

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

Meeting Highlights—January 24, 2006

Key Outcomes

- UCAC members agreed to several changes to the IAP-related policies in Chapter 10. Changes that were affirmed by the Committee as a whole, or direction that was given for any other staff action, are listed in the notes with exclamation point bullets and bold type. These changes and actions will be pursued by staff.

Additional changes were suggested by some members, but due to time constraints were not affirmed or rejected by the Committee as a whole. These are listed in normal type with round bullets. These changes will be considered by staff as they update language in Chapter 5.

Decision Items for February 7 Meeting @ 828 I Street, Sacramento Public Library Galleria

- UCAC priority issues re: Woodlake, Cal Expo Area plans and maps; Chapter 6: Non-recreational use

Announcements and Updates

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

Flood Control and Water Quality Subgroup Meeting

On Tuesday, January 31, staff will meet with the self-selected UCAC members and technical staff who are working on finishing flood control and water quality narrative text and policies for updating Chapter 4. The meeting will be held from 3-5 PM at the Water Forum, 660 J Street, Suite 260. The subgroup's work will be returned to the full UCAC during final review of the updated Parkway Plan (Plan).

Rancho Cordova Public Tour

On Saturday, February 4th, there will be a public tour of the Parkway in the Rancho Cordova area. It will take place from 9:45 AM until 3 PM, beginning at Cordova Recreation and Parks Headquarters, 2197 Chase Drive, Rancho Cordova. RSVP to kfranklin@cityofranhocordova.org by January 27th.

Focus of Tonight's Meeting

Sharon Huntsman (Center for Collaborative Policy) reviewed the agenda. The focus of this meeting is finalizing the IAP area plans, which will be located at the beginning of Chapter 10 in the updated Plan. These area plan maps and narratives were drafted with the assistance of Gregg Ellis from

Jones and Stokes Associates, who used the draft documents and meeting notes from the UCAC's work during the IAP phase to create the maps and narratives distributed for this meeting.

Drafting Assumptions for Area Plans

Leighann Moffitt (County Planning) referred to the document called "Background and Assumptions for Drafting IAP Area Plans." She stated that some UCAC members had questions about these assumptions, particularly about which parts of the Plan will be adopted by the State Legislature vs. local adoption by the Board of Supervisors. Leighann informed the UCAC that when the 1985 Plan was written, it was not clear what the Legislature's role would be in adopting it, so the process for adoption is not perfectly clear in the 1985 Plan. There is some text on this in Chapters 10 and 11 of the 1985 Parkway Plan; however staff have not yet drafted a revision of Chapter 11, so they are not asking the UCAC to agree to a final description of the adoption process tonight. Tonight, staff's goal is to introduce the issues surrounding the adoption process and get feedback.

Staff's assumptions about the adoption process are based on existing language in the 1985 Plan and current practice.

- *1985 Parkway Plan language on adoption:* The 1985 Plan says that facilities and improvements must be on area plans and area plans must be reviewed whenever a physical change is constructed. Chapter 11 says that area plans must be consistent with the Parkway Plan, land use designations, and the County General Plan, and reviewed by the Board of Supervisors (BOS).
- *Current practice when a change is made to the Parkway:* Some issues have gone to the Legislature, e.g. adding in-line skating as an allowable use on the bike trail (which was a Parkway-wide policy issue) and a land use change involving commercial stables where the land use designation was not consistent with the use. However, small physical changes that are consistent with existing land use designations in the Plan have been done upon approval by the BOS, not the Legislature (e.g. adding restrooms and parking lots that are consistent with existing land use designations).

The assumptions document distributed by staff says that area plans are locally adopted, while the Parkway general land use map (including land use designations) and policies go to the State Legislature for adoption. This assumptions document was written after discussion by the Project Management Team (PMT), whose intention was to clearly and transparently describe the role of the Legislature and the Board of Supervisors, consistent with 1985 Plan language and current practice.

UCAC discussion:

- What does Chapter 11 cover? --Chapter 11 says who has what authority to implement parts of the Parkway Plan.
- If there is a policy that says there can be an interpretive center, would it have to go to the Legislature? --If you propose in the area plan something that is consistent with the land use designation, you do not need to go to Legislature. Interpretive centers are consistent with a developed recreation designation.
- The 1985 Plan says "facilities" have to be on area plan maps. What are "facilities?" --Facilities could be as minor as a porta potty, or they could be more significant. Right now all

facilities go on area plans, and there is no differentiation of scale. This might be something “broken” in the Plan that the UCAC would want to fix.

- When will it become known what will be on the general land use map? --That’s a discussion to have as we continue chapter 10 and chapter 11. The PMT discussion has been to keep facilities approval at the local level (area plans approved by the BOS) and keep land use designation changes and policy changes at the Legislature level.
- Is there a clear idea of what the components are of the general land use map? --That’s still in the making. The PMT has envisioned that you might show some facilities on the land use map like trails and access points.
- Will the new Chapter 11 follow the same procedure? –Staff have not started drafting that chapter revision yet.

Staff welcome additional comments to help clarify the role of the State and other assumptions, such as the level of specificity desired for Chapter 11.

Discovery Park

State Parks California Indian Heritage Center (CIHC) Update

Pauline Grenbeaux, State Parks, provided an update on the California Indian Heritage Center Task Force’s progress. They began a 12-month master planning process in January. January through June 30, 2006 is their “programming” phase. This phase will identify more clearly what the activities of the CIHC will be, how much space is needed for what, and the emphasis and message of the CIHC. These decisions will be independent of possible locations for the CIHC.

The CIHC has a Master Plan team; the main contractor is EDAW in San Francisco. EDAW has museum and cultural programming expertise. By the end of June, the CIHC Task Force should have a pretty good idea of size and scale needs although not an architectural design. Pauline stated that after they have a good idea of their needs, they will look at the available site to determine how to make best use of the opportunities afforded by the site.

Staff and CIHC Task Force members have had a series of meetings with Indian advisory groups, who are largely building on the earlier museum plan that was done in 1991. Pauline stated that the 1991 plan is still “pretty sound in many minds”, but new developments have occurred since 1991 that might change the space needs, for example, computerized record keeping. Pauline also informed the UCAC that the CIHC Task Force and consultants had a two-day workshop with Indian advisors. This was not a public meeting, but staff have made a public announcement of what the agenda and topics were, and had a public session to report the results of the meeting. At the end of their 6-month master planning process, there will be opportunities for the rest of the community to talk about their desires, and the CIHC Task Force, staff, and consultants will look at integrating these.

UCAC discussion:

- If the updated Parkway Plan does not include space for an appropriate CIHC, what alternatives might the CIHC Task Force consider? –Pauline answered that if they can’t use the Northgate site, they would have to start over. It was made clear to the CIHC that they

would have to put at least half of the site on the south side of the river, but it is not clear that they would consider having all of the CIHC on the south side. It would be up to the Task Force to give guidance.

- Draft policy 9.5.1 says the total floor space of an interpretive center building at the existing mobile home park should be no larger than 32,000 square feet. Where did that number come from? –Update staff responded that this number was determined based on the existing square footage of all allowable mobile homes at Riverdale, and that the CIHC had nothing to do with determining this number. However, Pauline added that if you remove the repository and offices from the rough estimate of the CIHC’s space needs and located these elements on the south side of the river, 32,000 square feet in the Parkway would probably be adequate for the CIHC’s needs.
- Is there a consensus among the Indians about the Northgate site? –Pauline stated that there is consensus about very little. Some individuals would like to see other sites. Some have big concerns about flooding.

Overview of Discovery Park Area Plans

Gregg Ellis (Jones and Stokes Associates) highlighted important changes recommended for the Discovery Park area plan, consistent with UCAC discussion in the Integrated Area Planning (IAP) Phase. He pointed out that the maps show existing trails as a solid line and proposed trails as a dashed line.

- Recommended acquisition and restoration of the Uruttia property.

The updated Plan calls for acquisition of the Uruttia property and would change the land use designation around Uruttia Pond to Nature Study area, consistent with Bushy Lake. This area would be restored and would have opportunities for low-impact public access on trails around the pond and potential interpretive and cultural programming. The UCAC’s direction during IAP was to support human access compatible with restoration goals. The UCAC as a group did not support general recreational boating; however, low-impact non-motorized boating as an interpretive activity could be possible.

The narrative description would allow “minor interpretive facilities” in this area. The concept is that these would be made of naturalistic materials, have a low impact, and accommodate small to moderate size groups. Examples of “minor interpretive facilities” include tule huts similar to those at Effie Yeaw; an overlook on the pond similar to Cache Creek overlooks; a “ramada” shade structure or outdoor classroom; a fire ring similar to or slightly larger than the one at Camp Pollock.

- Recommended acquisition of the Riverdale property and installation of an interpretive center.

An interpretive center no larger than 32,000 sq feet is recommended at this site. This square footage is based on the existing building footprint of Riverdale which has 80 mobile home sites, which average about 400 sq feet each, therefore 80 x 400 is the existing footprint. (This estimate does not include roadways and hardscape, just the built facilities). In contrast the square footage of Effie Yeaw is 11,000 square feet.

Some limited recreation land was modified to a developed recreation designation in order to accommodate parking and facilities for the interpretive center; however this is balanced by modifying other land uses to be more protective, as calculated in MIG's land use designation totals.

- The limited recreation area that currently serves as the archery range and field course was partially redesignated as a protected area. This was due to the fact that the “field course” is currently unused for its intended purpose and has developed and grown into good habitat.
- Strengthen bike/pedestrian connections with the Sacramento Riverfront and with the surrounding urban neighborhoods in the Richards Boulevard and Natomas areas
 - Two Rivers Trail
 - Bike/ ped bridge connecting Tiscornia to West Sacramento
 - Bike/ped bridge on DNA-RT crossing
 - Allowed bike/ped bridge associated with possible future I-5 expansion
 - Potential bike/ped bridge at or near 160 associated with interpretive center
- Enhance the gateway at the eastern end of Discovery Park with improved access, trails, signage, and parking associated with an interpretive center.
- Note that the equestrian/hiking trail remains largely on current alignment.
- A potential amphitheater appears on the map. The UCAC did not reach closure on the issue of whether to allow an amphitheater. County Parks has prepared remarks on what they would support for an amphitheater. [Process note: This item was bumped from the agenda due to time constraints and will return to the UCAC at a later date.]

UCAC clarification questions and discussion on policy 9.1 through 9.1.5:

- How much will the Boy Scout Camp be affected by this proposal? –Not at all.
- ! UCAC members discussed whether it was possible or advisable to require rubberized asphalt on bike trails. City staff agreed with a preference for rubberized asphalt, but said that it sometimes comes down to funding. **Staff pointed out that the surface of trails is covered in Chapter 8, and a preference for rubberized asphalt or other environmentally sound construction methods was encouraged in policy.**
- The archery range and field range haven't been used? –The field course has not been used for some time for its intended purpose. The logic in shortening it was to preserve the opportunity for an existing use, but also preserve more of the quality habitat which contains a small wetland area. The limited recreation area of the archery range and course was about 5 acres; it is now about 2.5 acres.
- Why not have open space preserve in the northwest corner on the north bank of the river? – Gary Kukkola responded that he does not think open space preserve is an appropriate designation for that area. The open space preserve designation is mostly for bluff areas that might have a stability or safety problem. This area does have some public access, and probably some illegal camping. It could have programming if resources allowed.

- ! On page 7-7, table 7.3, it says that the use for a nature study area is normally a small group up to 20. If you surround Uruttia Pond with that designation, will having that restriction be inappropriate for the amount of visitors taken there in conjunction with the interpretive center? –**Consider changing Nature Study designation on some parts of Uruttia Pond, e.g. the eastern end of the pond.**
- ! There appears to be a discrepancy between the area designation that encompasses Riverdale on the 1985 Plan and the area proposed for developed recreation on the new draft. It seems to be twice as large as what is shown on existing plan. What is the reason for the expansion? --About 20 acres are designated for developed recreation, while the size of Riverdale is 4 1/2 acres. Some of the developed recreation area is for parking. There is a little expansion of the developed recreation from the 1985 Plan, but not much, and this was counterbalanced by changing a large are of limited recreation to protected area (this is the restoration site known as 18A). **Staff can get specific acreage using GIS calculations and perhaps overlay maps for follow up.**
- ! A UCAC member suggested adding language to policy 9.1.2. on the extension of Two Rivers Trail to say that it “shall be constructed” “on the levee tops” “as soon as funding is available”. Staff and UCAC members who have been involved in the Two Rivers Trail process recommended against saying that it shall be constructed on the levee tops, since there might be obstacles to this design and flexibility might be needed. Some UCAC members disagreed with saying “as soon as possible” since that appeared to prioritize one project over others. **UCAC members agreed they prefer the language “Support construction of” rather than “Consider,” that it should be “on levee tops where feasible” and that staff should use the narrative to explain the difference between the two segments of Two Rivers Trail.**
 - A UCAC member objected to the wording “support” in the Plan. He suggested either include the policy or don’t, but don’t say that the Plan “supports” something.
 - I am concerned about access to the Parkway after exiting the proposed light rail line at the station to the north of the Parkway. Can you have pedestrian access in a protected area? Yes, for bike / ped. Policy 9.1.4 and 9.1.5 would allow it.
 - UCAC members discussed whether it was desirable to designate access points for the proposed light rail line (DNA-RT) on the maps and in policy 9.1.5. They decided against it, since the land use designations do allow for access, and the DNA-RT line is not yet a done deal.
- ! **UCAC members agreed that policy 9.1.5 should use “If...then” language to specify that “if built”, the DNA-RT bike/pedestrian bridge shall span the American River...**
- ! A UCAC member suggested that policy 9.1.5 not specify access on the levees, but rather say that bicycle / pedestrian access shall be provided into the Parkway on both sides of the river. A staff member pointed out that this language could allow for new ramps coming down into the Parkway from the light rail line, which the UCAC had previously said it didn’t want. **Staff agreed to clarify the intent that the new access will not touch down in the Parkway, and must connect to trails.**
 - A UCAC member pointed out that people arriving on light rail are unlikely to use the access provided along with the DNA-RT line since the proposed and existing stations are pretty far from the Parkway; however, the access would be used by neighborhood residents and others coming to the Parkway.

- A UCAC member expressed concern about a lack of trails in the Discover Park east area, e.g. access to the archery range, from the proposed light rail access, and to the water. Staff responded that there is existing access, and the land use designations allow trail creation as needed. A UCAC member commented that the Plan should state that trails are coordinated with infrastructure improvements.

Public comment on 9.1 through 9.1.5

- Reiterate that bridges degrade the Parkway.
- After a thorough study of the need for a new bridge, if one is needed, it should be close to or part of an existing bridge because every bridge causes noise pollution and trash impact.
- I am concerned about the developed recreation area by the interpretive center. A wildlife corridor should be preserved.

UCAC discussion on policies 9.2 through 9.5

- A UCAC member suggested adding to 9.3 that the interpretive center must be under the control and administration of County Parks. Several staff and UCAC members argued that this would be too restrictive and could potentially kill a “deal” to purchase and restore property in the Parkway and bring in a needed interpretive facility; they advocated providing flexibility for the parties involved to figure it out. Staff clarified that no matter who pays for the property, it could not be taken out of the Parkway and it would be subject to zoning regulations (on building in a floodway) and Parkway land use designations; another staff member pointed out that the parties likely to acquire Riverdale (the State, City, County, and / or SAFCA) will all adopt / abide by the Parkway Plan. **UCAC members agreed to direct staff to draft a general policy for all acquired lands that conveys that privately-held lands that are recommended for acquisition in this Plan shall be acquired as part of the American River Parkway and managed in accordance with the Parkway Plan, in a manner that is consistent with the management of the remainder of the Parkway.**
- A UCAC member suggested adding language to Policy 9.3. regarding ADA access, for example, if there are steps leading to the observation platform. Staff replied that they are working with the County’s Disability Coordinator to draft a general statement regarding access for those with disabilities, and asked the UCAC’s permission to use staff judgment about creating a global policy and adding specificity where needed. UCAC members affirmed their permission.
- ! Members discussed whether Riverdale is the best location for an interpretive center. Some argued that it makes sense to put the interpretive center at Riverdale since it already has concrete and an impacted environment. Others argued that a center should be located farther from the river. Staff affirmed that the draft policies 9.4 and 9.5-9.5.5 were designed to encourage an interpretive center specifically at Riverdale. **UCAC members agreed that they would like the policies to be rewritten to allow flexibility on siting an interpretive center somewhere in the lower portion of the Parkway if Riverdale turns out not to be feasible.**
- Some members expressed discomfort with the 32,000 square foot maximum size described for the interpretive center, especially if elevated. One member compared it to a building the size of two football fields together. A few members reiterated that they would prefer a

smaller center closer in size to Effie Yeaw. Some said they would be okay with that amount of floor space if it were split among several buildings, and one suggested that no single structure should be larger than the largest building at Effie Yeaw. One member suggested that the 32,000 square feet should include trails and parking associated with the center. Other members argued against putting a fixed number for maximum square footage of the museum in the Plan, when they haven't yet determined what they need or what the design would be. In this same vein, some members objected to doing specific planning for an interpretive center in this forum and recommended leaving the specifics to planners and to the public process for any proposed center.

- A UCAC member asked if the “interpretive center” could be the CIHC. Staff responded that yes, it could be the interpretive components of the CIHC.
- ! **UCAC members agreed that they preferred for policy 9.5 to state that “It is consistent with this Plan” to have an interpretive center.**
- A UCAC member asked staff to define what exactly is an “interpretive center.” Staff stated that this could be defined in Chapter 3 under interpretive resources, and it is also described in the narrative for Discovery Park (page 5 of tonight’s handout with policies and narrative).
- ! A UCAC member suggested that interpretation should be earth science, life science, and culture related specifically to the Parkway, and that several types of interests could be served by one interpretive center. **UCAC members agreed that it should be specified that an interpretive center can interpret Indian lifeways statewide, not just associated with Indian historic use of the Parkway itself.**
- One UCAC member suggested building the interpretive center outside the levees in the City and letting Riverdale “go natural.” Another member argued that the Riverdale site is extremely damaged and should not be left alone.
- A member asked what would be the demand for the center, and how many people could be expected to visit. Staff replied that this would depend on the size and other characteristics of whatever center were built.
- Members discussed the Turtle Bay museum in Redding, which is a large and beautiful structure. Tim Washburn (SAFCA) proposed organizing a UCAC tour of the facility so that they could get a feel for a world class facility and how it interacted with the landscape. Some members indicated they would be interested in such a tour.
- Members discussed their interests in an interpretive center throughout the evening and the following is a summary: having a world-class facility;; having it be environmentally sensitive and compatible with the values of the Parkway; limiting intrusion, e.g. by minimizing floor space and parking; restoring the Riverdale site; leaving the design details to the public planning phase if/when there is a formal proposal for an interpretive center in the area/not being so prescriptive in Parkway policy so as to “kill” a deal.
- ! UCAC members considered three proposals for addressing the question of maximum square footage and did straw polling, not a “vote”, to test the level of support for each:
 - Leave the language as it is at 32,000 square feet maximum (10 members preferred this)
 - Remove policy 9.5.1 all together and have no maximum square footage specified (7 members preferred this)
 - Require that all interpretive activity associated with the interpretive center, including parking and trails, be no more than 4 acres of footprint. (4 members preferred this)

Staff confirmed that while the UCAC was not of one mind on this, most members preferred not including a size limitation, and therefore there was not enough support to retain policy 9.5.1. Staff could consider moving some of the narrative language describing the interpretive center that UCAC members appeared to like to policy in the final draft.

Post-meeting Facilitator's Note: At this point, the UCAC do not have a recommendation for a policy that describes the size of the interpretive facility. UCAC members who are interested in proposing a policy that might better reflect the range of UCAC interests are welcome to do so as part of the final draft in April/May. The facilitators are available to support this effort.

Public comment on policies 9.2 through 9.5

- Remember that all of this is subject to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, which will not allow incompatible development.
- Do not depreciate Uruttia as a wildlife preserve. Have islands, no fishing, facilities away from the shoreline. The elevated observation platforms on the Cosumnes River serve as a good example of human use compatible with a preserve.
- Add wording that conveys that the Parkway needs still water habitat / permanent, year-round wetlands for wildlife.
- At this stage, we have general support for a generic interpretive center in this area
- The objectives of a center need to be stated, including Indian culture
- The Plan should state there shall be no Indian casinos in the Parkway. –Staff replied that this is covered under the ban on commercial activity.
- Why not say that the total area of the interpretive activity associated with the center should be no larger than four acres (about the size of Riverdale) including parking and buildings?

Process note: The remaining agenda items were deferred due to time constraints. These items will return to the UCAC at a later date.

Action Items & Follow-Up

Who	What	When
UCAC members	Give feedback to staff on the role of the State and local adoption for consideration in drafting Chapter 11	February 28
Staff	Change draft IAP policies and maps to respond to UCAC comments with exclamation point bullets, and other comments as appropriate.	March/April final draft review
Staff	Bring visual aids to show changes in land use policies from the 1985 area plans to next meeting on IAP	February 7

Meeting Materials

- Revised agenda
- Draft ARPP Area Plans: Discovery Park, Woodlake, and Cal Expo (policies and narratives, draft 1/17/06)

- Figure 1: Draft Discovery Park Area Plan
- Figure 2: Draft Woodlake Area Plan
- Figure 3: Draft Cal Expo Area Plan
- Community Workshop and Site Tour (Rancho Cordova tour announcement from County Planning) January 20, 2006
- ARPP Structure diagram (State adoption and local adoption components)
- California Codes Public Resources Code Section 5830-5835 (proposed revision of Bushy Lake Preservation Act)
- UCAC Policy Direction on Off-Paved Trail Cycling
- Notes from January 3, 2006 UCAC meeting

Topics for February 7, 2006 Update Committee Meeting

- UCAC priority issues re: Cal Expo, Woodlake and Chapter 6: Non-recreational uses

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
	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)
	Greg	Speicher	Boating
	Ron	Stork	Friends of the River
	Peter	Tateishi	Dist 3 - Supervisor Johnson Appointment
X	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
 Teresa Haenggi, Sacramento City Parks
 Steve Launey, CalExpo
 Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova

Brian May, CalExpo
 Helen Selph, Sacramento City Planning
 JP Tindell, Sacramento City Parks
 Lee Fraschette, Cordova Recreation and Park District

Gregg Ellis, JSA
Bill Griffith
Betsy Weiland
Bruce Morriscal
Pauline Grenbeaux
Daniel Striplen
Susan Oldland

Geraldine Joerger
Elhmer Aldrich
Peter Watkins
Sherri ?

Project Staff

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