

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

Meeting Highlights—March 20, 2006

Key Outcomes

- UCAC members and the public provided feedback for revising Parkway Plan Chapter 7: Land Use and Aesthetic Resources of the Parkway (carried over from Chapter 3: Resources of the Parkway). Bold type with exclamation point bullets indicates agreed upon changes or direction for other staff action. Normal type with round bullets indicates additional comments that staff will consider when developing a final draft.

Decision Items for April 4, 2006 meeting 5:30-9 PM at the Library Galleria, 828 I St. in Sacramento

- UCAC member direction on Chapter 10: Area Plans and Chapter 11: Implementation priority topics:
 - Chapter 10 Introduction paragraph re: purpose of area plans
 - State and local adoption processes
 - Funding (expenditures and management needs, equity of sources, future funding needs. etc.)
 - Implementation Measures

Welcome and Announcements

Connie Miottel Resignation: Sunny Williams (County Planning) welcomed meeting attendees. She announced that Connie Miottel has resigned from the Committee. Connie has accepted a job in the Bay Area and is no longer able to devote the time to fully participate as a UCAC member. The City of Sacramento will not be appointing a new person to replace Connie. The number of UCAC members needed to approve a recommendation by vote remains the same (greater than 3/5 of the Committee = 13 members).

Expedited completion plan: Changes to the expedited completion plan discussed at the last UCAC meeting are complete. The revised memo has been emailed to UCAC members and copies are available this evening.

Conflict of Interest Forms: Sunny sent Form 700 on conflict of interest to all UCAC members. **Please complete by March 30, 2006** and return to Sunny Williams. Staff distributed a memo along with Form 700 which details UCAC members' responsibilities regarding conflict of interest. In summary, members should not participate in discussions, polls, or decision-making on any issue in which a member has a direct financial interest. Notes from the last UCAC meeting have been revised to reflect that one UCAC member had a potential conflict of interest

on the issue of restaurants, cafes, and commercial kitchens in the Parkway, and therefore the opinion she registered in the poll on that topic has been changed to “abstain”.

SB 1776: Sharon Huntsman (Center for Collaborative Policy) emailed UCAC members a copy of SB 1776, which would add Rancho Cordova as a signatory to the Parkway Plan. The Board of Supervisors will discuss this bill on March 21 at 9:50 am. Additional information can be accessed on the County’s website.

Rancho Cordova Public Workshop: On February 4, 2006, the Rancho Cordova City Council requested another public workshop to vet ideas for area planning in the Parkway adjacent to Rancho Cordova. The workshop will take place April 10, 2006, 6:30 p.m., at the Rancho Cordova City Hall - American River Room, 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova. There will be a brief presentation similar to the previous workshop with the remainder of the workshop focused on public input.

American River Raft Rental: UCAC members asked for more information about American River Raft Rentals’ proposal to relocate their concession into the Parkway near Lower Sunrise. In May 2005, the County Board of Supervisors directed County Parks staff to negotiate with American River Raft Rental on this project, which is proceeding consistent with the 1985 Parkway Plan. Documents concerning the proposal were emailed to UCAC members and are also available this evening. For further questions regarding the status of the project, please contact Gary Kukkola or Dave Lydick (County Parks).

City of Sacramento Council Meeting: The City Council will meet the evening of March 21, 2006 on the topic of community reinvestment. A small piece of the presentation will concern the California Indian Heritage Center.

UCAC member comment:

- Peggy Berry announced that 120 members attended the California Native Plant Society’s recent meeting to hear a presentation regarding the Parkway. She thanked the presenters, Marilee and Steve Flannery, and noted that the usual turnout for CNPS meetings is about 50 people.

Chapter 7: Land Use: Overview of Changes to the 1985 Plan

Sunny Williams (County Planning) reviewed the proposed changes to Chapter 7 dated 3/13/06 and noted one additional change to policy 7.13 since the document was distributed via email. She also introduced the new narrative regarding Aesthetic Resources of the Parkway developed for inclusion at the end of Chapter 3. She explained that Chapter 7 provides the general framework for land use designations, definitions and related policies. Like Chapter 5, proposed changes try to achieve greater fluidity of information, remove duplications and place information from tables in a policy or narrative for easier reading and consistency. The biggest changes appear in the visual impact policy and narrative, to clarify intent for areas located both within and adjacent to, the Parkway.

Overview of Aesthetics and Visual Impact Policies

Leighann Moffitt (County Planning) and Jim McDonald (City of Sacramento Planning) provided additional detail regarding proposed changes, which attempt to remain consistent with overall Parkway Plan goals. The proposed revisions reflect changes that have occurred in last 20 years, such as anticipated population growth and expected development (especially in the downtown area), the regional Blueprint process, and General Plan updates currently underway. The new narrative recognizes the importance of visual aesthetics in the Parkway along with the need to maintain good relations with adjacent land uses. It also acknowledges the need to balance growth and preservation of aesthetic resources in the Parkway. While the Parkway Plan provides policy and suggested guidelines to reduce potential impacts of adjacent development, zoning code regulations remain the responsibility of City and County jurisdictions. Revisions to those zoning codes may be revisited when the Parkway Plan Update process is complete.

Clarifying Questions about Proposed Changes

- ! It seems that policy 7.19 is almost identical to 6.4. **Staff will review to see how these two policies can be coordinated.**
- What's a context sensitive design? Staff Response: The term "context sensitive design" basically means that the design must take its surroundings into account, for example, the maturity of the trees or height of bluffs. Providing specifics is the type of detail included in a zoning code.
- Is this terminology too vague? Is there a way to regulate? Staff Response: Policy 7.26 provides some ideas about context sensitive design to reduce visual impact.
- Another question on terminology: What is a "unique opportunity for functional and visual synergy" on page 5 of the draft? Do all planners define this the same way? How will it be defined 10 years from now? Staff Response: If you define some things too much, you limit yourself in the future. For example, in the past, people tried to create a divider to protect the Parkway. Now, the back of a levee is somewhat of a dead zone. Instead, we want to encourage adjacent land uses that support and enhance the Parkway. For example, a greenbelt and promenade creates a synergy for both areas versus just a levee wall.
- Concerning setbacks or buffers, policy 7.26, page 5, first bullet. I heard there would be an esplanade 100-300 ft deep near Richards Blvd. That would be an ideal example of a setback or buffer in the inner City. Currently, there is no green space or transition. Can the City provide us with information on their plans? Staff Response: The City's plan calls for a minimum of a 100 ft setback. That's in the current ordinance.
- Can the City and County explain how the ordinance process happens? Staff Response: Rancho Cordova inherited the County ordinance (Parkway Corridor Combining Zone) and the City of Sacramento has their own (the Parkway Overlay Zone). Revision of the County zoning code was attempted, but it did not proceed forward and was very controversial. Currently, it is on the project list but is unfunded and must wait until this project and the General Plan update are complete. The adoption of a General Plan is currently underway in Rancho Cordova and zoning codes will be revised to fit with that. The same public process is used as with any ordinance adoption; it is advertised in various newspapers and on the website. You can join a listserv for the Rancho Cordova

General Plan and ordinance update. The City of Sacramento provides public notice in the event of any amendments to ordinances.

- I would like to recognize the City and County for their work and am reasonably comfortable with the work done by the staff.

UCAC Discussion: Aesthetic Resources of the Parkway

- Beautifully done.
- ! I would like to make one addition that addresses light pollution and protecting natural lighting. The UCAC supported this. **Lea Brooks and Betsy Weiland will develop language and work with staff.**

Public Comment

- I think I understand why you didn't put it in, but you have not mentioned insects or taken into consideration the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB).
- I would like to echo that this a beautiful piece of work and I support the inclusion of insects – we should make it as inclusive as possible.

Additional UCAC Comment and Direction

- ! **Safety needs to be considered and included in the drafting of the light pollution policy.**
- Light pollution has a severe effect on birds, nesting in particular. The Dark Skies Society has a representative here in Sacramento and whoever develops the language might consult that person.
- ! What about insect inclusion? Would this prevent West Nile spraying? No, this is about aesthetics. Instead of talking about insects specifically, discuss wildlife. **UCAC members support the inclusion of language that addresses wildlife. Staff will develop.**

UCAC Discussion: Visual impacts from inside the ARP: Policies 7.19 – 7.21.7

- ! 7.19 – The last phrase “without compromising public safety.” I want to ensure we're not taking away public utilities ability to construct safe facilities. **Staff will ensure that 7.19 does not interfere with public utilities ability to maintain, construct, and reconstruct their facilities.**
- Why was should versus shall used? Staff Response: We can't regulate utilities above or below ground but we can encourage that they blend in as much as possible.
- Does that apply to a sound proof pump for Aerojet? Staff Response: That would be our goal.
- 7.21.2 says that structures shall be constructed with naturalistic materials. If someone used materials such as Trex, would that be OK? I don't want to prevent those materials from being used. Staff Response: Naturalistic appearance does not necessarily imply natural materials, which may not be as durable over time. So yes, Trex would be okay.
- 7.21.6 says that structures shall not include advertising. I think that the word “permanent” should be added to “structure” to allow temporary ads, for example for events like Day in the Zone or produce stands. It depends how you define advertising.

- What about ads on trailers if the rafting service comes in? Is that appropriate in the Parkway? Staff Response: We have always discouraged advertising – a sign for a special day event is OK but anything beyond that where someone is capitalizing on having a presence in the Parkway, we toe the line pretty hard to disallow advertising.
- ! UCAC members agree with how this issue has been managed by County Parks so far. The same principles apply to both permanent and temporary structures. UCAC members propose the policy be rewritten to better reflect the intention. **Gary Kukkola will rewrite to describe more thoroughly the current policy on advertising and signage for vendors.**

Public Comment

- I think the staff and people that worked on this did a good job.
- I'm curious about 7.21.4 – structures may emulate historic design but shall be unobtrusive. What did you visualize there when talking about historic design? Can you give example of why you put that there? Staff Response: This is current language. If its not in bold type in the draft, it's existing language from the 1985 Parkway Plan.
- A professional historian would know exactly – does it comply with a historical period? Need a professional to determine that.
- Question to Rancho Cordova staff: Would any of these policies interfere with what you are proposing for restoring the mine tailings? Answer from Rancho Cordova staff: We haven't presented our ideas to the UCAC so this is out of sequence. If that type of restoration becomes part of an area plan and the UCAC approved of it, then some dredging equipment and a few interpretive signs might work. Response from Laura Kaplan (Center for Collaborative Policy): The Parkway Plan Update is an iterative process. If a change to an area plan is made later that is a desirable use, then staff and the UCAC can go back and revise policy language to accommodate it as needed.

UCAC Direction

- ! **Staff will work with Janel Silva to clarify and improve wording of 7.21.4 on historical design.**

UCAC Discussion: Visual impacts from adjacent land uses: Policies 7.18 and 7.25 – 7.27

- 7.18 – Does the zoning code regulate swimming pools? Is it building or zoning code that specifies how far back pools need to be from the bluff? Staff Response: Pools need to be set back. Depends what bluff you're talking about. It is in the zoning code though a construction permit also may be needed.
- Is a light pole considered a structure? Is a mile away considered adjacent? The High School installed a giant football field light that destroyed natural light on 2 miles of the bikeway. Staff Response: The County can not regulate what the high school does. Lee Frachette (Cordova Parks and Recreation District) explained that the lights were installed prior to the City's incorporation. It is regulated by the state and the City doesn't have authority over that. Those particular light poles are an anomaly – new ones will meet

state code to regulate spillage. The current ones came from Sac State and are exempt. There is a lot of spillage. However, if you contact the school with your concerns, they may take those concerns seriously.

- The regulation is useful as is. There is no way to define adjacent.
 - Might add “without appropriate mitigation.”
 - Ought to be consistent.
 - No objection to adding that language.
 - It is good language to say they should reduce or eliminate the potential impacts. To the extent they can’t, they should mitigate. It’s a little more complex than the language you’ve offered. After 30 yrs of CEQA, you try to reduce as much as you can and if not, then mitigate.
- ! **UCAC agrees to add “or eliminate” and “without appropriate mitigation” to 7.18**

Public Comment

- I definitely like the word “shall” and I approve of the friendly amendment.

UCAC Discussion: Policy 7.25

- Are there any parts of the Parkway that don’t have buffers or screens? If we’re not currently following the old policy, why are we including it again? Staff Response: Not every segment has screening but we strive to achieve that and inclusion of the policy helps us reach the vision. The fact that we haven’t achieved total compliance yet doesn’t negate the vision.
 - If there is a visually compatible land use, why would you need a screen? Staff Response: There may be land uses that create an exception to this rule.
 - A lawn with ornamental trees may not be attractive to everyone and it might conflict with values they want to preserve.
 - The draft language says to separate, buffer or screen – the interest is in not requiring screening if land use is visually compatible.
 - I would agree to not requiring screening where there is compatible land use if we had a definition of what is compatible, but we have not defined that.
 - Exceptions may be warranted. The policy as written seems excessively all encompassing.
 - This is a goal not a requirement.
 - My building permit had to be approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1986. My concern has more to do with landscaping that can be done by a private land owner. I can plant trees but I can’t build a levee. Staff Response: I don’t think it’s only up to the home owner to screen. The levees are included in this policy because it serves that function. That’s why there are options – screening doesn’t have to be a levee.
- ! **This issue referred to “off line” discussion with staff. Staff will revise the policy to meet the interest of not requiring screening if it is not needed, without unacceptably weakening the policy.**

Public comment

None

UCAC Discussion: Policy 7.26

- In the Costco parking lot at mile 4 of the bikeway, the lights are so bright they spill over into the Parkway and are blinding. Would this policy cover this problem? If not, I'd like to figure out a way to do so. Staff Response: This gives policy direction but is not prescriptive to require revision to zoning codes. It's intended to give guidance but is not strong enough to disallow lighting in adjacent parking lots.
- ! Can there be mitigation? Staff Response: This policy can simply provide advice and includes intrusive lighting on page 6. **Lea will follow up with suggestions to staff.**
- The last sentence in the narrative under *Riverside and Bluffs* (page 5 sentence begins "continued use of") should be included in the policy and not just in narrative. Another UCAC member supports this. Staff Response: All jurisdictions use different forms to regulate. It's difficult to be all inclusive of types of regulations and tools. The term "development plan review" is specific to the County. Policy 7.26 states "regulate" so it applies to whatever venue is used.
- Every time I see should or shall in a narrative, I look for a corresponding policy. Staff Response: It is in the policy in 7.26 when we say, "shall regulate." Could list different tools if we want to be more inclusive.
- Like 7.27, maybe recognize the special nature of the bluffs with a new policy.
- Since we have an open space preserve policy, is this redundant? Staff Response: They're not equal. 7.26 deals with land outside the Parkway.
- I suggest revising 7.27 so it is not specific to the City but retains the last sentence that all development should respect the intent of Parkway goals.
- It's helpful to be as specific as possible when constructing policy. Different parts of the river have different themes. Downtown has skyscrapers. It's helpful to have policies reflect the reality. It is appropriate to discuss specific areas of the Parkway with regard to the bluffs, downtown, and any other areas. Another UCAC member agrees.
- Maybe add 7.28 to address bluffs.
- In the interest of paring down, we don't need to.

Laura called a straw poll to determine how many people prefer specifics in the policies and how many prefer a general policy (the last sentence of 7.27) with specifics included in the narrative.

Poll Result: 8 members present prefer 7.27 as is, with specifics included in the policy. 10 members present prefer a general policy with specifics about the downtown core included in the narrative.

UCAC member comment:

- Can we put forward as no recommendation with both options as valid? Laura clarified that in the case of no recommendation, a memo will go forward that explains the debate.
- Can we just decide? More people would like it to change than not. I'm asking if the 8 people can live with the suggestion.
- Another option is to defer to staff judgment.

Laura calls a straw poll to determine how many members can live with the change that eliminates the specifics and keeps the last sentence of 7.27 as policy. Result: 14 people can live

with it. This is not consensus – 13 is needed for a vote, not a consensus. A UCAC member asked to hear from the four people who can't live with it. Another UCAC member clarified that she didn't understand and therefore didn't vote. The others did not comment. The public was invited to contribute to the discussion to achieve a solution.

Public Comment

- I have a question about the relationship between 7.26 and 7.27: If I go into court, it seems schizophrenic. The conflict is in 7.26, it is clearly defined “you shall” but in 7.27 we now have this special area, all of a sudden its not a “shall” but a “should”. It seems very clear in 7.26 but not in 7.27. I would like to go toward the suggestion to be clear in aesthetic goals whether it is the bluffs or the urban core. Twenty years down the road, we could have the urban core stretching all the way down the Parkway. So does the policy about the urban core apply then? Should be consistent no matter where you're talking about.
- In 1986, the County published the Congers report...should the bluffs somehow be acknowledged as a special area? Gary Kukkola (Sacramento County Parks) responds: As I recall in 1986, erosion zones were added to the ordinance. I'm not sure if it gave special status for visual intrusion. It did give special consideration with regard to erosion.
- We can change 7.27 to eliminate the top part of the policy. Leave the last sentence and change “should” to “shall.”
- That makes no sense. The last sentence refers specifically to downtown.
- I thought we had one sentence we're addressing. As we grow, we'll have more areas that are called out. We have specific areas that are called out now.

Since the group is unable to reach agreement, Laura calls for the scheduled break. Following the break, staff explained their perspective: If you reduce 7.27 to the last sentence, it is redundant and unnecessary, therefore staff do not support making 7.27 into a general policy that applies to all areas. 7.27 was written to achieve a specific purpose: It is important to the City of Sacramento because it acknowledges the unique nature of downtown – it is different than the rest of the Parkway. You cannot mitigate to reduce visual intrusion to zero in the urban core. 7.26 alone doesn't recognize the uniqueness of the central city and downtown core. Staff want the Parkway Plan to be consistent with the Regional Blueprint, which calls for dense growth in the central city.

UCAC Discussion: Policy 7.26 (cont.)

- Replace should with shall
- There is a big difference between building high rises around the levee and downtown. There is a difference in the impact on the Parkway regarding where high rises are built. You can see downtown high rises now. If you built high rises in the Richards area, the impact would be different. Can we make a distinction between impacts in different areas? Staff replied that this is part of the zoning code.
- ! **Replace should with shall in the last sentence in 7.27.** With one exception, all UCAC members can live with this. Melinda Williams went on record to say she could not live with this for reasons already stated.

Another public comment: The draft language talks about minimizing visual impacts and context sensitive design. Does that include lighting and light intrusion also? Obviously, we're not talking about safety lighting but major impact from constant light in the sky. Staff Response: In the downtown core, we'll have more problems with light pollution. Any development projects have to do a lighting plan and we work with them to minimize impact. Visual impacts do include lighting.

Laura asks if the UCAC want to recommend a separate policy on the bluffs.

UCAC member comment:

- Why not? The bluffs are special and unique.
- What more can be said about policy on bluffs?
- If we thought about it, we might come up with policy beyond what is in the narrative.

UCAC Direction

- ! **The UCAC directed staff to review the narrative to determine if there needs to be a policy specific to the bluffs.** Any interested UCAC member should work with staff.

Overview: Policies on Recreation Reserve Areas

Gary Kukkola (Sacramento County Parks) described three areas currently designated as Recreation Reserve including: a sheriff's facility, an area east of Hagan Park and Rancho Cordova that includes agricultural land, and an area upstream of Hazel Ave with land owned by BLM that previously served as an aggregate mining site. The proposed revisions recognize that not all land in Recreation Reserve areas is undeveloped and acknowledge potential new uses.

UCAC Discussion: Policy 7.13

- Clarifying question: Even with the revisions to the text, can you imagine in the future that all Recreation Reserve will devolve to developed recreation? Are we doing our duty if we do not re-designate some areas in this Update? Staff Response: I don't see it all going to developed recreation. Rancho Cordova for example may require some change in land use designation to accomplish some of its goals. This will be addressed when we consider area plans.
- Is there a need for this Recreation Reserve area designation? Staff Response: It seems there is still a role. At some point, we will move forward under the guidance of this policy, but we will not make changes without study and direction from the Board of Supervisors to ensure consideration of Parkway values before changes are made. Gary pointed out the revision to 7.13 that relates to this discussion. It now reads: An amendment to convert a Recreation Reserve Area to another land use designation shall only take place after the BOS has conducted adequate study and public hearings.
- Is it after the study and public hearing or only upon their approval?
- ! **7.13 - Add that it requires Board approval.**

Public Comment

- Question about amendment procedure and adequate study and public hearing. Do we need some clarification of what is adequate public comment? Why are only the BOS going to hold a hearing when action also is required by other jurisdictions? The City or County can not unilaterally approve land use designation changes. Staff Response: The BOS would do the initial process.

UCAC Direction

- The BOS doesn't really need to be specified.
- Are we talking about amending the plan or a local area plan? Staff Response: We're talking about changing a land use designation.
- So we need to go through the whole process of State and local adoption.
- A little redundancy would work well here, to repeat what that process of adoption is.
- ! **Direct staff to be clear about the necessary approval process and different entities involved.**
- UCAC members do not want to try to define "adequate study."
- You can't force the legislature to hold hearings.

UCAC Discussion: Policy 7.14

- The terms "agriculture" and "native plant nurseries" appear several times. Add "non-polluting" when agriculture is mentioned and possibly organic methods. I really want to have that regarding anything to do with the water. Staff Response: This is addressed in Chapter 6, which defines what is appropriate and desirable in agriculture.
- I, Peggy Berry, want to go on record that I believe organic should be required and disagree with the decision to make it optional.
- Regarding access roads, has anything been left out of this policy? For example, might you want a directional sign? Is a sign considered a facility? Staff response: No it's not a facility, but we're not precluded from using a sign.

UCAC Discussion Policy: 7.15

No member comments.

Public comment

- ! Go back to refer to 7.9 in relation to 7.15. You haven't added in agricultural and native plant nurseries to 7.9. Can this be cleaned up somehow? **Staff will make these two consistent.**

Open Agenda Time for other UCAC Priority Issues in Chapter 7

Laura reminded the group of the process: Committee members or the public may suggest discussion on any remaining policies from Chapter 7. Laura helped the group build a list of topics to address.

UCAC member topics:

- *The relationship between land use designations and the river.* If you read restrictions on protected areas (page 8), how does this relate to the river? It says motorized boating and motorized boat access are not allowed. Are you not allowed to go by it? How will you get your boat in the water?
 - Staff response: You can have a motorized boat anywhere on the American River, but it is restricted to 5 mph. It's not precluded just because it passes by a protected area. Fishing and boating regulations on the river are determined by State and local ordinance. Local regulations govern speed and the State governs fishing. Land use designations do not apply to the adjacent river. We can't govern what occurs on the waterway.
 - What about fishers on the shoreline? Staff Response: Unlimited except during certain times of the year.
- Page 8, the wording about "commercial activities, caretakers, and agriculture may be permitted" wasn't in the 1985 Plan. I want to know why we are doing that and I don't agree.
 - Staff response: This is not an addition. It was in the 1985 tables but did not exist in narrative or policy. We brought it into the policies to make it easier to find and read.
 - Under the '85 Plan, there were some sales of organic produce. So even the '85 Plan anticipated some potential commercial activity of organic produce.
 - Can you define commercial activities? Staff response: It is in Chapter 6
 - **I want to clarify what kinds of commercial activities will be allowed? Staff will discuss with members outside the meeting.**
- On page 7, Nature Study Area, you have added equestrian use as an allowed use. I think this is not consistent with the language that all uses in Nature Study areas should be passive.
 - Staff response: Equestrian trails currently go through Nature Study Areas. We added this language to try to resolve an internal inconsistency in the document.
 - If the equestrians can do it, then it opens the door for other non-passive activities.
 - Option: Remove the equestrian reference and explain that it is a non-conforming use.
 - The difference is that the '85 Plan doesn't show it as an allowed use. Staff response: It is not in the table, but it is on the map.
 - The way I read it is that they did not want the equestrian trails to be included in Nature Study Areas. This is a giant step forward to say that this use is allowed.
 - None of the equestrian trails in Nature Study areas are major thoroughfares. They are incidental encroachments into areas that were

limited to pedestrian use in the past. I would not support equestrian trails in Nature Study Areas.

- How does it work to define it as an inconsistent use? Staff response: We can add language similar to that for the golf course in Ancil Hoffman Park.
- ! **UCAC: We do not want equestrian trails in Nature Study Areas and need to state that this is a non-conforming use. Staff will add language.**

Public suggestions for open agenda time:

- This suggestion is generic to the whole plan and would clarify for the inexperienced reader of the plan. There is a lot of reference to types of recreation. Every time you refer to a type of recreation, keep consistent with what is described in the beginning of the Plan (that is, categories of recreation). Staff response: That is what we are trying to do.
- ! **7.1 second line, should read “adopted Parkway area plan.” Staff will make this change.**
- ! 7.3 In what context are you referring to “welfare” we all have different ideas about what welfare means. **UCAC agrees to remove the word “welfare” from 7.3**
- Add flood control facilities to 7.16 to permit in all land use categories.
 - “Flood control facility” is so broad. Add the word “public.”
 - There is a separate section of the Parkway Plan that deals with flood control.
 - ! Public flood control facilities include dams. This is a wild and scenic river corridor. The Plan should not be ambiguous about saying you can dam the river. We need to be clear that we are being consistent with goals of the Parkway and applicable law. Should refer to chapter on flood control without adding a lot of detail. **Staff will work on language to ensure this is done.**

Meeting adjourned 9 pm

Action Items & Follow-Up

Who	What	When
Staff and consultants	Revise Chapter 7 and Aesthetic Resources Narrative to reflect UCAC direction with exclamation point bullets, and other comments as appropriate.	
Committee Members	Follow up discussions with staff as noted.	
Committee Members	Return completed Form 700 to Sunny Williams	By March 30, 2006

Meeting Materials

- Agenda
- Chapter 7 Draft 3-13-06
- Aesthetic Resources of the Parkway narrative
- Revised policy 7.13
- Conflict of Interest memo
- Form 700
- Revised Expedited Completion memo
- Rancho Cordova Public Workshop flyers
- Meeting notes from 2-28 (revised) and 2-7

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
	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
X	Renée	Taylor	Dist 4 - Supervisor Niello Appointment
X	Annemarie	Vincent	American River Parkway Foundation
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

Lee Frchette, Cordova Parks & Recreation District

Tim Washburn, SAFCA

Teresa Haenggi, Sacramento City Parks

Steve Launey, CalExpo

Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova

Bob Overstreet, Sacramento City Parks

Jim McDonald, Sacramento City Planning

Celia Yniguez, Sacramento City Economic Development

Brian May, CalExpo

J.P. Tindell, Sacramento City Parks

Ron Suter, Sacramento County Parks

Maxine Clark
Betsy Weiland
Bert Hodges
Michael Picker
Bill Griffith

Matt Franck
Patty Kleinknecht
Kevin Regan
Elhmer Aldrich
Bill Dillinger

Project Staff

Leighann Moffit, County Planning
John Folk-Williams, Center for Collaborative Policy
Sunny Williams, County Planning
Gary Kukkola, Sacramento County Parks
Laura Kaplan, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy
Deb Marois, Center for Collaborative Policy