

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

Meeting Highlights—April 4, 2006

Key Outcomes

- UCAC members and the public provided feedback for revising the Parkway Plan adoption process and funding policies included in Chapter 11: Implementation. **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 of Chapter 11.**
- UCAC members will email comments about implementation measures to staff and discuss at a future meeting.

Decision Items for April 17, 2006 meeting 5:30-9 PM at the Library Galleria, 828 I St. in Sacramento

The UCAC will discuss carry-over topics from previous chapters:

- The ARPP's relationship to Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (from Chapter 1)
- Interpretive Resources of the Parkway (from Chapter 3)
- Flood Control Policies (from Chapter 4)
- Overnight Camping (from Chapter 5 and 7);
- Bridges (from Chapter 8); and
- Implementation Measures (from Chapter 11).

Welcome and Announcements

Sunny Williams (County Planning) welcomed meeting attendees and provided a reminder of the upcoming Rancho Cordova Public Workshop: April 10, 6:30 pm at Rancho Cordova City Hall.

Two alternates participated in place of regular UCAC members: Michael Picker for Greg Speicher and Wendy Sturges for Katie Baygell.

Brief overview of Parkway Plan adoption process: State and local level adoption
(Found in the introduction to Chapter 10 and in Chapter 11 Policies 11.1-11.8, pages 1 and 7-9. Draft dated 3/30/2006)

Leighann Moffitt provided an overview of the Parkway Plan adoption process as described in the draft Chapter 11 dated 3/30/2006. Leighann explained that the 1985 Plan did not anticipate State legislative adoption, so the text of the 1985 Plan does not clearly outline how the Legislature is involved in approving changes to the Parkway Plan. To date, the State legislature has been consulted on only three items: to permit in-line skating and the removal of two developed areas from the Parkway.

Staff and the Project Management Team (PMT) have proposed new policies to clarify the adoption process. These policies would require State adoption for changes in land use designations and Parkway-wide policies, and allow a local adoption process by the Parkway Manager (which has been the County Board of Supervisors since the inception of the Parkway), for changes to area plan maps and area plan specific policies, provided that these changes are consistent with the Parkway-wide goals and policies. Leighann described that this is consistent with current practice, where it is impractical for the County to go to the State every time it wants to install a facility that is consistent with the underlying land use designation, such as a porta-potty. Currently, Parks is clearly authorized to operate the Parkway as long as that management is consistent with Parkway-wide policies and land use designations.

Policy 11.6 reflects these changes. Policy 11.5 maintains the status quo with the County Board of Supervisors approving local-level area plan changes. 11.9 was added to include reference to a single management entity and deliberately left broad to allow for that to change in the future. Figure 11-1 on page 8 of the draft Chapter 11 provides a graphic of the adoption process that shows what parts of the plan are adopted at the State level and what are adopted at the local level. Text that further describes this policy appears on page 9 under “Area Plans.”

As stated in a recent memo to the UCAC, governance issues regarding future management of the Parkway and the role of other jurisdictions are currently underway among agency staff and elected officials. Making specific recommendations on governance is not part of the scope of work for this Update process. UCAC member comments regarding governance can, however, be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors.

Clarifying Questions about Proposed Changes

- What happens in areas where there is joint management responsibility but they aren't giving us guidance? For example, State Parks is two years late on the preferred alternative for Lake Natoma. Staff response: State Parks is updating their general plan and we're trying to determine what language can be incorporated into this Parkway Plan Update. We need to update the Parkway Plan as best we can given the information we have. We're trying to make the Lake Natoma portion consistent with proposed changes to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan. Refer also to page 5 of the draft Chapter 11, which describes the jurisdiction and responsibility of State Parks. This section hasn't changed.
- Who is the manager in the Lake Natoma area? Staff Response: The State administers this portion. That hasn't changed in this Update.

UCAC Discussion: State and local adoption processes (Policies 11.3, 11.5, 11.6, 11.9, 11.10)

- What does the State approve? Will they only see the first couple of chapters of the Plan? Staff Response: They will see the whole package but what they have authority over is land use designations and Parkway-wide policies. We would retain local authority over the area plans.

- What happens if there is an appeal process? For example, when State Parks wanted to build a parking lot, the Board of Supervisors approved it. Then it went to the State legislature who defeated it. Do these new policies mean there would be no avenue to take it to the State legislature? Staff Response: It would depend if you could argue that the change was inconsistent with land use designation or Parkway-wide policies. In the case of that parking lot, it was not consistent, therefore there was an appeal to the State.
- What about the idea that there might be some successor organization or Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that manages the Parkway? Currently, decisions are made by the County Board of Supervisors. In the future the cities might make those decisions, and I've also heard people talk about the possibility that there would be a JPA separate from the County. Should we allow for that now or would we have to go back to the State legislature? Facilitator response: Discussions about future governance are going on at a highly political level. This is not something that staff can draft into the Update at this time, since the future is unknown. With the current draft language, staff have tried to make the plan as flexible as possible without changing the status quo. For example, the language which talks about a "single authority" may allow for a JPA.
- A UCAC member proposed that policy 11.9 specifically name County Parks as the single management entity. Other members discussed that the reality is that there are other jurisdictions, such as State Parks and other agencies as determined by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act who have some management responsibilities in the Parkway. There is also some federally owned and managed land in the Parkway. Members discussed that County Parks might want to designate some management responsibilities to other entities, and conversely, Cal Expo is an example where another agency owns the land but the County manages it by agreement. Some members recommended that the Plan should describe this complex current reality.
- Currently, County Parks rangers patrol downstream from Hazel Avenue while State rangers patrol upstream. However, State patrols have been in the Nimbus flat area. We should clarify this in the Plan because people need to know where to report incidents— the State ranger or County.
- Members clarified that they were concerned that if the State acquires some land in the Parkway, such as the Uruttia property, they would then be the managers of it and this could undermine the ability to manage the Parkway in a consistent manner. Staff clarified that policy 11.10 was added in order to ensure that all lands acquired into the Parkway would be managed in a manner consistent with the Parkway Plan, and that page 2 of the draft explains that County Parks has primary management responsibility.

Public Comment 11.9

- I strongly support that 11.9 is needed and I agree that the County should be named.
- I agree too and the reason is to ensure consistent day-to-day operations. If a flood control situation arises, County Parks needs to know about it, but someone else has authority. The way it's worded describes the general day-to-day maintenance.
- We've been doing it this way for years and I recommend retaining it the way it is.

UCAC Discussion 11.9

- Could we hear from County Parks? Ron Suter (Director, County Parks) clarified that County Parks believes there should be one manager of the Parkway, but that Parks has no position on whether the Parkway Plan should specifically name the County as that single management entity.
- I am also supportive of a single management agency and I too think it should be County Parks. If it gets changed later, than so be it. I also think we should footnote those instances where County Parks is not managing.
- This is the prerogative of the Board of Supervisors. If you get too specific, they would have to go to the State to get changes if they reorganize. There are critics of how the Parkway has been managed and I'm one of them, but I think its bad legislative crafting to get that specific. I think we should let the Board designate who the manager is.

Laura called for a straw poll on the following question: Do you agree there should be a single management entity? Results: There was no UCAC opposition to the idea that there should be a single management entity.

- Members discussed the idea of adding a “footnote” to document the exceptions where currently someone other than Parks is the manager. The exceptions are that State Parks lands in the Parkway are managed by State and Federal land owned by the Bureau of Reclamation is managed by them. Private parcels are managed by their owners, who must obey the zoning codes for their parcel. Nimbus Flat directly below Hazel is one area in the County that the State park rangers lease. There are 400 acres in the Cal Expo floodplain that is State of CA owned and patrolled by County Parks through an administrative lease. The State Department of Fish and Game sets hours of operation and manages the Nimbus Fish Hatchery.
- Tim Washburn (SAFCA) suggested that to the extent the County owns the land it “shall” be managed by the single management entity. If someone else owns the land, the Plan can say that the Parkway manager “should” attempt to reach agreements to manage the land.
- I prefer a more precise suggestion. We continue to say that there is a single County-wide manager with asterisks to describe the current circumstances in which there are other managers and state a policy preference that the County tries to work out an arrangement so that it becomes the manager of these other areas. And, if it can't do that, then the County ensures that the area plans are consistent with the Parkway.
- Bob Overstreet (Sac City Parks): It seems there are two related but separate issues. One is governance. The other is consistency of management. They aren't necessarily the same. Agree that whoever manages should do so consistent with the Plan. This is a different question than how many agencies manage the Plan.
- The group discussed the issue of private property in the Parkway and acknowledged that they can't tell private property owners how to manage their lands. Brian May (Cal Expo) clarified that Cal Expo has the right to manage its own property consistent with the Parkway Plan and the Bushy Lake Preservation Act.

Laura called for a straw poll on the question of specifically naming the County of Sacramento as the single management entity. Results of straw poll: 10 want to name the County as the single management entity, which is not a consensus.

- I have doubts about the financial capacity of Sacramento County to deal with this project. It's not an indictment of County Parks – 95% of the County budget is federal money focused on social and health services. Very little is focused on local. In terms of public policy, we ought to be looking at a JPA.
- Laura asks staff for clarification: If the County is named now as the manager, would the Plan have to go to the State for approval in order to change the management entity designated in the Plan? Response: This is a legal question we shouldn't try to answer here. The County could say JPA, City of Sacramento, whoever, you are now the manager of the Parkway. This is an attorney question for County Counsel.

UCAC Direction 11.9

- ! **The UCAC agrees by consensus that the policy should be: 1. A single manager, 2. the addition of an asterisks to describe other managers, 3. the establishment of a policy preference that a single manager should try to work out management agreements and if not a single management entity, that all Parkway land is consistently managed.**
- ! **Leave to County discretion whether or not to name County Parks as the single entity in 11.9.**

UCAC Discussion on Policy 11.10

- Policy 11.10 should be more specific. Instead of regulating acquisition, regulate the parcel instead. I just want to be sure this is clear that it's a single Parkway management entity and that there isn't room for other entities to take over if someone buys a parcel.
- ! **Suggestion to say “Newly acquired Parkway lands shall be managed in a manner consistent with this Parkway Plan.” UCAC agrees that this is better wording and staff will make the change.**
- A member of the public suggested that 11.10 should refer to 11.9 to explicitly connect the idea of a single management entity with the management of new lands. UCAC members and staff discussed that the policies in the Plan are all related and don't need to repeat each other. Members agreed it was not necessary to repeat “single management entity” in 11.10.

UCAC Discussion on Policy 11.3

- I am concerned that Policy 11.3 will be a deterrent to new projects because it says a proposal can't proceed to the contract drawing stage until after the proposal has been approved. It reminds me of what has happened with the California Indian Heritage Center (CHIC). We're saying we're not comfortable because we haven't seen a drawing. They're saying they don't want to spend money to develop plans if they don't know if the project will be approved. Seems like we're putting a catch-22 into policy. Staff Response: Page 10 defines contract drawings, which are used to go to bid and are more specific than a schematic. 11.3 is existing language and we just tried to clarify that it has to be consistent with area plans and the adoption process.

- I'm trying to understand the normal County process when someone comes forward with a project outside of the Parkway. How does it compare? Is this more restrictive? How is it different? Staff Response: It is different but is regulated through zoning codes, which are more specific.
- I don't think anyone is going to go past schematic and spend an enormous amount of money unless they know they can go forward.
- In the past, we asked for that with the CHIC.
- ! **Staff will clarify what kind of specificity of schematic / drawing / planning is required in order to approve a project proposal in accordance with the Plan. UCAC member Bob Horowitz offered to work with staff on this.**

UCAC Direction

- ! **Ensure description on page 10 is accurate.**
- ! **Rewrite policy 11.3 to describe the level of detail needed to determine consistency with area plans.**
- ! **Melinda Williams will work with staff on items that should be policy from the narrative introduction to Chapter 10.**

Brief overview of policies on funding (Chapter 11, policies 11.4, 11.11-11.14, narrative pages 16-18)

Gary Kukkola (County Parks) provided background and an overview of changes to funding policies. He noted that Parkway funding is heavily dependent on General Fund subsidies and acknowledged the historic unpredictability of funding. In the last few years, funding has stabilized and some services have been restored. He referenced a 2000 report completed by the Dangermond consulting firm that identified unmet needs and best practices for the Parkway. In 2000, the Parkway operating budget was about \$4 million with about 67% coming from the County General Fund, approximately \$1.5 million short what would be needed to support the best practices standard identified in the Dangermond report. The cost of land acquisition at that time was \$17 million. There is no guarantee that General Fund support will ever reach needed levels, therefore the County and other jurisdictions need to collaborate and work together to identify additional funding. He also explained a proposed change submitted by a UCAC member to policy 11.4 that would add the words "and enforce proper use."

Clarifying questions

- Is there a possibility that the Parks Department may consider seeking the advice of a different financial consultant? I think it would be beneficial to get another point of view. Staff Response: That's always a possibility but we are pretty far along in using the Dangermond group.
- What's the other 33% of funding? Staff Response: Parking revenues, TOT tax and other funding sources at the time the report was compiled. We don't have that information for the current fiscal year.
- Where does something like the commercial rafting operation fit? Staff response: If that is successful, there are opportunities for revenues for the Parkway, for example, a percentage of concessions or parking revenue from parking inside the Parkway. There are

revenues associated along with additional impacts. Whether they balance out remains to be seen.

- ! I am concerned that the desire to raise funds through parking fees conflicts with the desire to have people walk or bike to the Parkway. I would like this issue of conflicts of interest in raising funds addressed and am not sure how to include this. The community needs to be able to have a thorough debate. **Staff will work with UCAC member Lea Brooks to ensure that the policies on funding do not encourage adding parking lots for the sake of raising funds.**

UCAC Discussion: Funding policies 11.11

- ! Regarding “best practices” – there is nothing in the narrative to further explain what that means. Does this conflict with anything in the policy document? For example, some flood control “best practices” might not be consistent with the Parkway. Staff Response: I don’t think there is a conflict here. I think we can clarify and expand the narrative without redoing the whole Dangermond report. **Staff will better define “best practices” in the narrative and ensure these are not in conflict with other policies in the Plan. Melinda Williams will work with staff on this.**
- “Shall work cooperatively” has no assignment of responsibility. None of the policies mean a whole lot unless there is the funding to do it. The County budget fluctuates with income and sales tax and the Parkway is a low priority. I think we should be more directive and say the County should seek a dedicated source of funding for the Parkway.
- I suggest that 11.11 state a “dedicated source of funding.” Staff Response: The County and other jurisdictions are supportive of this.
- Dedicated means that there is a consistent source of funds without fluctuation. We need to be explicit that this needs dedicated funding that is specific to this purpose.
- 11.11 should use “shall.”
- All UCAC members present support replacing language in 11.11 to: “The County shall seek a dedicated source of funding.”
- I think the part about working cooperatively should remain. Why let the cities and others off the hook?
- I’m confused why the County is “shall” when we didn’t want to make them manager?
- Staff comment: We need to ensure collaboration for projects beyond dedicated source of funding. It’s not collaborative only in the sense of dedicated funding but collaborative in the accomplishment of things that wouldn’t be done otherwise. If it weren’t for SAFCA’s cooperative spirit, some things would never be accomplished.

Public Comment

- Working cooperatively should be included.

UCAC Direction 11.11

- ! The UCAC agreed to the following general principle, to be written into the policy by staff: The County shall seek dedicated source of funding in cooperation with other jurisdictions. The principle of working collaboratively to fund additional projects, as exemplified by SAFCA’s restoration work in the Parkway, should also be encouraged.

UCAC Discussion 11.12

- Why did you change the language? Staff Response: It's a grammatical change because "in-kind services" generally don't mean money.
- ! **Can you just strike "supplemental?"** Staff Response: **Yes. UCAC agrees to this change.**

UCAC Discussion 11.13

- I don't think you can enforce this policy if it comes down to decisions between parks and the fire department or Sheriff, for example. The County will distribute General Fund moneys as it sees fit. **UCAC agrees to change the word "shall" to "should".**

UCAC Discussion 11.14

- In Section G of the *Urban American River Parkway Preservation Act*, the State of CA provides recognition and specifies certain funding sources that are available to the Parkway. These are not spelled out in the policy.
- I'm not sure I'm understanding this all correctly. Would it work to eliminate 11.14 and add to 11.12 "and/or State of CA" after support organizations? Staff Response: I understand what you're suggesting. It's a little vague as is. Combined with 11.12, it would probably accomplish the same purpose.
- Is there a reason to have it separate? Staff Response: The policy was originally intended to direct through that Act, three sources of funding that we can apply for. There are other grants we can continue to apply for that are not included in the Act. The State is a venue in which we can seek funding. This is truncated and the intent was to expand options. I'm not sure if we lose anything by combining.
- The intent for 11.14 is to bring forth the funding sources available through the Act. Perhaps we should amend to name the Act as well as other State funding. We obviously don't want to limit ourselves.
- The Act reminds the legislature of its own priorities.
- I'm wondering who's seeking funding and what about Federal sources of funding?
- Yes, why limit to the State?
- Just say go find more money.
- A UCAC member suggested that the policies should specify that one-time grants should not be used for O&M, but rather for capital improvements and acquisitions. This member felt it was not good policy to rely on unstable infusions of money for O&M, but withdrew the suggestion when Ron Suter (County Parks) responded that in the last 10 years, there have been a lot of one-time grants and supplemental allocations by the BOS used for O&M, and that the County would not want to be restricted in how it manages its money as determined by the BOS.

Public comment:

- A lot of funds that come through the State are Federal, so this should be added.

UCAC Direction

- ! **Seek additional funding as provided for in the Urban American River Parkway Preservation Act and other State and Federal sources. Staff will work on language.**

UCAC Discussion 11.4

Laura explained that there was a proposed change to 11.4 by UCAC member Katie Baygell, who could not attend the meeting. The staff draft policy states that new facilities shall not be developed unless the financial resources to maintain them are identified. Katie proposed adding funds should be available not only to develop, but also to enforce proper use.

- Why would you call it enforcement instead of operations and maintenance?
- Is this requirement for advance identification of funding consistent with all facilities that go up in the Parkway? On paper this sounds good but sometimes we need one time grants. It seems like this doesn't work in real life. And I'd like to not support the suggestion. Is 11.4 consistent with current reality? Ron Suter (County Parks) replied: The Board requires that we identify funding for any facility or program development. I have not yet suggested facilities that didn't have funding attached.
- It's obvious if you're putting in a new bathroom and don't have funds to clean it then why bother. A boat ramp is different. Maintenance is something that has to be actively maintained versus something that needs to be replaced in 20 years. A new road wouldn't be rebuilt in two years. Ron Suter replied: You're right. We need to identify the need, how to pay for it and maintain it. This wording is consistent with what I'm told by policymakers.
- How far out do you have to maintain something? What does "developed" mean? I think what you mean is that it should not be constructed. Staff Response: Depends on the project. For example, a one year program at the nature center needs funding for 1 year. A bike trail should have money set aside every 4-5 years so we can take care of it.
- 11.4 seems inconsistent with current practice despite the explanation. In the implementation plan, 6c on off-paved-trail cycling, to my knowledge is the only recreation use in the Parkway that requires its own funding. If you require funding for a specific recreational use, can that be co-mingled with other funds? How can this be implemented? I think there's no way you'll be able to acquire funds for this use. Ron Suter: It was determined way back that we must identify funds for new uses before going forward with a new program. Someone could write a check or the Board could allocate funds for a new program.
- What about co-mingling? Does it have to be specific? Ron Suter: Yes, it must be specific. If I haven't identified the funds, then the Board could identify funds.
- Future funds are inherently speculative. I think this basically means no new facilities unless there is a dedicated source of revenue. The US Congress is not appropriating money dedicated to specific purposes. I suggest that it say "should" instead of "shall" unless financial resources can "reasonably" be identified rather than in such an absolute fashion.
- Would changing "shall" to "should" pass muster with the BOS? Ron Suter: No. But understand, I don't have to identify new money. I evaluate programs every year. I may take money from a trail that hasn't been used in 20 yrs and use it in a new way – you can develop new programs and facilities with existing money.
- I see this as an absolutist policy that hamstrings what can be done in the Parkway. It should be less absolutist.

- I agree. There is nothing here that prevents Parks from meeting a stricter standard. Ron Suter: I don't believe the Board will go for "reasonable."
- In my world, working with state government, a reasonable funding source is one that people can rely on.
- I'm supportive of Ron Suter. In trying to obtain funds for a rugby park, I've seen all the steps. Nothing is allowed to happen until we had the dollars to build it to specifications. We have people who say they'll donate money and a \$1 million grant, but we can't do anything until all the money is there and the money to maintain it for 25 years is in place.
- All 15 UCAC members present indicated that they can live with "shall."
- Clarifying question – does O&M include rangers? Staff Response: It includes everything – maintenance, operation, and enforcement.
- Suggestion: add in "programs" so it reads "new facilities and programs shall not be...unless financial resources to support them." Staff Response: Adding programs is better stated.
- Support assumes that enforcement is included? Staff Response: Yes. We have a mandate to provide safety, maintenance and everything else.

UCAC Direction

- ! **UCAC unanimously agree on new language: New facilities and programs shall not be developed unless the financial resources to operate and maintain them are identified and available.**

Brief overview of implementation measures (Chapter 11)

Sunny Williams (County Planning) provided an overview of Chapter 11 Implementation measures, which replaces the "action plan" from the 1985 Plan. Accomplished actions from the 1985 Plan have been deleted. Actions not yet accomplished and are geographic specific have been moved to Chapter 10: Area Plans. Some changes (for example 2c on page 13) are directly from UCAC discussion. Sunny also explained that 6b contains new language proposed by a UCAC member to clarify meaning, because the earlier draft sounded like bike recycling was occurring in the Parkway. 7e and 9 are completely new, proposed by UCAC members (Eric Johnson and Al Freitas, respectively).

UCAC Discussion: Implementation measures

The group agreed to defer discussion of the implementation measures to a future meeting, rather than extend the meeting past 9 PM. They offered the following comments and agreed upon next steps:

- I want inconsistencies between policies and implementation measures cleaned up.
- Clarifying question: What's the difference between a policy and an implementation measure? Staff Response: Implementation measures are recommended to occur; policies are direction for management.
- Are we recreating what was already done in RCMP? Staff Response: No. The RCMP was never officially adopted by any body. This process is meant to include items from the RCMP.

- ! UCAC members will email comments about big picture items, concerns they can't live with, or additional implementation measures to staff by the end of week. Staff will compile into one document. Staff will review the schedule and add this discussion to a future agenda. Refinements also can occur offline.
- ! Sunny will send the documents with the newly proposed language to UCAC tonight.

Meeting adjourned

Action Items & Follow-Up

Who	What	When
Staff/consultants	Revise Chapter 11 to reflect UCAC direction with exclamation point bullets, and other comments as appropriate.	
UCAC	Follow up discussions with staff as noted.	
Sunny Williams	Email UCAC newly proposed revisions for implementation measures.	4-4-06
UCAC	Email comments on implementation measures to staff.	Friday 4/ 7/06
Staff/facilitators	Add discussion of Chapter 11 Implementation Measures to future agenda.	TBD

Handouts/Materials

- Agendas
- Draft Chapter 10 Intro paragraph
- Draft Chapter 10 Area Plans items from the old Chapter 11 moved into the new Chapter 10, dated 3/29/06
- Draft Chapter 11 dated 3/30/06
- Meeting notes from 3/20/06

Attendance

Members: X=Present, Alt=Alternate present

	Name		Representing
X	Jerry	Ahlin	City of Rancho Cordova Appointment
Wendy Sturges	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)
	Eric	Johnson	Dist 1 - Supervisor Dickinson Appointment
X	Eddie	Kho	Dist 5 - Supervisor Notolli Appointment

	Mark	Murray	Buffalo Chips Running Club
	Ted	Sheedy	Sacramento City Appointments
X	Janel	Silva	Sacramento Area Dog Owners Group (SACDOG)
Michael Picker	Greg	Speicher	Boating
X	Ron	Stork	Friends of the River
	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
X	Melinda	Williams	Sacramento City Appointments

Others

Lee Frchette, Cordova Parks & Recreation District
 Tim Washburn, SAFCA
 Teresa Haenggi, Sacramento City Parks
 Brian May, CalExpo
 Kathleen Franklin, City of Rancho Cordova

J.P. Tindell, Sacramento City Parks
 Bob Overstreet, Sacramento City Parks
 Ron Suter, Sacramento County Parks

Burt Hodges
 Bert Hodges
 Bill Griffith

Patty Kleinknecht
 Elhmer Aldrich
 Rick Bettis

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