

MEETING REPORT

CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURAL CENTER AND MUSEUM
(CALIFORNIA INDIAN HERITAGE CENTER)
TASK FORCE MEETING
April 2, 2004

PUBLIC MEETING

Secretary of State Building
1500 11th Street- Secretary of State Board Room
Sacramento, CA 95814

Task Force Members and Designees present: Loren Bommelyn, Gen Denton, Walter Gray, Susan Hanks (for Charlene Simmons), Cindy La Marr, Bill Mungary, Larry Myers (Absent: Dave Widell)

DPR Staff present: Maria Baranowski, Billie Blue- Elliston, Leo Carpenter, Jr., Paulette Hennem, Cuauhtemoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux, Warren Westrup

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson La Marr called the meeting to order at 8:20 am. Denton gave the opening blessing. Task Force members, DPR staff, and members of the public introduced themselves.

COMMUNITY LIAISONS' REPORT

Carpenter and Gonzalez gave a presentation on their community outreach work in various California Indian communities throughout Northern California. In each community they spoke about the California Indian Heritage Center and they provided an open forum for community members to express their concerns and ideas. The most important topics and concerns were included in the presentation.

Mungary commented that he did not want these communities given any false hope. Carpenter and Gonzalez noted that they are doing what they can to get California Indian people behind this project.

Hennem commented that Carpenter and Gonzalez were going about this process in the right way and that these visits had resulted in collaborative efforts and a series of loans to tribal museums from the state's collection of cultural objects.

The Task Force directed staff to write a letter to the tribes that were visited to thank them for their input.

PRESENTATION ON REGIONAL INDIAN MUSEUM NETWORK

Carpenter gave a presentation on the history the state's five existing Regional Indian Museums. He believes the California Indians would be better served if efforts were directed toward strengthening the Regional Indian Museum network to 12 sites. There was a discussion about the closure of the museum at Lake Perris. Carpenter also made a recommendation for the governance structure of the CIHC. He suggested that two representatives, a man and a woman, from each of the 12 regional museums, serve on the governing board. These representatives would work on raising funds from the tribes.

REPORTS

Gray asked to move the review of annual report to after lunch to give everyone time go over the document.

GOVERNANCE SUB-COMMITTEE: Gray gave the following report:

- was started in January to recommend a governance structure for the California Indian Heritage Center
- has only had one meeting
- different types of governance structures were reviewed
- another meeting will be held in late April or May

FINANCE REPORT: La Marr reported:

- wants to form a Sub-committee to organize fundraisers (i.e. an event in conjunction with the opening of NMAI in Washington, D.C.) and find other sources of funding.
- once the site is announced people will want to get involved
- Gray volunteered to be on sub-committee with La Marr

TASK FORCE UPDATES

TASK FORCE VACANCIES- La Marr noted that two seats on the Task Force have been recently vacated and should be filled as soon as possible.

- The new State Librarian needs to appoint a new designee to replace Charlene Simmons. Susan Hanks, from the California Research Bureau, attended the meeting in Simmons' absence.
- There was discussion regarding the Resource Agency designee who can be more involved in the project.

APPROVAL OF PAST MEETING REPORTS: The following Meeting Reports were approved

- December 8, 2003, Sub-Committee on Foundations
- February 18, 2004, Sub-Committee on Governance
- February 18, 2004, Task Force Meeting Regarding Sites

Tabled for further editing

- January 15-16, 2004, Task Force Meeting.

PRESENTATION OF SITE ANALYSIS

Ed Chase of Market Value Planners gave an overview of the site evaluation process and gave a summary of his Consultant's Report.

Sacramento is a leisure destination. The CIHC would fit into the current trend of "learning vacations." Construction costs would be around \$17 million. About 100 cars can fit on one acre of land. For the Folsom site, a light rail stop will be across the street, but most people will drive. Parking will be difficult because the piece of land is narrow and small. There is already infrastructure in the area and has good access to the highway. It is already a State Parks property. The sites at Stone Lakes are county owned and are of "good" size. There are many potential partnership opportunities with the wildlife refuge. One of the main problems with this site is that it has no direct river access.

LUNCH: 12:20 pm

RECONVENE: 1:20 pm

La Marr had everyone present introduce themselves. Officials from the City of Sacramento, City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) were present to speak about the sites.

REVIEW OF ANNUAL REPORT

A motion was made to add information about the Task Force Sub-committees. Gray moved (Mungary seconded) to adopt the draft report with this addition and submit to the Task Force chairperson for final review before it goes to Senator Brulte.

Unanimous approval

SITE ANALYSIS CONTINUED

Representatives from Stone Lakes: Tom Harvey manager of Stone Lakes for US Fish and Wildlife Service and Dave Paullin.

Currently, Fish and Wildlife is about 1/3 the way to protecting the corridor. SP has land as well as many other organizations. Fish and Wildlife doesn't have total say over Cammray and Correa sites. They do work closely with the lone Band of Miwok Indians and want to work with local tribes and develop ceremonial uses of the refuge and do basket material gathering. This project would be an appropriate use of the land. Would like to work with parks assuming that other people are behind the project and would work to secure funds. Currently, the refuge's highest priority is to protect private land from development and not the acquisition and protection of public land.

Myers wondered if they could be reclaimed like the CalTrans owned parcel of the refuge. Harvey responded that there are great possibilities to develop new wetlands.

Mungary thanked him for being present and wanted to know if there is any reason why the Task Force should not be looking at this property. There was no reason except for the fact that the site is with in the flood plain.

Westrup wondered if this land was a potential acquisition for Fish and Wildlife, if they had money for the land, would they apply for the money to acquire the land, what is the time frame, is it viable, and would it be more valuable if were packaged with a land swap?

Harvey said that it is currently anticipated that this land will be managed land with sanitation district because it is publicly owned. Restoration is already underway and there is no funding. He advised the Task Force to look to private funding sources.

Paullin said a land exchange could be considered, but it wouldn't likely buy the county property.

La Marr asked what the time line was for the funds to be available.

- Appropriations to the Refuge will be available in FY06 and it's just a dollar amount. The refuge could make this a priority but this project is new and it has not really been discussed. Much has been put on the back burner because of lack of support from congress.

Grenbeaux wanted to know what the interpretive goals of the refuge were and in what way they are willing to work with the Heritage Center.

- At this time the refuge is working on its master plan and is also defining uses for visitors. Priority is given to wildlife dependent uses such as hunting and fishing. Interpretation is also an important component for the conservation and protection of cultural resources in addition to the natural resources. One possibility is to interweave the stories of interaction between people and wildlife.

La Marr asked when will the new interchange be put in and was concerned about the smell from the sewage treatment plant across the freeway, as well as about the pesticide carry-over from the nearby crops.

Gray, referring to the interchange, said that he thought that not many people are sure but that it would be several years down the line. The men from Fish and Wildlife also reported that they had had no problems with the smell from the treatment plant in the refuge and that because the land is in the flood plain farmers need to be conscious of pesticide use.

Representatives from Lake Natoma Bluff: Joe Luchi, City of Folsom and Jacqueline Ball, Superintendent, Gold Fields District, DPR.

- a letter of support from the City Planner. The City's goal is that is looking for more Native American representation within the city. The city doesn't have much to offer, but it will support the Task Force in its choice if it chooses the Lake Natoma Bluff. They could look for federal funds.
- the city's "Corporation" yard is not being considered for this project
- a two story building could be done as long as it works with the city. The taller the building the more sensitive it will be, but it's not out of the question.
- the city wants to do more interpretive programs
- at Henkle Creek there are grinding stones under the new bridge and the city would like to build an interpretive center nearby.

Luchi stated that the intersection will have to be built by the city and that it would have to look for the money. Its Public Works Department would have to make a strong commitment and as soon as the city knows that this is definitely a need the city wants. They would then work to secure the money. Luchi estimated that the cost to add the fourth leg to the Iron Point Road intersection would cost \$250,000 and \$1,000,000 to construct a pedestrian over crossing. This could also be added as a destination to the existing trail system in the city.

Mungary was worried about all the other stake holders that use this part of Folsom Lake State Recreation Area. He said that if the Task Force chose this site, it would be a disappointment to find that the center wasn't wanted there in the first place.

Baranowski asked about the potential for offsite parking. Luchi stated that the city has no plans to build any multilevel parking structures but the city has a bus system and could offer use of overflow parking and the bus system for special events.

Ball said that this time this project feels real and is making sure there is a place holder in the new Folsom Lake SRA General Plan for the California Indian Heritage Center.

She said that there has to be a path, as part of the biking infrastructure of the American River Parkway. She anticipates that there could be a huge stakeholder response if one was not left. The park tries to adhere to the American River Parkway Plan.

Baranowski said that it would be hard to disguise that building on the bluff. There may be things that people can do with the land. We should come up with a function with that land with oaks on it. What kind of protection do the trees need?

Ball felt that the area would be overwhelmed if there were to be a building placed on the bluff. She said that there could be some use of Willow Creek, but the Center could not expand into the Willow Creek area without interfering with a popular site.

She said that camping could take place at Beale's Point which is about 8 miles away and the camp ground could be converted to a group camp ground.

Representatives: Heather Fargo, Mayor of Sacramento; Janet Baker, City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation; Mick Klassen, SAFCA; Robert Waste, Gold Rush Park Foundation; Gary Kukkola, Sacramento County Parks; Sonny Williams, Sacramento County Planning Department; Tim Washburn, SAFCA

Mayor Fargo brought copy of the Sacramento City Council resolution to include this project in the city limits. This site at Northgate is a prime location--close to the American River and downtown with its large population. According to Fargo, this project fits in well with the City's plan and future goals.

Baker, Klassen, Waste are supportive of the sites on the lower American River. Waste noted that there is potential to have a light rail stop close to the Northgate site once the new line goes in on Truxel.

Mungary asked if there any projects that have been built on the American River. This project would be the first but the advantage is that it would be removing something that is not a good use.

Williams said that the lower American River has a "wild and scenic rivers designation" and that in order to build the Center on the Northgate property there would have to be some consistency with this designation and the American River Parkway Plan. Currently the Parkway Plan is being updated. The update will take two more years and will be 2007 before the update is adopted.

The property does not flood from the river, but rather the flood water comes from slough on the other side of the property. Northgate Boulevard doesn't flood every year.

The Mayor's concept of the purpose of the Center is: to have California Indians to practice their traditions and to allow others to see this and experience it. She envisioned that there would not really be any over night camping except for ceremonial purposes. She would like to see camping in Discovery Park because there is no camping currently in the County of Sacramento. There would also be exhibits, activities, and interpretation at the Center.

La Marr said that she envisioned a state of the art research center along with a theatre and training facility. It would not be just a "rest stop." She noted that the lead up to building the facility takes a long time and then the building would take a short time.

Gray wondered if there should be any action taken at this point in time.

Myers felt that the staff should go and start talking with the stakeholders and see what they say about locating on the lower American River and see how the Center can work with Friends of the American River, Sierra Club, and similar organizations.

Gray felt that staff should no longer pursue the Bushy Lake site and Sutter's Landing Park and that the Task Force move forward informally to pursue the other three sites.

Gray suggested that staff look at the two sites on American River (Lake Natoma Bluff and the Northgate site) together because of similar agency involvement and then the site off the Sacramento River (Stone Lakes site) by itself. Keep the three for now and then make a better informed decision about which one to recommend later. It is possible to get higher quality answers for the Lake Natoma Bluff quickly as it is already State Parks property. He also suggested that all the Task Force members go out and look at the sites in all weather to really see the suitability of the sites.

ADJOURN: 4:56 pm