum. Staff agreed that standards need to be created, but felt this level of detail is not appropriate in the Parkway Plan.
- Not all bicyclists drive to the Parkway. A member suggested that 5.14 Condition D should include designated access points and trails, including but not limited to those near parking areas.

Public comment on 5.14

- Ron Suter (Director, County Parks) supports the idea of a trial period for off-paved-trail bicycling, with expansion into new areas at the discretion of the Parkway manager, as long as there is one manager for the Parkway (not broken into separate jurisdictions).
- I support more inclusive multi-use trails.
- There is less problem behavior on flat trails, as exist in the Parkway.
- Off-paved-trail cyclists will self-regulate. They will help populate remote areas of the Parkway.
- The Parkway is a good place to learn to mountain bike.
- Remember the nexus to homelessness in the IAP area. This problem doesn't exist upstream. I don't support allowing the use to expand upstream. Limit it to IAP area.
- I am the International Mountain Biking Association (IMBA) advisor. The trend toward increasingly available urban trails prevents people having to drive to go bicycling; there is a benefit to youth in the area; legal activity drives out illegal uses; there is a potential for a bike patrol that could benefit the Parkway; and biking helps reduce obesity.
- I am concerned about erosion caused by off-paved-trail cycling. We need to find appropriate places, rely on the Parkway manager.
- Monitoring is easy and can be done with photos, ranger logs, etc.
- Multi-use trails are working all over the world. We need this activity close to our homes.

- *We already had a test. There is existing multi-use on the trail between California State University, Sacramento and Folsom. The world's experience with multi-use trails is also a test.*
 - *Biking is good for society. All uses have impacts, why exclude this one?*
 - *This is a neighborhood Parkway, and neighbors need access.*
 - *There is more damage from fishermen and horses than from cyclists.*
 - *We are experiencing a clash of values, but we can work together.*
- ! The UCAC approved the following staff proposal, which was crafted in response to UCAC member discussion and public comment of Policy 5.14. This agreement will be used by staff to revise policy 5.14:
- **Permit off-paved-trail bicycling on designated maintenance and emergency roadways at the discretion of the Parkway manager, as approved on locally adopted area plans—which requires a public approval process including adoption by the Board of Supervisors.**
 - **Designate off-paved-trail bicycling on Woodlake and Cal Expo area plans per IAP and at discretion of Parkway manager.**
 - **Further expansion after a three-year trial period and evaluation is subject to Parkway manager discretion requiring approval on locally adopted area plans and consistent with conditions A-D in staff proposal 5.14.**
 - *Note: Ron Suter, Director, County Parks, requested and received clarification that the first and second bullet points also would include “consistent with conditions A-D in the staff proposal 5.14”*

In-stream recreation

- ! *On Policy 5.21, a member expressed concern that stationary kayaking in play holes could interfere with fishing, salmon spawning and other activities. The UCAC boating representative noted that he has kayaked in areas near to other types of users with no problem. Staff will strike the staff comment about in-stream activities that remain in a single location.*
- *A member objected to listing sailing in Policy 5.21 since sailing is impractical on the American River. Other members objected that it could be done at Gardenland Pond and there is no harm in leaving the language as it is.*
 - *Regarding Policy 5.24, a member asked how Park rangers could monitor peace officers? Staff responded that they sensitize them to Parkway interests and risks.*

User education

- *Fine, no change.*

Chapter 5 Policy issues from Nov. 7th workshop

Overnight camping

- *A member asked why do we need camping in the Plan? It should be eliminated. Staff responded that the 1985 Plan allows for designated primitive camps for environmental education of youth under supervision, and it has not been a problem.*
- *A member questioned why the Boy Scout Camp Pollock is designated as a non-conforming use. He suggested there should be a consistent policy for Camp Pollock and the primitive sites. Staff replied that Camp Pollock is private property regulated by the City Zoning Code. The structures are non-conforming because they could*

flood. Staff need to make a recommendation on whether Camp Pollock can be included in camping regulations.

- *Should Policy 5.5 specify that permits are granted at the discretion of the Parkway manager? Answer: It is already regulated by County ordinance and directed toward river education.*
- *There should be criteria for issuing permits for camping to avoid undesirable groups. Answer: There has not been a problem with undesirable groups applying for permits. Youth camping has not been a problem.*
- *How is Policy 5.6 limited to avoid for-profit exploitation? Answer: County ordinances prohibit it.*
- ! *What is the limit on RV camping? Answer: This is typically permitted to support staff for events in Discovery Park who set up the night before and stay overnight. It was intended to be a source of revenue at \$10 or \$12 per RV per night, but there is no demand. This policy also regulates RVs at the Cal Expo exhibiter parking lot, and should be linked.*
- *A global ban on individual camping, which is currently embedded in Policy 5.9, should be strengthened and separated out as its own policy for the County owned portion of the Parkway.*
- ! *What about boaters camping on islands and boats? Answer: County Parks does not regulate mooring; they have no jurisdiction within the waterway. The American River is a navigable waterway with its own laws and regulations. The issue of camping on land associated with boats will be referred to the special meeting on aquatic recreation.*
- *Could adults camp? Answer: the policy says youth OR educational groups with an educational or interpretive interest in the Parkway.*
- **There is a non-conforming restroom (permanent facility) associated with camping at Goethe Park. This needs to be clarified.**

Resolving conflicts among users / increase in recreational use over time

- *What has been the history of closing parts of the Parkway to prevent overuse? Answer: Areas have been closed in Goethe Park due to BMX use. Some islands have been closed for Labor Day. Trails have been closed due to coyote danger or to protect endangered species. These areas are barricaded and signed, and sometimes a ranger is assigned there. When the bike trail is closed for construction, there are signs and workers at either end to detour people. These measures keep out 90% of traffic, and violators can be cited.*
- *What does "leveraging resources" mean? Answer: Partnering.*
- *Dog waste education should be added to the section on media. There are few dog waste baggie stations in the Parkway, and few trash cans.*

Other UCAC comment:

- *The narrative lead-in to Chapter 5 doesn't reference fire control and emergency vehicles. Answer: This is covered in Chapter 8. Staff will add language to the ban on motor vehicles "except for specified exceptions."*
- *Do the Area Plan maps show pedestrian trails? Answer: Yes.*
- *On Policy 5.10, are wheelchairs (including motorized wheelchairs) allowed on pedestrian trails? Answer: Yes, this is covered in Chapter 8, which was drafted with the assistance of the County's Disability Coordinator. Staff will provide a quick cross-reference in Chapter 5 to say where this is explained.*
- *Members asked whether they are required to consult with their organizations before approving new policies. Staff clarified that geographic representatives were appointed as individuals. The BOS appointed organizations to the UCAC, who were then asked to select their own representatives, who were confirmed by the BOS. Staff and other UCAC members clarified that it is important for members to be familiar with*

their organization's interests, but they need to be effective representatives as individuals. Not everything that happens in a meeting can efficiently be run by each representative's organization or Board.

Other Public Comment:

- *The 1985 Plan is very specific, no skim boards. Rangers enforce against skim boards that are tethered to trees. However, we also have a problem on islands with people throwing down boogie boards, using sandbags to change channels, scaring wildlife, etc.*

Action Items & Follow-Up

Who	What	When
<i>UCAC members</i>	<i>Give comments to Sunny on policies in Chapter 5 not addressed at tonight's meeting</i>	<i>By December 14th</i>
<i>Staff</i>	<i>Change draft Chapter 5 to respond to UCAC comments with exclamation point bullets, and other comments as appropriate.</i>	<i>December</i>
<i>Staff</i>	<i>Distribute IAP draft document for review</i>	<i>January 2006</i>

Meeting Materials

- *Agenda*
- *ARPP Update Schedule of all UCAC Meetings 2005-2006*
- *Chapter 5 Recreational Use of the Parkway Draft 12/1/2005*
- *Alternative Policy 5.14 Proposed by UCAC member Bob Horowitz December 6, 2005*

Topics for January 3, 2006 Update Committee Meeting

UCAC priority issues re: Chapter 8: Public Access and Trails. The policy issues in this chapter the UCAC have prioritized are bike/pedestrian bridge crossings; design standards for boat ramps; signage and wayfinding.

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
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	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
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	Ron	Stork	Friends of the River
	Peter	Tateishi	Dist 3 - Supervisor Johnson Appointment
X	Renée	Taylor	Dist 4 - Supervisor Niello Appointment
X	AnneMarie	Vincent	American River Parkway Foundation
X	Frank	Wallace	California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
	Art	White	Sacramento County Recreation and Parks Commission: ex-officio
	Melinda	Williams	Sacramento City Appointments

Others

Leighann Moffit, County Planning
 Tim Washburn, SAFCA
 Helen Seloh, Sac City Planning
 Bob Overstreet, Sac City Parks
 Teresa Haenggj, Sac City Parks

Ron Suter, Sacramento County Parks
 Leo Winternitz, Water Forum

Bill Griffith
 Jim Haagen-Smit
 Jim Morgan
 Cathy Haagen-Smit
 Chris Marney
 Derek Minnema
 Curtis Fowler
 Pam Kennedy
 Lee Frchette
 Shawn Harrison

Maxine Clark
 Randy Smith
 Kevin Regan
 Ben Swann
 Steve Sorelle
 Hagen Hammons
 Briel and Doug Wiedman
 Tom Cassera
 Jackie Kuwarth
 Tom Meagher

Project Staff

Sunny Williams, Sacramento County Planning
 Gary Kukkola, Sacramento County Parks
 Sharon Huntsman, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy
 John Folk-Williams, Center for Collaborative Policy
 Laura Kaplan, Center for Collaborative Policy