

MEETING REPORT

CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURAL CENTER AND MUSEUM (CALIFORNIA INDIAN HERITAGE CENTER)

TASK FORCE MEETING

September 30 and October 1, 2004

PUBLIC MEETING

Library and Courts Building
914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Thursday, September 30, 2004

Task Force Members and Designees present: Loren Bommelyn, Gen Denton, Karen Edson, Walter Gray, Cindy La Marr, Bill Mungary, Larry Myers, and Dave Widell

DPR Staff Present: Maria Baranowski, Leo Carpenter, Jr., Cuauhtémoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux, Paulette Hennum, Warren Westrup

CALL MEETING TO ORDER—La Marr

Meeting called to order at 9:00 am. Bommelyn gave an opening blessing. Task Force members introduced themselves.

APPROVAL OF MEETING REPORT FROM PREVIOUS MEETING—La Marr

Approval of the Meeting Report from April 2, 2004 was tabled until the next day to allow time for review.

REVIEW AGENDA

At Myers request, the Task Force agreed to add Lee Davis to the agenda to talk about the 1991 Study.

REPORT ON GRAND OPENING OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN—Bommelyn

Bommelyn reported that he was pleased at how many people attended this momentous occasion. He noted a lack of historical perspective in the exhibits. La Marr noted that her experience was different than Bommelyn's but that she

was also pleased with the opening. Staff members Carpenter and Gonzalez also attended the opening on behalf of the project.

UPDATES

1. Governance Subcommittee

Gray reported that two meetings were held in July to discuss how to create a composite organization where the needs of both the State and California Indians could be met. He hopes to bring more information to the next meeting. Later a suggestion was made to invite Lee Davis to attend the Subcommittee on Governance.

2. New Task Force appointments

Gray reported that Karen Edson had just been designated to represent the State Librarian. The DPR-appointed position is still vacant; a recommendation has been submitted to the Director.

3. Funding

The California Cultural and Historical Endowment will award \$162 million from Proposition 40 in grants in four award cycles. Gray advised waiting to apply until after the first cycle. The second round is in January or February, 2005 is intended for development projects. Fall 2005 and 2006 will be the next two cycles, \$35 million each. Fall 2005 should be the target date to apply.

Gray thanked the State Railroad Museum Foundation and the Golden State Public Benefit Corporation for their donations to fund the meeting.

4. California Performance Review (CPR)

CPR concluded that the State should consolidate cultural agencies under one organization.

PRESENTATION BY SUBCOMMITTEE on SITE SELECTION—Myers

Myers and Mungary worked with DPR staff (Grenbeaux, Baranowski, Westrup, and Gonzalez) to analyze the three sites prior to this meeting.

1. Summary of staff work- Grenbeaux reviewed some of the questions raised at the last TF meeting about the proposed sites, and described what staff and the members of the Subcommittee on Site Selection did to get answers. Most of the information is captured in the informational binders provided to the Task Force members before this meeting.

2. Comments on Sites—Lee Davis

Davis worked on the 1991 Study pertaining to this project. After reading the information provided the Task Force and touring the three proposed sites, she

shared her thoughts about the suitability of the sites based on principles identified through public process and professional analysis.

In 1991-92, the biggest issue was the acquisition of the site. Davis observed that a centrally-located institution like the Northgate site would get support from the general public as well as the California Indian community. The Capital is a neutral area for tribes. Northgate would draw the most school kids.

She believes that the Folsom site does not have enough land for the outside programs. The timing of the project should not be rushed. The main concern should be getting something that serves California Indians, and to have native people use the space and feel comfortable to come to this location not just to see exhibits. Folsom wasn't the first choice in 1991, nor is it in the center of a city.

Political alliances are key to fundraising success. The political arena at Freeport is not clear. At the Northgate site people have strong feelings which will make them strong allies. Folsom alliances haven't been too strong.

Financial sustainability is important to the Center's success. If it is located at Northgate it will be within the Sacramento museum district. It is the perfect place to acknowledge of California Indian history. This would be a statement and a symbol to all.

Davis said that she would recommend differently now (than in 91/92) about collections storage because of the burden curatorial costs put on the maintenance budget. The collection can be taken care of elsewhere and then showcased at the Center. It will an actual living museum.

3. PRESENTATION ON ACQUISITION AND DUE DILIGENCE—Westrup

Construction of the California Indian Heritage Center on each of the sites is possible.

The simplest site to acquire is Folsom because it is already held in fee title by DPR. The Northgate site would be the most challenging because of the multiple property owners and public entities involved. SAFCA has embraced the project which is important. The Sacramento Regional Sanitation District says they'll talk with DPR about the Freeport site. It may be possible to do a land exchange or a long term lease.

Westrup suggested that the Task Force pick one site and a time frame to see if it will work. He also suggested choosing a second-choice alternate site.

LUNCH

RECONVENE- 12:50 PM

4. REPORT BY MARKET VALUE PLANNERS—Ed Chase

Chase summarized his written report and rated the sites based on a scoring system he created. He recommended the Northgate site as the most suitable. He noted none of the sites was perfect.

5. SITE CHARACTERISTICS—Gonzalez

Gonzalez made a PowerPoint presentation showing the general characteristics of each site and the area around it.

6. FLOOD AND RIVER ISSUES IN THE SACRAMENTO AREA—Tim Washburn

Tim Washburn of the Sacramento Area Flood Control agency (SAFCA) summarized the history of flood control in the Sacramento area, the risks of flooding, and the regulatory challenges of building in a river corridor.

7. DECISION MAKING PROCESS—Myers

The Task Force decided to determine their site preferences by voting, and all present agreed that they would support the majority vote.

8. POTOWAT HEALTH VILLAGE

A videotape about the Potowat Health Village in Arcata was shown to all present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pat Tedesco supported the idea of locating next to the river to show the different seasonal uses, and how people and the river can live in harmony.

ADJOURN—

La Marr adjourned the meeting at 4:25 pm. She said the meeting would reconvene in the morning at 8:30 am.

Friday, October 1, 2004

Task Force Members and Designees present- Loren Bommelyn, Gen Denton, Karen Edson, Walter Gray, Cindy La Marr, Bill Mungary, Larry Myers, and Dave Widell

DPR Staff Present: Maria Baranowski, Leo Carpenter, Jr., Cuauhtémoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux, Paulette Hennem, Tara Lynch, Jim Michaels, Scott Nakaji

CALL TO ORDER—La Marr

La Marr called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and blessing was given by Denton.

UPDATES

1. Lynch reported that the name of the Task Force will change from the California Indian Cultural Center and Museum Task Force to the California Indian Heritage Center Task Force on January 1, 2005 due to Senate Bill 1264.
2. Hennem reported on the progress of NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) related issues.
3. La Marr reported that Senate Bill 18, the Sacred Sites bill, was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger on September 30, 2004.

KEY ISSUES—Myers

1. Folsom- Will the site be large enough?

Members discussed the size of the property, constraints existing uses might have on outdoor programming, ability to camp on the site for special events, safety outside the flood plain, possible attendance at this site, the distance from downtown Sacramento, and the kinds of partnerships that could be built.

Joe Luchi, Economic Development Coordinator for the City of Folsom, said that the California Indian Heritage Center would be the main attraction for the City of Folsom, and would be a wonderful entrance feature to the city. This project would be good for a city that values history and culture, like Folsom.

Jim Michaels, Planner for the Gold Fields District (DPR), talked about how state land is not under the jurisdiction of the city but they would work with the city to be good neighbors. Local stakeholders usually comment on things like view shed and open space.

Scott Nakaji, Acting Gold Fields District Superintendent, said that overall his District is very supportive of the project.

2. Northgate- Will the intensity of the public planning process be worth the effort? Members discussed support from the City of Sacramento possible opposition by organizations such as Save the American River Association (SARA) and the relationship of CIHC with the water and the spirit of the place.

Bob Overstreet, Parks Director, City of Sacramento, said that the Mayor is highly enthusiastic about the project and will help in whatever way she can. Sacramento is currently engaged in plans to begin reconnecting its identity with the two rivers. He said that the hydrology of the site could be mitigated and thought they should focus on how many people the CIHC would reach and the desired sense of place. He urged the Task Force to stay in the public planning process because participating would be worth the time.

Ron Suter, Sacramento County Regional Parks Director, stated that the County manages the parkway from Hazel Avenue to the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers. He and the County Parks Commission felt that it is premature to choose a preferred site and that the County Parks Commission and the County Board of Supervisors should have been asked to participate in this process.

LUNCH

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSION- CONTINUED—Myers

3. Freeport- Is it worth the time to work on such an undeveloped site? The Task Force discussed the sense of place at the site, the lack of development on and around the property, the concern of flooding from the south, inclusion in the wildlife refuge, and the annexation of areas around the site.

Bob Overstreet, Parks Director, City of Sacramento, urged the Task Force to keep this site in mind, perhaps as a backup to the Northgate site. The site is not located within the annexation area of the village of Freeport. Necessary infrastructure would be the largest issue to handle at this site.

Brian Young, Bufferlands Manager, Sacramento Regional Sanitation District (SRSD), stated that as of this time the boards of the SRSD and the Sacramento County Sanitation District have not received any information about the CIHC project. The focus of the Buffer lands is conservation. An additional issue for this site is the conversion of the site from farm land to an alternate use.

Tom Harvey, Director of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, expressed a willingness to explore possibilities. There is still not a lot of information about the project. He said that the Refuge is concerned with habitat. He thought that the

Task Force should look into locating the CIHC north of the Buffer lands because it does not flood and it is private property.

SUMMARY—Myers

Myers reminded the Task Force members that they decided to vote and majority rules and all Task Force members would support the final decision.

OLD BUSINESS—La Marr

Meeting Report approved (April 2, 2004) with amendments.

M/S Bommelyn/Denton.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Frank Cirill, President Emeritus of the Save the American River Association (SARA), spoke about his organization's concern with development within the American River Parkway. (SARA submitted a letter to the Task Force prior to the meeting.)

Robert Waste, President, Gold Rush Park Foundation, supported the Northgate site as the best location and stated that the time invested in the public planning process was well worth the effort.

SELECTION OF PREFERRED SITE—Myers

Individual members expressed their concerns and preferences. The group voted 5 to 3 for the Northgate site as the preferred site. The group then voted 5 to 3 for the Folsom site as the second-choice alternate to Northgate.

DPR staff will now work with the American River Parkway Update Plan and see if the project can work in the American River Parkway. Progress will be evaluated in six to nine months and, if the first choice site is not working, DPR will move to the second choice site, Lake Natoma Bluff.

The next Task Force meeting was set for November 18-19, 2004

ADJOURN—

La Marr adjourned the meeting at 3:10pm.