

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

## **Meeting Highlights—April 17, 2006**

### **Key Outcomes**

- UCAC members and the public provided feedback for revisions to carry-over issues related to bridge crossings, overnight camping, interpretive resources, flood control, the Wild and Scenic River Act, and implementation measures. **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 May 30, 2006 meeting 5:30-9 PM at the Library Galleria, 828 I St. in Sacramento**

- Agendized items: Updating area plan maps and policies for the Rancho Cordova area (Goethe and Rossmoor Bar), additional area plan map updates as determined. If time, the outstanding issues memo also will be discussed.

### **Welcome and Announcements**

Sunny Williams (County Planning) welcomed meeting attendees. She informed the UCAC that in addition to the documents staff mailed prior to the meeting, a handout was available of UCAC member Al Freitas' proposed language for the section on bridge policy.

### **Carry over issue: Bridge Crossings**

Sunny Williams (County Planning) reminded UCAC members of previous bridge discussions and referenced a recent memo (entitled "Memorandum Re: Parkway Plan Policy on Bridges Across the American River" dated 4/13/2006) sent to members to summarize the remaining issues.

During the Committee's last discussion of bridges, a member suggested that the Parkway Plan could simply prohibit new crossings since these tend to be politically infeasible anyway. Other members were hesitant to prohibit new crossings altogether, and agreed to a general prohibition on new crossing only if staff could map all proposed crossings at this time for UCAC discussion. The Update Project Management Team (PMT) has said that it cannot support a prohibition on new bridge crossings in the Parkway Plan, and instead suggested that it would be helpful if the UCAC could suggest guidelines for consideration of Parkway interests when new bridges are considered in the future.

The draft bridge policies that staff are proposing tonight, along with minor narrative changes, were crafted to try to take into account divergent UCAC views. These policies focus on providing broad guidance on design for both vehicular and non-vehicular bridges. A remaining key issue is whether amendments shall require local or State adoption. Staff's proposed policy language would require local adoption, which allows coordination among jurisdictions and

public review without a cumbersome State approval process. Currently, regional transportation planning is carried out on a local level, but the Plan could be interpreted to require that adding new bridge crossings to the Parkway Plan map would require approval by the State. This ambiguity results from the 1985 Plan being written prior to adoption by the State legislature.

### **UCAC Discussion 8.17**

- Clarifying question: Does “impact to Parkway environment” include the river? Staff response: Yes, it is certainly not intended to exclude the river. We want to keep bridges out of the river and arch over the river. Any bridges must also conform to Wild and Scenic River Act requirements.
- Al Freitas asked UCAC members to consider the proposed language he drafted for bridge policies. The main difference between his draft and staff’s is that his draft largely omits mentions of motor vehicle bridges. In his view, the Parkway Plan should not be the venue to establish County transportation policy. Therefore, it should only have policies for bridges that provide direct access to recreational activities in the Parkway. By leaving out other mentions of vehicle bridges, Al feels the Parkway Plan would not be endorsing or opposing them, and the Parkway Plan would be divorced from transportation planning.
- Does staff foresee any issues with this change? Sunny Williams answered that she is unable to speak on behalf of the Project Management Team (PMT). She explained that the staff draft policies include broad language to protect Parkway resources in the event new bridges are considered. Sunny noted that if motor vehicles are excluded from the Parkway Plan policies, guidance doesn’t exist for these future bridge crossings. Lee Frchette (Rancho Cordova Park and Recreation District) responded that they have no problem with these proposals but wondered if the UCAC wants to encourage considering tunnels instead of bridges?
- A UCAC member commented that the lower American River is a Wild and Scenic river and bridges are a part of those discussions. The Parkway Plan can affect where bridges are located and how they are designed. Whether or not bridges are appropriate to consider is part of our political judgment.

### **Public Comment**

- I have to agree with Al in a sense. It’s a far more powerful statement to remain silent. We’re not giving the impression we support auto bridges across the American River. As far as staff concerns about bridges being built without bike and pedestrian paths, that just won’t happen. CEQA and the Plan itself already address these issues including protecting the aesthetics. I do agree that it isn’t necessarily in our purview to design vehicular bridges over the American River Parkway.
- The Plan should include in a general way the adverse effects that come with any bridge – visual, noise and other pollution that dilute natural resources. Staff response: The narrative does describe adverse effects though not in detail.
- Public recommendation: Expand the narrative to describe adverse effects of bridges on the recreational user in more detail.

## UCAC Discussion of Policy 8.17

- Facilitator Laura Kaplan pointed out that the basic difference between staff's version and Al's version is that Al's version limits the policy to bicycle / pedestrian bridges in keeping with his views on staying silent on motor vehicle bridges.
- Staff implied that bridges will be built no matter what. We don't want to support that.
- Bridges inherently have some adverse effect. Do we want to include language that says they shall be designed to have the "least negative impact"?
- The impacts are quite different depending on whether it is an automobile or pedestrian bridge. If the PMT and Board of Supervisors (BOS) are not prepared to say where the bridges could be and it's impossible to have that in the Plan, I think the comments on the power of remaining silent on motor vehicle bridges were very insightful.
- We can be explicit in the narrative about ways bridges degrade the environment. We can't NOT talk about automobile bridges and expect that people won't propose bridges.
- Staff clarified that on page 8-4 in the old Plan there is language that describes how each crossing degrades the environment. Most of this is retained in the new version.
- ! UCAC agrees **there should be strong language in the plan about the potential adverse impacts of bridges, which may be different or a matter of degree with automotive bridges creating more impact than bike-pedestrian bridges.**
- I don't think the staff proposal supports additional auto bridges. If there is a bridge, people will drive across. If there is no bridge, they may drive 10 miles around which also creates cumulative impacts to the overall environment. I like the way the staff wrote the policy.
- Does anyone pay attention to the Parkway Plan when they build a bridge? Why go through all these gyrations if no one is going to pay attention anyway?
- The Parkway is not explicit about where RT can construct but there is language in the Plan that they need to consider and they do consider it. To the extent that the Parkway Plan is ambiguous, people are less inclined to pay attention.
- The BOS will use anything that is in the Plan to diffuse impacts. I am in favor of all these proposals because it gives the environmental community ways to reduce negative impacts.

Facilitator Laura Kaplan clarifies that the Parkway Plan is binding under State and local law. She summarizes that it appears the UCAC agrees that bridges are degrading and basically likes the concept stated in policy 8.17 to minimize their impact. The PMT suggested UCAC give guidance should a motor vehicle bridge be built in the future. She suggests the UCAC consider other policies and return to this question of whether to give guidance for future consideration of motor vehicle bridges or to stay silent and not create policy guidance on motor vehicle bridges.

When the UCAC returned to this discussion later in the evening, a majority of members agreed that they do want to give guidance for all types of bridges, including motor vehicle bridges. (See page 7 of these notes). A minority opinion preferred that the Parkway Plan be silent on motor vehicle bridges, and this will be reflected in the UCAC's Outstanding Issues Memo which will be part of the staff report to the adopting bodies.

### UCAC Discussion 8.18

- Laura pointed out that AI had not suggested a change to this policy.
- A member commented that there are plenty of beautifully designed bridges that are not muted earth tones, but that she felt a “modern bridge” that was not necessarily earth tone in color could be compatible with the river.
- A member commented that this policy felt like too much micromanaging on bridge design.
- Who decides if a bridge is in context? Staff responded by giving the example of the Hazel Avenue bridge widening project. Engineers met with community members to decide in part what the bridge should look like. They took into account color, whether the bike-ped should be separate, and modern designs like the sundial bridge. Design tends to be dictated more by budget than by design preference while still keeping in line with community input.
- I agree that dictating what color is ridiculous. Strike “muted, earth toned colors.”
- I think this is adequate and we should move on.
- Staff clarifies that the policy was written in response to UCAC discussion.
- A member suggested that the policy could require that a design committee give input on any proposed new bridge. Others commented that happens anyway.
- We want bridges to be the least intrusive on the Parkway. Redding (the location of the Sundial bridge) is a different place.
- I like that it states it should be muted, earth toned colors. The gold bridge to West Sacramento is a good example of an ugly color and how much public input did they get on that?

Straw Poll: 2 people are opposed to the staff language but are willing to stand aside.

**! UCAC agrees to keep the staff draft language on 8.18.**

### UCAC Discussion 8.19

Staff clarified that AI’s proposed language omits policy 8.19 altogether. The staff version is mostly 1985 Plan language and addresses bridge expansion as a first preference. AI’s version does not. Staff’s version is explicit in local adoption. AI’s version is silent on who adopts bridge amendments.

- Why are you omitting? AI responded: I incorporated that in the next policy, 8.20. Laura clarifies that AI’s version of 8.20 talks about expanded bridges, but does not explicitly state a policy preference for expanding old bridges before building new ones.
- I like the idea of expanding existing bridges first before building new ones. I’m kind of neutral on locally adopted.
- I like the first sentence on expanding old bridges first. The map amendment – is that a locally adopted plan? Staff response: Yes.
- If a motor vehicle bridge becomes part of the Plan, then it is currently required to go the State to be amended. The Staff version makes it clear that it does not have to go the State if a bridge is built over the American River. Again, I do not want to pass judgment on transportation.

Laura reminds the UCAC that they can recommend a State adoption process but the staff may have a different recommendation. Sunny clarifies that the PMT does not support a State amendment process for bridges.

- It doesn't seem like this makes it clear that this is a local adoption process. Staff clarified that this language is in keeping with the process for local adoption described elsewhere in the Plan and approved by the UCAC.
- I would like to hear Ron Suter and Gary Kukkola (Sacramento County Parks) about out how this impacts Parkway management. Gary responds: The language doesn't imply that bridges should or shouldn't be built. But, if one is built, what criteria will ensure it is a bridge you can live with as a stakeholder? In the past, we've wrestled with separating bike and auto.

Laura calls for a straw poll and asks UCAC members to indicate if they want to retain the expansion concept in 8.19. Straw Poll results: 11 favor retaining the policy preference for expanding existing bridges first, 3 oppose.

- Al is trying to take a neutral position beyond our lifetime. Make it as aesthetic as possible and as tough as you can without taking a position. It's an accident waiting to happen.
- We've spent numerous hours discussing what we'd want bridges to look like if they are constructed. How can they do it right if we don't give direction?
- The intent in Al's draft is to be completely neutral on the question of new bridges. People who want to build bridges will have to sell that to the community. Al is addressing only those issues that pertain to the Parkway – bike and pedestrian bridges have to do with the Parkway.
- Are there enough PMT members to know their position? Ron Suter (Sacramento County Parks) responds: No.

Laura summarizes that the basic divide is still between people who want to give guidance if new auto bridges are constructed and those that want to be silent. The only substantive issue struck in Al's version is the preference for expansion.

- What if 8.19 were rewritten to be a stronger "if" statement, IF new bridges were considered, then expand additional vehicle capacity first.
- We ought to take the two points in 8.19 and say who wants them or not. We shouldn't be talking about additional motor vehicle trips.
- I suggest we take a break and ask staff to reword.

### **Public Comment**

- If you need more capacity to move people across the river, there are other modes besides automobiles like bus rapid transit. Clarification: the staff version states "motor vehicle." Most of this language is from the 1985 plan and states a preference that if additional capacity is needed for motor vehicles, that bridges should be expanded first before new ones are built.

## UCAC Direction

Following the break, staff presented options for policy language to the UCAC. Staff clarified that the choice of “Be silent” is choosing to delete the concept being discussed.

Choice 1: Add a policy statement to the Plan “If it is necessary to accommodate additional motor vehicle trips across the river, expanding the capacity of existing bridges should first be considered” OR be silent on this concept.

Choice 2: Add a policy statement to the Plan “If a new bridge crossing is required, a map amendment to the locally-adopted area plan shall be required” OR be silent on this concept.

### Straw Poll Results:

- ! **Choice 1: 9 UCAC members are in favor of adding this policy statement to the Plan, 4 prefer silence on the issue. Laura affirmed that this dissent will be documented on the Outstanding Issues memo.**
  
- ! **Choice 2: 14 UCAC members prefer a local map amendment requirement, 1 person not in favor and agrees to stand aside. Choice 2 goes forward on consensus.**

## UCAC Discussion 8.20

- Al’s language in 8.20, does this address expansion? Yes, but it doesn’t state a preference for expansion first.
- ! **Should say motor vehicle to be consistent. Al’s proposed version of 8.20 with this change passed by consensus.**

## UCAC Discussion 8.21

Staff explained that this policy is included to distinguish between impacts that come with bike-ped bridges versus vehicular bridges.

- ! **The construction of a bridge could include two jurisdictions that cross two areas. Add an (s) so that the policy refers to amending area plan(s).**
- This includes criteria for connectivity. Should it address that the Parkway is a commuter route? Staff response: The concept of commuting is included in circulation.
- ! **UCAC unanimously approve of this policy with the addition of (s) to “plan(s)”.**

## UCAC Discussion on Proposed Tunneling Policy

Does the UCAC want to include a preference for tunneling under the Parkway rather than bridging over it, as suggested by the public?

- I would love to have anything going under but I don’t know if it’s realistic.
- Tunneling was brought up when Light Rail was planning a bridge across. The alternate estimate was 2-3 times the cost of a bridge. Usually cost presents a problem. Also, there is disturbance of the river bottom. It’s a little far fetched but at some time in the future, it might be determined less costly. They’re already putting sewers under.
- I think we lose credibility if we talk about this.

- We don't know what a tunnel will cost 20 years from now. Let's say to consider it before bridging.
- Does this provide a burden in terms of proposing a project? Staff response: Yes, it's an additional burden, but is it unreasonable? We can add something to the text as an option to explore the feasibility.
- Tunneling may or may not be good but we don't have enough information right now.
- The Plan should just state that you have to consider all alternatives for the crossing.
- Doesn't crossing mean over? Staff Response: No, you can cross under.
- If you add tunnels to a policy requiring the least impact to the Parkway, a CEQA analysis might determine that a tunnel has the least environmental impact and might require it despite cost. The PMT might not agree with that.
- ! **Staff will delete "bridge" and state that all crossing alternatives be considered.**

### UCAC Discussion 8.17 Revisited

- Why doesn't Al's version apply to all bridges? Al responds that he is trying to divorce the Parkway Plan update from county transportation planning.
- In 8.17, the first sentence says shall, the second says should. Why? Staff response: It expresses a preference in the second sentence, and a requirement in the first.
- ! Laura calls for a straw poll on the question of including all bridges or only bike-pedestrian bridges in 8.17. Straw poll results: 6 UCAC members prefer any crossing, 7 UCAC members prefer bike-pedestrian only. Summary: It is clear this group does not want additional motor vehicle crossings. There is a difference of opinion regarding whether it's better to give some guidance if new motor vehicle bridges are constructed or not. This will be reflected in the outstanding issues memo.
- ! Straw Poll Results: How many think the Plan should be silent and not give guidance on motor vehicle crossings? 10 UCAC members prefer to give guidance, 3 UCAC members prefer silence, one member abstains due to confusion on the issue and expresses concern that silence will result in loss of voice for the community. Staff will rewrite policy to reflect the UCAC's direction to give guidance on motor vehicle bridges, and note outstanding issues.

### Carry over issue: Overnight Camping

Gary Kukkola (Sacramento County Parks) explained that new guidance on camping in response to previous UCAC discussion clarifies group size and that camping without a permit is not legal and not supported. Permitted camping is defined geographically. The language also provides guidance and criteria for new sites should a need for new sites be determined in the future.

### UCAC Discussion Overnight Camping

- Is there any information on the impact of permitted overnight camping, not illegal camping? My understanding is that no one is doing it. Gary responds: We do track that information. The reservations for permitted camping are pretty low.
- Do you have a qualitative sense of the impact? Gary responds: Anecdotally, it's pretty low. Upper Sunrise is used very sparingly. Goethe Park can sustain more use.

- ! **5.11 seems to say that camping is only permitted in campsites upstream of Hazel Avenue, which would be in conflict with other policies in this section. Staff will rewrite to ensure consistency with the other policies.**
- ! **It's not Campfire Girls, it is Campfire USA. This change will be made by staff.**

No other changes suggested by UCAC or the public.

### **Carry over issue: Interpretive Resources**

Gary Kukkola (Sacramento County Parks) explained the primary changes to this section, which attempt to reflect UCAC input. New historical information was added to the narrative about the California Native Americans who used the Parkway. Much of this historical information is derived from *The Lower American River - Prehistory to the Parkway*, published by the American River Natural History Association. Other changes include a proposed definition of "minor" interpretive facilities; components of an interpretive program described on page 9; and a definition of an interpretive center drafted by Al Freitas. The only change staff made to Al's proposed definition was to omit language that would limit the size of an interpretive center to about the size of Effie Yeaw Nature Center. This omission was done in order to conform with previous direction by the UCAC.

### **UCAC Discussion Interpretive Resources**

- I think the history on Californian Native Americans is too lengthy and I would like to see more reference to plants and animals. I would like to include a reference to a building comparable in size to the Effie Yeaw Nature Center for a definition of an interpretive center on page 9.

Laura: UCAC members already rejected a size limit for an interpretive center and want to be silent on this issue. Please notify staff if you would like to re-considered this at the final meeting.

- ! I don't think the history of Native Americans is too extensive. They deserve everything they can get. We have an agricultural period. **We should have a historical section on agriculture featuring the Urrutia, Deitering, and Slobe properties. All UCAC members agree.**
- Is the gazebo at William B. Pond considered to be made of naturalistic materials? Staff response: Does that gazebo have metal roof? If it is not considered to be naturalistic, it should be. We did have a discussion about naturalistic materials. They may be composite or man-made materials that give a natural appearance in color, texture and form. Clarification: The facility you're talking about is not an interpretive center, it's a picnic facility.
- ! I second the suggestion to **have a small section on plants and animals organized around a riparian ecosystem. Staff response: That is referenced earlier in the chapter. Staff will make sure it's there.**
- I really like the wording on page 14 regarding erosion control.
- ! **We haven't said much about dredging, yet it's something people see when they go in the Parkway. Might want to explain this. Staff response: We will look at how we can**

**include a paragraph on this. If UCAC members have historical information on these areas, please forward to staff.**

- On page 9, 1b – Do we want to limit interpretive centers to areas that already have well established access? Maybe in 10 years there would be another location that is appropriate. Staff response: Interpretive centers must be located in developed recreation areas and that generally implies good access.
- What does 3b mean regarding the relationship between the location and the community to be served? Al Freitas responds: Interpretive centers should be diverse, not all alike. We should capitalize on what nature offers us. I'm an advocate for the establishment of an interpretive center that serves Rancho Cordova at the end of Chase Dr and uses what's there as a natural classroom for both adults and children. But this should not serve just the adjacent community.
- ! **We need to revise 3b to better reflect these concepts – the center can serve a broad range of interests and not solely the adjacent community.**

### **Public Comment and UCAC Direction**

- I took it to mean like the Parkway Foundation's center. A lot of consideration needs to be given to adjacent neighborhoods in relation to noise, traffic and other impacts. Al responds: It does mean that too.
- ! **Policy 3b needs to clarify that interpretive centers take into consideration adjacent neighborhood impacts.**
- ! **I recommend language that states the department shall promote the use of and partner with nonprofit organizations such as the Native Plant Society and Audubon Society to provide interpretive walks. UCAC unanimously agrees.** The proposed draft language is provided to staff by Elmer Aldrich.
- ! **Add more history on the Hispanic and American era. UCAC members will send ideas and comments to staff.** The history on Effie Yeaw is already included.
- Those who want the section on Native American history shortened state that they are willing to stand aside and leave the narrative as-is.

### **Carry over issue: Flood Control**

Paul Devereux (American River Flood Control District) explained that the policy and text changes are suggested since some of the old policy language would make it difficult to carry out future flood control work. Policies need to be supportive of the current efforts to obtain 200-year flood protection. Right now, the target flow for flood control is 160,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) for a period of a few days, which is greater than previous flood control releases have been. Emergency flood fighting may at times require rock mooring to make sure the levees can hold. This can be made more aesthetic in the future, but there are some competing values between flood protection and aesthetic values. A committee that included Paul, UCAC members Ron Stork and Al Freitas, and Tim Washburn (SAFCA) developed the new proposed language. The two main changes are to 3.13 and 3.18 to recognize the role of flood control agencies and to allow biotechnical fixes.

## UCAC Discussion Flood Control

- UCAC members expressed concern for proactive management of areas upstream of the levee-confined portion of the Parkway. They stated that they don't want to see large property losses due to flood erosion, nor do they like seeing emergency bank armoring with rock. Staff responded that in an emergency you do what you have to do to protect life and property, and there needs to be appropriate mitigation. Local flood control agencies have been doing proactive bank protection work and erosion protection projects that protect the levees, along with recreational areas. However, due to cost, it can be hard to get State and Federal partners.
- Tim Washburn (SAFCA) clarified that no one taking responsibility for resources of the levee other than flood control agencies. In policy 3.16 we have the principle to proactively protect levees and other resources – it says shall.
- Who's responsible? Staff response: The Plan.
- Should 3.14 be made clearer? I'm talking about privately installed steps or gardens down by the river. **3.14 add "public facilities and private encroachments"**.
- ! I want to commend the flood control agency for the clarification of allowable recreation activities on the levee under policy 3.13.
- Clarification: policy 3.18 is included to prevent a lawsuit against a flood control agency for doing what is needed during an emergency.
- ! **3.13 – put the verb together "should be"**.
- Who polices private encroachments? Staff response: People who live adjacent to levees can build things like stairs. There is a permitting process through the Bureau of Reclamation. The flood control district is now taking a fairly strong position on not allowing new encroachments.
- Do people get cited for encroachment violations? Staff response: A cease and desist order is issued until permits are obtained.
- Is this on the land side of the levee? Staff response: Yes. We don't permit anything on the water side.
- ! Page 12. We need a policy that includes public safety because we nearly killed someone fishing when water suddenly started rising. There is an alarm system. Releases are usually done at night when people generally aren't on the river, except for the homeless. Flood control releases should be consistent with public safety. **Staff will add "and public safety" under second bullet on pg 12.**
- What is a multi-use buffer? Staff response: It is space on the land side of the levee. It could be part of a berm or publicly owned space used for maintenance, recreation or other public uses.

## Public comment

- The Department of Water Resources has responsibility for the islands in the river, which are critical to wildlife habitat. I've worked with them when they wanted to remove vegetation along the edges of the islands, which would destroy views and wildlife habitat. I suggested instead that they cut vegetation in a stripe down the middle of the island, which improves flow capacity with less damage to views and habitat.
- 3.10 should explain mitigation, how it's accomplished, and who has authority to do it.

- I'd like to thank everyone for 3.17 – it is well constructed. One question: Are the permits from the County or some other regulatory authority like the Reclamation Board. Tim Washburn (SAFCA) responds: There could be lots of permits from many different agencies.
  - Then who is responsible for making sure this occurs? First, we must know someone is doing something. The Parks Department could be the one to oversee.
- There needs to be some sort of checklist so the County can monitor permitting compliance. I also commend the wording of the paragraph on page 14 related to erosion control.

## UCAC Direction

- I also like that paragraph on erosion on page 14.
- There is nothing in here about animal welfare and safety as related to flood control. Tim Washburn responds: We anticipate that is covered in Chapter 3 and we reference continuous habitat corridors.
- Realistically, there is no way we're going to protect animals when they have to do flood control.
- Are you taking animal habitat into consideration when designing flood control projects? Staff response: Refer to policy 3.10. "Parkway" impacts encompasses impacts to wildlife.
- I would like to propose some mention of wildlife. Policy 3.16 refers to wildlife in relation to erosion control.
- Question to Tim and Paul, would you like to include "vegetation management projects" in 3.10?
- Vegetation management removes vegetation for flood control – an example is pruning.
- Pruning eliminates wildlife habitat.
- ! **We ought to describe the impact on wildlife and why we mitigate. Tim will craft the language to add more information about mitigation. Add sensitivity to wildlife and vegetation management to policy 3.10**

## Carry over issue: Wild and Scenic River Act

Ron Stork, Friends of the River presented an overview (kudos for showing up despite being under the weather!) of the changes needed to make the Parkway Plan the Wild and Scenic River management plan and why this is a good idea. While the Parkway Plan is prepared under the authority of the Urban American River Parkway Preservation Act, it also plays an institutional role as a State and Federal Wild and Scenic River plan. Therefore, it is helpful to have the Parkway Plan explain its own institutional setting. The proposed language offers the essential structure of what needs to be in a Wild and Scenic River management plan (e.g. defining the corridor boundaries and outstandingly remarkable values for which it was designated) and also offers guidance to State and Federal agencies to carry out their responsibilities under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Ron noted that it is arguably challenging to do some of the projects proposed for flood control on Wild and Scenic rivers, and having the Parkway Plan be the Wild and Scenic River management Plan for the lower American River can provide some legal basis for carrying out flood control in the Parkway. For example, the Parkway Plan chapter on flood

control assumes that mitigation will be done. It is important to be descriptive and clear and have the State legislature affirm that our understanding is the same as theirs.

Laura Kaplan (Center for Collaborative Policy) reminded the group that the legal counsel of concerned agencies have not yet reviewed the proposed language. They will need to ensure that the inclusion of this language on the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act does not interfere with Parkway management.

### **UCAC Discussion Wild and Scenic River Act**

- Wild and Scenic defines the river itself plus the immediate environment? Ron responds: Right.
- When we discuss the Parkway, does that include the immediate environment? Ron responds: The boundaries are on page 3 and are the same as those defined by the State Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Projects proposed outside the boundaries of the Parkway have more limited jurisdiction.
- What about bridges? Ron responds: If the bridge does not hit the water, then State and Federal agencies can decide if they want to get involved on bridge siting. It just has to be consistent with the Plan. The Plan is general. We are trying to identify examples of flow charts for decision making that can be included in this section.
- ! Would it be more clear to **title this section Wild and Scenic Act**? Agreed.
- ! There is a **typo on page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph...should say American River, not Parkway River.**
- If the ownership of an in-holding changes, will that affect boundaries? No, they are encompassed within the boundaries.
- Dave Ford has a suggestion on the fisheries language and will send to staff.

### **Public Comment and UCAC Direction**

- Steelhead and salmon are specifically mentioned in this draft language. I would also like to see shad and striped bass included because these are important for fishing. Response: We're citing what was said in 1980. If it was not there originally, we can't add it in.
- ! **This language says there is a "limited" population of bass and other fish, but that is no longer accurate. These fish are now listed as "common." Staff will check to see if this can be changed.**
- On page 1, there is an inconsistency about who is the designated manager. Can we add on to the State description? Ron responds: It's not there because the State manager is ambiguous. The Federal statute is more clear. With limited exceptions, the County is the manager for this river and compliance with the Wild and Scenic Act. It's well recognized that the State Wild and Scenic Act could use some reform to clarify management and this is currently under review. Unfortunately, the State and Federal agencies don't match on this.
- ! State management is complex and may change. How many UCAC members want to have that described more fully? **UCAC agrees to leave this to the discretion of legal review.**

UCAC thanks Ron Stork and applauds his efforts.

## Carry over issue: Implementation Measures (Chapter 11)

Sunny Williams explained that changes since the last meeting are indicated in bold and by comments next to the text.

### UCAC Discussion Implementation Measures

No UCAC comments on page 1 of the revised implementation measures document (dated 4/13/2006). Discussion on Page 2:

- This takes into consideration the entire Parkway right? Yes. It's possible that there are components from the Rancho Cordova meeting that would need to be reflected in here. Those changes can be made as needed.
- 5b on developing a fee and permit schedule for commercial activities– do you think this is something you're going to do? Is this something important for the management of the Parkway? Staff Response: The concern is that there are organizations like Sac Fit operating commercial enterprise on the Parkway and that we are not collecting fees. We've included this because of UCAC comment. We've modified it so it is not specific to any one group. There are equity issues in not capturing fees, for example with commercial fishing. All fees would have to be assessed on individual merits.
- Will it just drive commercial use underground if people are using the Parkway in the way Sac Fit is using the Parkway? Won't they do it on the sly? You will have a hard time telling a guide boat from a recreational fishing boat. Staff response: This is the feasibility issue—we would need to assess if it's feasible to develop a fee system.
- Can we encourage the honor system? Why not benefit the Parkway by being willing to pay a fee to use this resource? Staff response: We tried to draft this to reflect that but enforcement is an issue.

### Public Comment and UCAC Direction Implementation Measures

- ! **3c – suggest that the language read “ecosystems” instead of “natural resources and ecological functions.” UCAC agrees.**
- 3g – Are the dredge tailings described or interpreted at all – are they considered historical? Staff response: They are not currently registered as a historical area but they are highlighted as a cultural resource. They do have some value and people are in the process of assessing the historical significance and which areas need to be preserved for historic purposes. This issue was raised in 2004 during the RCMP: Should they be restored, given a different land use designation, and how do we make that determination? There was never a recommendation so it is inserted here based on your discussion.
  - The city of Rancho Cordova is recommending restoration and interpretation of some tailings at Rossmoor Bar. They did not recommend a size but I think 20 or 30 acres would be most appropriate because the tailings are not altered yet.
  - If tailings are next to the river, then would that bar people from fishing? Staff response: No. Fishing is consistent with Parkway policies.
- ! **Change 3g wording to “other uses consistent with Parkway policies.”**

- I hope the UCAC will support that language. There is real concern about touching these tailings. There is a lot of habitat provided by these. UCAC agrees.
- We may in the future find these tailings to be a very valuable resource. The bottom of the river is being scoured out and gravel washed downstream. The tailings may improve aquatic habitat. Staff response: This measure would not prohibit the use of some tailings for in-stream uses.
- From a geological and historical standpoint, the tailings are manmade and not a natural habitat. We should preserve some tailings as an example of a thing NOT to do, and restore the rest of it.
- ! **On page 3, #4 add “native” before vegetation. Reword so it doesn’t sound like you’re irrigating the bluffs. UCAC unanimously agree. Staff will reword**
- ! **6c on page 4 may be a good Parkway-wide policy. Staff will propose back to UCAC.**
- ! **6b - Event organizers need to promote bike parking otherwise people won’t ride bikes. Staff will revise the wording of 6c to require promotion of bicycle parking.**

**Meeting adjourned 9:18 pm**

**Action Items and Follow-Up**

Who	What	When
Staff/consultants	Revise documents to reflect UCAC direction with exclamation point bullets, and other comments as appropriate.	
UCAC	Follow up discussions with staff as noted, send historical information that you’d like to see included in the narrative on interpretive resources.	
Facilitator	Add to the Outstanding Issues Memo that there was UCAC disagreement on whether the Parkway Plan should give guidance or stay silent on motor vehicle bridges	
Staff/consultants	Add discussion of Outstanding Issues Memo to future agenda.	TBD

**Handouts/Materials**

Agenda

UCAC Carry-Over Topics dated 4/11/2006

Memorandum Re: Parkway Plan Policy on Bridges Across the American River dated 4/13/2006

UCAC member Al Freitas’ suggested bridge policy revisions dated April 17, 2006

Outstanding Issues Memo and cover letter dated April 11, 2006

Chapter 11 Implementation Measures dated 4/13/2006

**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
	Bob	Horowitz	Sacramento Area Mountain Biking Association (SAMBA)
	Eric	Johnson	Dist 1 - Supervisor Dickinson Appointment
	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)
	Art	White	Sacramento County Recreation and Parks Commission: ex-officio
	Melinda	Williams	Sacramento City Appointments

**Others**

Lee Frachette, Cordova Parks and Recreation District  
 Tim Washburn, SAFCA  
 Teresa Haenggi, Sacramento City Parks  
 Steve Launey, CalExpo  
 Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova  
 Ron Suter, Sacramento County Parks

Betsy Weiland	Patty Kleinknecht
Bert Hodges	Shiela Halousek
Elhmer Aldrich	Chuck Bucaria
Bill Griffith	Jackie Kuwarth

**Project Staff**

Leighann Moffitt, 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