

Meeting Report

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

TASK FORCE

January 15th and 16th, 2004

State Museum Resource Center – Art Space
2400 Port Street, West Sacramento, CA 95691

January 15, 2004

Task Force Members and Designees present: Loren Bommelyn, Ruth Coleman, Gen Denton, Walter Gray, Cindy La Marr, Bill Mungary, Larry Myers, Charlene Simmons (John Gomez, Jr. absent)

DPR Staff present: Billie Blue-Elliston, Leo Carpenter, Jr., Cuauhtemoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux, Paulette Hennem, John Mott, Cathy Taylor

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson La Marr called meeting to order at 1:20 pm. Denton gave the opening blessing. Task Force members articulated their visions for the facility.

- Bommelyn: • look at the conservation of artifacts, and a facility to help native people preserve their artifacts
- Mungary: • create something of significance
- Denton: • a place to put all the artifacts, for people to learn about California Indians
• provide credible resources to get information from
- La Marr: • has to be done right, and this is the right time to do it
• need to raise more money
• meet upcoming deadlines for recommending a governance structure and a site.
- Simmons: • State Library is already working to create a new 8th grade school curriculum, a website, and work with tribal libraries
• they look forward to partnering with the California Indian Heritage Center.
- Myers: • this time the project can get completed
• must focus on control and governance, even at this time of limited resources.
- Coleman: • this is a high priority project which cannot fail
• the artifacts need to be shown and that the exhibits need to be developed and, interpreted correctly, as living cultures
• this is a place where California Indians can showcase their own culture.
• Pilar Oñate, her designee, has left the department and now Walter Gray, the new Chief of Cultural Resources Division, will represent her
- Gray: • this is a defining project for the department
• this is as good a time as any to look to the future; when economy comes around we will be ready to receive more money for the project

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 3-4, 2003 MEETING REPORT 1:45 pm

Simmons moved to accept the report, Myers seconded the motion.

Yes- 6, No- 0, Abstain- 1

VISION STATEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Simmons noted that this Vision Statement was built on previous work accomplished by the Task Force.

Myers suggested that the first line of the Vision Statement be changed to “Under the guidance of California Indian people, the California Indian Heritage Center will: ...”

Bommelyn moved to accept the Vision Statement with the change. Myers seconded.

The final approved Vision Statement reads:

Under the guidance of California Indian people, the California Indian Heritage Center will:

- *Present a statewide perspective on California’s diverse Indian cultural legacy.*
- *Honor the contributions of California Indians and promote dialogue between generations.*
- *Enhance public understanding of traditional and spiritual beliefs and practices.*
- *Protect California Indian cultural resources.*
- *Collect and present traditional and contemporary California Indian artistic and cultural expressions.*
- *Partner with tribal communities and regional cultural centers and museums.*
- *Provide educational opportunities to research and understand California’s Indian history, cultures and the impact of contemporary issues.*
- *Be recognized as a treasured California destination that enriches public life.*

GOVERNANCE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTER

Simmons introduced Professor Evelyn Lewis, from the UC Davis School of Law. Her specialty is in non-profit law and she is not a practicing lawyer.

Lewis said that her goal was to get to the root of what people want so that they can work on fine tuning their visions. Walter Gray spoke about the governance structure at the Golden State Museum, Taylor about Old Sacramento, and the Railroad Museum and Mott about Cooperating Associations and operating agreements. One key point is that the mission of partnering organizations must be similar so that they can work toward a common goal.

Lewis continued the discussion by asking “Why do tribes want to join together with State Parks?” and vice versa.

- Mungary: • State Parks has the experience and leadership
• the Task Force and State Parks need to establish a mutual cultural awareness
- La Marr: • the state owns assets
• tribes may not be able to do this project alone and that the state has a public fiduciary responsibility
- Simmons: • the state has money and artifacts
- Myers: • the state has influence (political) and community-wide representation
• a brand identity and credibility
- Bommelyn: • California Indians have as much a right to see artifacts; access can’t just be given to academics

- California Indians can help State Parks better interpret California Indian culture. We, as California Indians, need to talk about our reality and need State Parks to understand who we are.

Denton:

- the State has many contacts and they can bring many people together
- it also has connections to resources

Coleman:

- that each group has a different expertise and the California Indians have the best understanding of their own culture

Gray:

- hopes it will be successful in both the fiscal and programmatic arenas.
- success will also aid in fundraising

Lewis asked Task Force members what their greatest fears are in being associated with this project.

Coleman:

- that people will think funding issues will motivate DPR to favor certain tribes
- differing missions in foundation and state parks

La Marr:

- that it will fail; a more personal kind of failure
- if nothing happens as opposed to a finished product that doesn't meet the expectations of the public

Mungary:

- need to organize and gather more input on the facility

La Marr suggested the formation a Sub-Committee on Governance.

La Marr appointed herself, Gray, Simmons, and Myers to the Sub-Committee. Bommelyn moved to accept the Sub-Committee and the appointments. Myers seconded.

ADJOURN: La Marr adjourned the meeting at 4:30 pm.

January 16, 2004

Task Force Members and Designees present: Loren Bommelyn, Resources Secretary Mike Chrisman, Gen Denton, Walter Gray, Cindy La Marr, Bill Mungary, Larry Myers, Charlene Simmons, Dave Widell, (John Gomez, Jr. absent)

DPR staff present: Jackie Ball, Maria Baranowski, Leo Carpenter, Jr., Wendy Franklin, Cuauhtemoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux, Paulette Hennem, Tara Lynch, John Mott, Stephanie Schiele, Warren Westrup

RECONVENE - CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson La Marr called meeting to order at 9:20 am. Bommelyn gave the blessing. Introductions were made. Dave Widell, Assistant Secretary to the Resources Agency, was introduced as the new designee for Secretary Chrisman. Secretary Chrisman told the Task Force that the Governor fully supports this project.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

TASK FORCE FUNDING UPDATE

An account was set up with the State Parks Foundation. La Marr sent letters of solicitation to some tribes that had expressed that they would be willing to donate money. She said that Myers was also to do some soliciting. La Marr said she would follow up with calls. Mungary stated that the Task Force should apply for grants and pursue other funding sources, or the Task Force needs to do a better job making tribes see what's in it for them so they will want to give money. La Marr also stated that Tribes who donate funds would be acknowledged.

UPDATE ON BAGLEY-KEENE OPEN MEETING ACT

Staff Counsel Lynch reviewed the public meeting requirements:

- Up to four Task Force members can meet informally without triggering the public meeting requirements.
- Official sub-committees of 3 or more members must follow the public meeting rules.
- Official sub-committees comprised of members of the public that are created by the Task Force for input must follow the public meeting rules.
- Persons helping with the project that are not part of an official sub-committee need not follow the public meeting rules.

TASK FORCE MEMBER REQUIREMENTS

La Marr reminded Task Force members of their obligation to attend all meetings. Lynch suggested that La Marr could talk to each member to reaffirm their commitment and ability to work for the project.

SITE SELECTION

Baranowski reviewed the ten site proposals received in response to the letter of solicitation sent in the Fall. She explained why five of the ten sites did not fit the criteria that the Task Force developed. They are: J.D. Grant Ranch County Park, San Jose, CA, Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge, Elk Grove, CA, Liberty Station, San Diego, CA, Lake Natoma, Folsom, CA, and Gold Rush Park, Sacramento, CA.

LUNCH: 12:20 pm

RECONVENE: 1:05 pm

Task Force members voiced stated which sites they should be included in the market/feasibility analysis.

Gray:

- like to see J.D. Grant Ranch County Park analyzed because of the physical scope and geographic scale. There is a lot of potential for growth and that because it is a challenge to access it will make the experience more rewarding for the visitor.
- Stone Lakes is an extensive site, with a large buffer, and it is close to river access and the property experiences seasonal floods.
- Lake Natoma site has no room for long term expansion or we would just have to plan accordingly.
- Gold Rush Park is a nice vision but the developers should not use this project as anchor for the rest of the development plan.
- the Cal-Expo overflow parking area should be looked at as a potential site.
- Liberty Station is his least favorite site.

Myers:

- doesn't favor Liberty Station because of the noise from planes, and its close proximity to the San Diego airport, could be disruptive.
- J.D. Grant Ranch County Park is just too difficult to get to, and would like to know why it is underutilized, even though it is close to such a metropolitan area.
- good to look at it as well as all the three Sacramento area sites.

Simmons:

- Stone Lakes looks intriguing but it wouldn't be a good to place the Heritage Center in a flood plain.
- Liberty Station would not be the right kind of place and the noise from air traffic would be disruptive.
- Gold Rush Park is a long shot
- asked if there are any other sites within the city of Sacramento
- likes the Lake Natoma site, but is worried about the urban encroachment on the site.
- likes J.D. Grant Ranch County Park but thinks that access to the site is still a problem. She is not sure about Gold Rush Park and Stone Lakes because the actual sites have not been specified yet.

La Marr:

- doesn't think that J.D. Grant Ranch County Park would be a good site because we would never own the land and she would also like an area where there is a greater amount of tribal influence.
- Liberty Station is just too far south, and it will marginalize tribes that are in the north and would be restricted to use certain buildings and wouldn't be able to establish a separate identity from the rest of Liberty Station.
- Lake Natoma site can work, and feels that there are ways to work around the problems of the site.
- There is a real possibility to talk with the city of Sacramento about the Gold Rush Park site.
- Stone Lakes has some potential too.

Denton:

- Liberty Station is just too far south for the Indians of Northern California to go.
- J.D. Grant Ranch would be too hard to get to.
- Lake Natoma may be the best logical spot.
- A central location in the state is a plus too.

Mungary:

- the Task Force should do an analysis of all five sites and then make an informed decision about all the five sites.

- Bommelyn:
- would like to evaluate Lake Natoma, Gold Rush Park, and Stone Lakes.
 - J.D. Grant Ranch County Park would be a problem because it would be on leased land.
 - Lake Natoma belongs to DPR, and we have the support of the City of Folsom.
 - Liberty Station is a problem because of the mission style architecture and what it represents
 - likes the fact that Gold Rush Park is near the American River, and fact that many prominent politicians in Sacramento are in favor of this visionary idea.
 - Stone Lakes should be looked at; there will just have to be some negotiation as to what parcel of land it will be on.

Myers moved to pursue the three Sacramento area sites for further analysis. Bommelyn seconded.

Liberty Station and J.D. Grant Ranch County Park will not be looked at further and the three Sacramento area sites will be analyzed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carpenter addressed the Task Force with concerns about the project and site selection. He said that the Task Force should make sure that they know what they want because that can help with site selection. There can be offsite facilities for artifact conservation, labs, and open storage, if the Task Force chooses to select a smaller site. He also wanted to know why J.D Grant Ranch County Park is underutilized and feels that it should be analyzed with the Sacramento area sites. Carpenter likes the Lake Natoma site but there has to be some use of the Willow Creek area for camping, native plant garden, native villages, and access to the lake.

Westrup said that it is possible that State Parks could negotiate a 99 year lease with J.D. Grant Ranch County Park. If the California Indian Heritage Center is the large attraction it hopes to be, then the County would have no problem in extending the lease further into the future.

Jackie Ball said J.D. Grant Ranch County Park should be looked at. People are not going to this open space because maybe they have a lot of parks to go to already. People will come even if access is hard. The Task Force should hear what the study says about this site.

Mungary said that he thinks the site should get people out to the park. As for Liberty Station, the San Diego County tribes may be willing to give money to the project. He would have liked to see more data regarding the sites before making a decision like this. He thinks that they should pay a little more money to get all the sites evaluated.

Bommelyn said that he is willing to withdraw his second to the motion to add one more site to the analysis - but not do all five.

La Marr spoke in favor of the Sacramento sites.

Myers asked if there is money to evaluate all five sites. Baranowski said she will make it work. This is only the first part of the contract with the site analyst; the second part is the full evaluation of the final site.

Task Force members voted to evaluate the three Sacramento area sites.
Yes- 6, No- 1, and abstain- 0

DISCUSSION OF FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTER

Mott discussed terms that are commonly used to describe relationships between State Parks and Non-Profit groups, and the kinds of working relationships that can be formed.

FUTURE TASK FORCE MEETINGS

February 10, 2004- Sub-Committee on Governance meeting in the morning. There will be an informal meeting regarding Master Planning in the afternoon, depending on the schedules of La Marr and Gomez.

The next Task Force meeting is tentatively set for all day April 1 and all day April 2, 2004 to allow for site visits. Baranowski and Grenbeaux will schedule for the site tours.

STAFF UPDATES

Carpenter and Gonzalez gave a presentation about the history of the State's planning of the California Indian Heritage Center.

ADJOURN: 4:20 pm