

American River Parkway Preservation Society
Annual Organizational Report
October 1, 2010- September 30, 2011

Mission

**Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart.**

Vision

**We want our Parkway, seven generations from now, to be a vibrant, accessible,
and serene sanctuary, nourishing and refreshing the spirit of all who enter it.**

In This Report:

Section	Page
Organizational Leadership	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Public Communication & Education	8
Financial Statement	23
Current Membership Status	25
Strategic Plan (2009-2014)	26
Conclusion	32
Appendix I: E-Letters	33
Appendix II: Newsletters	58
Appendix III: Planning Position Paper: Auburn Dam Policy Environment	81

**American River Parkway Preservation Society
Organizational Leadership**

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Michael Rushford, President
Criminal Justice Legal Foundation

Vice President

Kristine Lea, Training Developer
Scientific Applications International Incorporated

Treasurer/Senior Policy Director

David H. Lukenbill, President
Lukenbill & Associates

Director

Rebecca Garrison, Executive Director
50 Corridor Transportation Management Association &
Point West Area Transportation Management Association

ENDOWMENT ADVISORY GROUP, CHAIR

William C. Schopfer, President
Fund Development Associates

SLOBE PARKWAY ADVOCATE AWARD RECIPIENTS:

Robert J. Slobe, President
North Sacramento Land Company

Franklin Burris, President
North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce

Mary E. Tappel, Environmental Scientist
California State Water Board

Dave Lydick, Deputy Director
American River Parkway & Regional Parks Division

Rob Kerth, President
North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce

Phil Serna, Supervisor, 1st District
Sacramento County Board of Supervisors

Executive Summary

This has been one of the better years for the issues our organization cares about.

Concerning nonprofit management of the Parkway, the county recently entered into an innovative agreement with Doug Ose to manage Gibson Ranch Park as a forprofit organization, exactly the precedent setting model that could eventually lead to our goal of seeing the Parkway under nonprofit management.

Concerning the illegal camping by the homeless in the Parkway, especially in the highly impacted area between Discovery Park and Cal Expo, with a particular and troubling concentration close to the Woodlake residential community; the new county supervisor for that district, Phi Serna, has taken a strong position.

In a February 23, 2011 article in the *Sacramento Bee* about the Parkway and the illegal camping he wrote: <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/23/3422768/comprehensive-view-needed-to-deal.html>

Parkway users deserve a safe, clean environment free from harassment or other personal threat. They should not feel compelled to avoid the parkway for fear of their own safety, which is what a number of constituents have conveyed to my office in recent weeks. They deserve better; we all deserve better.

The American River Parkway offers one of the best recreational opportunities anywhere in the country, but it will be enjoyed only if it is safe. To that end, local law enforcement, including Sacramento County park rangers, have established added presence along the lower reach of the parkway to enhance public safety and to encourage parkway users to return.

Let's also remember that the parkway itself is a "constituent" here. Illegal camping has produced tons of trash and debris, some of which is hazardous biological waste. Illegal campgrounds, large and small, "self-governed" or not, contribute to this problem. Along the American River Parkway, refuse has collected in makeshift dumps, and what doesn't remain in these derelict collection sites oftentimes is spread by the wind, is scavenged by animals or ends up pooled along the riverbanks.

This is exactly the type of advocacy for the Parkway we deeply appreciate and our organization awarded him the Slobe Parkway Advocate Award in 2011, named after long time Parkway advocate, Bob Slobe, noted in the enclosed Press Release, (pp. 13-14).

Introduction

About the American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)

The American River Parkway Preservation Society is a 501 I (3) nonprofit corporation founded in 2003. The Society's role is to help inform public policy regarding the American River Parkway through the exploration and development of such concepts as:

- providing Parkway management through a Joint Powers Authority and a nonprofit organization,
- developing a financial endowment for funding support,
- building the Auburn Dam for stable water flow and temperature for year round recreation and protection of Parkway habitat and wildlife,
- designating the American River Watershed as a National Heritage Area encompassing the Parkway,
- dramatically enhancing the recreational, educational, and sanctuary resources of the Parkway.

We have published conceptual and policy primer reports annually on World Rivers Day—the last Sunday in September—and have now completed the publication series of four reports addressing our five guiding principles (a sixth was added in 2011, see next page):

- September 25, 2005 report focusing on the Lower Reach of the Parkway where crime and illegal camping have virtually destroyed the ability of the adjacent community to use their part of the Parkway.
- September 24, 2006 report focusing on the Auburn Dam and the environment surrounding the minority community opposition to it.
- September 30, 2007 report focusing on governance, eco-regionalism and heritage; calling for daily management of the Parkway by a nonprofit organization, thinking from an eco-regional perspective around environmental issues, and advocating for the establishment of a Rivers of Gold National Heritage Area
- September 28, 2008 report focusing on recreation, education, and sanctuary, calling for increased public safety in the Lower Reach, financial stability, and a regional vision.

Stimulating thinking about public policy is central to our approach and we will sustain a continued argument about the future of the Parkway in a thoughtful and scholarly manner, built upon the ideas introduced in the policy primer reports.

The Society's advocacy programs of public communication, providing research and policy information to leadership, and our annual organizational publications are designed to reach a broad and diverse audience.

Our work is focused on six critical issues, addressing each through public education congruent with our guiding principles:

1) Developing effective management with an ability to secure adequate funding for public safety, ongoing maintenance, facility repair, invasive plant management, and restore the beauty and safety once fully enjoyed in the sanctuary of the Parkway.

Our Approach: Years of ineffective management and deferred maintenance have deeply damaged the Parkway and without the development of alternative funding and management structures, it will continue to deteriorate. We propose management by a nonprofit conservancy, building an endowment fund for supplementary funding, and creating a National Heritage Area embracing the Parkway, acknowledging its national importance while attracting greater funding and oversight.

Our Guiding Principle: Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it's a necessity.

2) Relieving the continuing pressure on the river, whether through flooding, illegal sewage discharge, or taking water for new development; all of which hurts the salmon, other habitat and aquatic life, and ultimately our enjoyment of the Parkway experience.

Our Approach: The Sacramento region is becoming one of the most desirable places to live in the country, so it is not surprising that development continues at record levels. Each new city in our area brings new pressure for growth and more pressure on the optimal water conditions the American River salmon need to thrive. We support the construction of the Auburn Dam to address these issues and to protect the integrity of the Parkway and have authored a report concerning this available on our website.

Our Guiding Principle: What's good for the salmon is good for the river.

3) Restoring the Lower Reach of the Parkway from the habitat devastation, fires, and pollution caused by widespread illegal camping by the homeless; and helping restore a sense of dignity and responsibility within the homeless community.

Our Approach: The dignity of the human person, including the poor and distressed, must always be respected, as also must the dignity of the poor and distressed community. We have collaborated with homeless advocacy organizations, local government, businesses, chambers of commerce, and neighborhood associations to develop a plan providing Parkway maintenance jobs for the homeless. We have authored a report, on our website, on the Lower Reach of the Parkway describing policy options to restore the Parkway for the adjacent communities who have been unable to use it for the past several years.

Our Guiding Principle: Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway: Social and environmental justice calls upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.

4) Bringing the community into a deeper understanding of the great value of the view space of the Parkway and how deeply destructive encroaching into the commons, by development, can be to the Parkway experience.

Our Approach: Given the stunning beauty of the Parkway, it is no wonder people want to build along its edges, even though their homes may visually intrude on the sanctuary of the commons, destroying the sense of being embraced by nature that is the essential Parkway experience. We will work to ensure that restrictions against visually intrusive construction, that are clear and irrevocable, are implemented and embraced.

Our Guiding Principle: If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.

5) Encouraging the inclusion of responsible usage by new Parkway user groups congruent with the spirit upon which public ownership of a natural resource is predicated.

Our Approach: The Parkway belongs to all of us. It is a community resource. Parkway management plans should contain no absolute restrictions on user activity, rather a process of study and decision-making. There are a variety of new usages that should be under consideration to become part of the Parkway experience, including full access for the disabled, an expanded network of picnic and sitting places, musical concerts, holiday celebrations, off-leash dog walking, mountain biking, inline skating, and additional nature centers.

Our Guiding Principle: Regarding new parkway usages, inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.

6) Continuing encasement of open space, restricting suburban community development upon which a sustainable tax base funding necessary public works is built, is contrary to sound future planning.

Our Approach: Suburban communities are where the overwhelming majority of American families wish to live, and the opportunity in our region for those communities to be built for the families who hope to live in them, is a shared supportive responsibility for those of us who presently enjoy our life in the suburbs and for those who hope to enjoy the suburban family lifestyle in the future.

Our Guiding Principle: The suburban lifestyle—as surrounds the American River Parkway—which is imbued within the aspirational center of the *California Dream* and whose vision is woven into the heart of the *American Dream*, is a deeply loved way of life whose sustainability we all desire.

Public Communication & Education

Weblog

ARPPS maintains a daily weblog at <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/> and during our program year, from October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011 we posted 263 individual messages concerning articles, reports, news items, and event information connected to our mission.

Letters to Public

ARPPS mailed 442 letters to members of the public describing the work ARPPS does and inviting them to apply for membership.

Public Advocacy, Support Letters, Press Releases

Public Advocacy

Senior Policy Director met with the Auburn Dam Council, June 3, 2011, discussing the role ARPPS plays in advocating for the Auburn Dam (see planning paper, page 81)

Senior Policy Director met with Sacramento Mayor Kevin Johnson, August 1, 2011, discussing the American River Parkway (see page 32 for details).

Support Letters

1) January 17, 2011

Congressman Tom McClintock
8700 Auburn-Folsom Road, Suite 100
Granite Bay, CA 95746

Dear Congressman McClintock:

Your support for the Auburn Dam in the January 15, 2011 *Sacramento Bee* article was very well received by our organization, which also supports building the dam.

As so clearly noted in the recent USGS report: *Overview of the ARKStorm Scenario*, available at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/>, Sacramento is in dire need of 500 year level flood protection.

Dams are the solution, building the Auburn Dam, and, raising the Shasta Dam to its originally engineered height, as a 2004 article from the *Los Angeles Times* reports, which is on the web at: http://www.watershedportal.org/news/news_html?ID=165.

In order to provide you with additional information concerning the need for the Auburn Dam beyond that which the Auburn Dam Council provided, we wanted to note the importance for

the American River Parkway, Sacramento & the salmon: protecting the physical integrity of the Parkway, protecting Sacramento from flooding and providing the proper water temperature and river flow for optimal salmon health in the Lower American River.

We devoted our 2006 report, *The American River Parkway, Protecting its Integrity and Providing Water for the River Running Through it: A Report on the Auburn Dam Policy Environment*, on the issue, which is on our website at <http://www.arpps.org/Report2-AuburnDam.pdf>.

The introduction to our report notes:

Our report looks at the oppositional environment surrounding the building of the Auburn Dam, to shed light on its motivation and origin; as the public supports building Auburn Dam, as the 2006 J. D. Franz Research Inc. survey revealed (58% El Dorado County, 59% Placer County, 62% Sacramento County); and few fully understand the ongoing opposition to the project.

The two issues, Parkway protection and the protection of Sacramento, become fused as the primary value of the Parkway is its location in the heart of the Sacramento metropolitan area, and what threatens the whole threatens the heart.

We look at the oppositional environment as it is becoming increasingly common for those just learning of the threat Sacramento faces from flooding, and how only Auburn Dam can protect us at the 500 year level, to ask: "How can anyone be against this?"...

Our organization feels that the optimal way to maintain the integrity of the American River Parkway, and protect the region, is to increase the water supply in the American River Watershed by constructing the Auburn Dam.

Approximately 2.7 million acre feet in an average year, is run-off from the 1,875 square miles of the American River watershed, three times the capacity of Folsom Dam. Being able to retain that water and the extra run-off in wet years is a key element in allowing the managers of the dams on the American River to have the option of controlling the temperature and flow of Lower American River water, particularly during dry years, to create optimal conditions for the salmon, recreation, and habitat protection. (pp. 8-9)

We have also included an enclosure from Michael J. Preszler, P.E., principal of California Water Consulting, Inc., one of the authors of the 2008 report, *American River Authority: Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Summary Report*, on the web at <http://www.americanriverauthority.com/admin/upload/AUBURN-FOLSOM.SOUTH.UNIT.SUMMARY.REPORT.pdf>

We look forward to your continued efforts to build the Auburn Dam.

Take care.

Sincerely,

David H. Lukenbill, Senior Policy Director

Cc: Michael Rushford, President ARPPS
Michael J. Preszler, P.E.

Enclosure: California Water Consulting Summary

2) February 23, 2011

**OPEN LETTER TO THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
SACRAMENTO COUNTY PARKS COMMISSION & THE SACRAMENTO CITY
COUNCIL**

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, & Council Members:

The American River Parkway is the most important recreational area in our region and it has a serious problem of illegal camping in the Woodlake Reach area of the Parkway—as we see from the series of stories in the Sacramento Bee over the past few weeks.

The reduction in public safety in the Woodlake Reach area—traditionally most burdened with crime related to illegal camping—now includes organized efforts which have apparently laid claim to the Woodlake Reach as a tent city.

Illegal camping by the homeless in the Woodlake Reach has long been a public safety issue, but now that an organized tent city has arisen, persisting even after removal warnings, raises the issue to one of even greater seriousness.

We call on public leadership to ensure public safety in the Parkway is their primary priority.

Many respond to the public safety claim with “where can the homeless go?”, or, “how do we solve homelessness?”, but both questions have to be addressed separately, as we would any larger issue impacting public safety. After all, we wouldn’t question the police who are responding to an outbreak of crime in a neighborhood, “where can the criminals go?” or, “how do we solve crime?”, nor do we stop arresting drug abusers until we solve drug abuse.

We can chew gum and walk at the same time.

Conditions that reduce public safety, as illegal camping in the Parkway does, while continuing to render one of the most beautiful and historic areas of the Parkway unsafe for families from the adjacent communities—as it has in the Woodlake Reach of the Parkway for decades—are conditions that public leadership must respond to with a primary focus on public safety.

Sincerely,

Michael Rushford
President

Kristine Lea
Vice President

Rebecca Garrison
Board Member

David H. Lukenbill
Senior Policy Director

3) May 6, 2011

OPEN LETTER TO THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

In relation to the May 4, 2011 story in the Sacramento Bee <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/05/04/3599932/sacramento-county-park-district.html> about your possibly considering asking voters to raise the sales tax to pay for a regional park district, we would offer—not a proposal for all of the regional parks—but a proposal for the largest, the American River Parkway.

We propose that you spearhead the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) comprised of the adjacent governments, and the JPA creates a new nonprofit organization to provide daily management and supplemental fundraising for the Parkway.

We have offered details on this strategy—including sample agreement language and JPA membership composition—on our website at <http://www.arpps.org/strategy.html>.

The Parkway is a signature park, with a national reputation, and, by conducting a nationwide search for the appropriate executive director of the nonprofit, you will be able to discover someone with the experience and talent to take the American River Parkway into the future with secure and dedicated funding.

This, of course, will eventually provide more available funding for the other parks in the regional parks department.

Sincerely,

Michael Rushford
President

Kristine Lea
Board Officer/VP

David H. Lukenbill
Board Officer/CFO

Rebecca Garrison
Board Member

Cc: ARPPS Board

Press Releases

November 15, 2010

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release

November 15, 2010

Sacramento, California

**AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY (ARPPS)
HELPING THE HOMELESS**

The homeless issue is a Parkway issue as the Lower Reach of the Parkway—Discovery Park to Cal Expo—has been the de jure tent city for the homeless for years.

As the cold of winter invigorates the urgency of public policy strategies to alleviate the suffering of those who are homeless, we do well as a community to remember that the primary and most effective help is often a balanced combination of giving aid and inspiring those aided to begin the internal work of personal transformation that will elevate them beyond the need for aid.

Providing services without inspiring internal change generally leads to a tragic continuation of the problem

In this regard, we might note the words from the seminal book, *To Empower People: From State to Civil Society*, by Peter Berger & Richard John Neuhaus, who wrote:

“Time and again, I found that indigenous community leaders have substantial long-term impact because they have been able to affect not only the behavior of those they serve but also the internal base of values that determines behavior. In tackling the most critical problems that confront low-income communities, they have made distinctions—as most top-down programs do not—between poverty that is caused by factors outside an individual’s control (for example, lay-offs or extended illness) and that which results from the life choices an individual makes (drug-addiction and out-of-wedlock births, for instance). They recognize that, with regard to poverty that results from an individual’s choice, an internal change is prerequisite for any external programs or aid to have lasting and substantial effect.

“Grass-roots activists who live within the same zip code as the people they serve have a unique capacity to inspire this kind of transformation. In many cases they have suffered—and have overcome—the same problems that they are guiding others to battle. They are often living examples of achievement against the odds, and they provide models of the values and principles that they espouse. Hundreds of testimonies from effective grass-roots leaders have shown that their foundation of faith has enabled them to see potential for transformation and revitalization where professionals have limited their goals to custodianship.

“Furthermore, surveys have shown that a base of local support is a more natural and more approachable resource than professional services that are “parachuted in” to the communities. When queried, hundreds of low-income people responded that if they confronted a crisis they would turn first to family members, friends, local churches, and other organizations that are indigenous to their communities for help. Only as a last resort would they choose to turn to a professional service provider.

“In spite of this reality, we continue to use a service delivery system that relies on what is the last choice of those who are in need.”

Berger, P. L. & Neuhaus, R.J. (1996). *To Empower People: From State to Civil Society*. (2nd Ed.) Washington D.C. The AEI Press. (pp. 106-107)

Have a wonderful Thanksgiving and remember that empowerment is more truly compassionate than pity.

Organizational Leadership
American River Parkway Preservation Society
Sacramento, California
November 15, 2010

March 18, 2011

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release

March 18, 2011

Sacramento, California

**AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY (ARPPS)
ANNOUNCES**

2011 SLOBE PARKWAY ADVOCATE AWARD RECIPIENT

Supervisor Phil Serna

The award was presented to Phil during the North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce luncheon March 17, 2011 at Enotria by ARPPS President Michael Rushford & Bob Slobe.

Phil is the Sacramento County Supervisor for District 1, elected with over 70% of the vote in his first elected office.

District 1 is the site of the most impacted area of the Parkway from illegal camping by the homeless, which for the past 25 years has caused great environmental destruction, a drastic lowering of public safety, and the virtual holding hostage of the residents of the adjacent neighborhoods to safely use their part of the Parkway.

Supervisor Serna has taken a clear stand to protect the Parkway from the corrosive impact of illegal camping while retaining a compassionate stand to help the homeless.

His voluntary charitable experience, as a member of the board of directors of Cottage Housing, which provides a clean and sober environment—enforced through drug testing—in the residential housing complexes it operates, amplifies his commitment.

In a February 23, 2011 article in the *Sacramento Bee* <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/23/3422768/comprehensive-view-needed-to-deal.html> about the Parkway and the illegal camping he wrote:

“Much has been reported in recent days regarding the situation along the lower reach of the American River Parkway. Unfortunately, there's been a predictable attempt by some to hijack public attention to narrowly advocate their cause instead of acknowledging the complexities of the situation.

“Dealing with those complexities and seeking solutions is the responsibility of your local elected officials. As one of them, I've made every effort during the past three weeks to thoughtfully and compassionately address the issue of illegal camping, public safety, environmental impact and homelessness. Admittedly, it is not an easy thing to do 50 days into the job.

“Parkway users deserve a safe, clean environment free from harassment or other personal threat. They should not feel compelled to avoid the parkway for fear of their own safety, which is what a number of constituents have conveyed to my office in recent weeks. They deserve better; we all deserve better.

“The American River Parkway offers one of the best recreational opportunities anywhere in the country, but it will be enjoyed only if it is safe. To that end, local law enforcement, including Sacramento County park rangers, have established added presence along the lower reach of the parkway to enhance public safety and to encourage parkway users to return.

“Let's also remember that the parkway itself is a "constituent" here. Illegal camping has produced tons of trash and debris, some of which is hazardous biological waste. Illegal campgrounds, large and small, "self-governed" or not, contribute to this problem. Along the American River Parkway, refuse has collected in makeshift dumps, and what doesn't remain in these derelict collection sites oftentimes is spread by the wind, is scavenged by animals or ends up pooled along the riverbanks.”

We are very happy to award this level of commitment by Supervisor Phil Serna to one of the finest urban recreational areas in the country.

**Organizational Leadership
American River Parkway Preservation Society
Sacramento, California
March 18, 2011**

August 8, 2011

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release

August 8, 2011

Sacramento, California

AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY (ARPPS)

If you are living in suburban California, you are part of the Dream, the *California Dream*.

A central part of the birthing vision of the *American Dream* was the *California Dream* and all that America promised, as Kevin Starr notes: “In a very real sense, the California dream was the American dream undergoing one of its most significant variations.” *Americans and the California Dream 1850-1915*. (1973). New York: Oxford University Press. (p.443)

The American River Parkway is surrounded by suburbs, which is appropriate being that a central axis of the *California Dream* is suburban single home ownership, and the American River running through it was where gold was first discovered, leading to one of the greatest migrations in history.

The suburban single home ownership aspect of the *California Dream* is under attack, as Joel Kotkin notes in a recent article, *California Wages War on Single Home Ownership*: “In California, the assault on the house has gained official sanction. Once the heartland of the American dream, the Golden State has begun implementing new planning laws designed to combat global warming. These draconian measures could lead to a ban on the construction of private residences, particularly on the suburban fringe.” Retrieved July 26, 2011 from <http://www.newgeography.com/content/002357-california-wages-war-on-single-family-homes>

To help protect that vision, which we all hope to sustain, we have defined a sixth critical issue, shaped our approach, and formulated our sixth guiding principle.

Critical Issue #6) Continuing encasement of open space, restricting suburban community development upon which a sustainable tax base funding necessary public works is built, is contrary to sound future planning.

Our Approach: Suburban communities are where the overwhelming majority of American families wish to live, and the opportunity in our region for those communities to be built for the families who hope to live in them, is a shared supportive responsibility for those of us who presently enjoy our life in the suburbs and for those who hope to enjoy the suburban family lifestyle in the future.

Our Guiding Principle: The suburban lifestyle—as surrounds the American River Parkway—which is imbued within the aspirational center of the *California Dream* and whose vision is woven into the heart of the *American Dream*, is a deeply loved way of life whose sustainability we all desire.

**Organizational Leadership
American River Parkway Preservation Society
Sacramento, California
August 8, 2011**

Articles Published

1) Published in Sacramento Press 1/14/11

[http://www.sacramento.press.com/headline/43661/Versailles Gibson Ranch](http://www.sacramento.press.com/headline/43661/Versailles_Gibson_Ranch)

Versailles & Gibson Ranch

The Board of Directors of the American River Parkway Preservation Society voted to approve the Ose proposal for Gibson Ranch at our meeting of 1/3/11.

In the Sunday, December 26, 2010 issue of the *New York Times*, we are informed that:

“Versailles, one of the most visited monuments in the world, will soon be able to offer tourists a place to rest for the night...

“The Hotel du Grand Controle, an annex building on the edge of the Versailles estate, will be transformed into a 23-room hotel, administrators of the publicly owned palace announced recently.

“The restoration and modernization of the 17th-century building will be overseen by a Belgian company called Ivy International, which has taken out a 30-year lease on the property. **The project is a rare transfer of control of a French public heritage site to the private sector.**

“It’s a pioneer initiative,” Jean Jacques Aillagon, the chairman of the Versailles palace, said in a news conference in Paris. **“The building was given to us in a dilapidated state; my concern was to save it.”** (page TR. 2, highlighting added)

Saving shuttered Gibson Ranch from further dilapidation and whether the County should approve management by a forprofit entity led by former Congressman Doug Ose is the issue.

It is an issue which has been of interest to our organization as it addresses much of what we have also found lacking in local government management of the American River Parkway.

Our organization has long called for the use of innovative funding and management practices for the Parkway that are being used successfully with other parks and the concepts embedded in the Ose proposal are congruent with those practices.

When the board of supervisors agreed to study the privatization proposal in November of 2010, the opposition—County Parks and aligned nonprofits—appeared to build their case primarily from the damage it might do to their in-house regional park proposal, which would increase taxes, while the Ose proposal would save taxpayers money.

The proposal to open the Ranch to the public under a lease management agreement comes from a family with a long-established record of public service and philanthropy, is supported by many locally, and is aligned with standard lease management agreements involving some form of privatization.

Given that, the opposition—especially that voiced in the editorial pages of the *Sacramento Bee*—seemed overwrought.

We were very pleased when the county agreed to move forward in their consideration of the plan to turn over management of the park to a forprofit entity.

With final approval, which we wholeheartedly support, it will be refreshing to see innovation and creativity become part of the mix of local parks management which, if it is as successful as we anticipate, may also impact future decisions regarding the American River Parkway.

The Parkway is already witnessing success with one innovative management and lease agreement, that of Soil Born Farms—which began as a forprofit later becoming nonprofit—at the historic 40 acre American River Ranch in the Parkway.

Soil Born Farms sells the food it grows from its own farm stand and to many of the finer restaurants in the area.

Another project in the region that brings innovative park management under a lease agreement between the County and the Galt Area Historical Society is the McFarland Ranch in Galt.

This is the historic ranch of Scotland native John McFarland, who came to the Sacramento Valley in 1857, founding Galt. The work the Historical Society has been able to accomplish in renewing and restoring the ranch is phenomenal.

Our organization will continue to follow the Gibson Ranch project as it—hopefully—becomes a reality and as the public responds to the new forms of recreation available at Gibson Ranch generating income to the forprofit and profit to the County.

If it's good enough for Versailles, it's good enough for Gibson Ranch!

David H. Lukenbill, Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society

2) Published in Sacramento Press January 21, 2011 at [http://www.sacramentoexpress.com/headline/44081/Opinion_American_River Parkway](http://www.sacramentoexpress.com/headline/44081/Opinion_American_River_Parkway)

Homelessness & the American River Parkway

Sacramento is a compassionate city, and virtually all of us care about and want to help, those struggling with the behavioral issues that often lead to homelessness—drug and alcohol addiction, financial duress, mental health, criminality and others—but generally not to the extent that our personal, familial, or neighborhood safety is seriously threatened.

For our organization, the issue isn't homelessness, but the impact of illegal camping in and around the Parkway, largely by the homeless, on the adjacent neighborhoods and users of the Parkway.

The impact on the adjacent neighborhoods is that they have not been able to safely access their part of the Parkway for the several years this has been a problem, and that is the issue that resonates with our organization, public safety in the Parkway.

As a consequence, of course, we have had to address the larger issue of homelessness in general, which we have done in articles and news releases posted to our website and blogsite.

Through prolonged examination of the issue, we have reached a couple of conclusions: one is our support for the *Housing First* concept for the chronic homeless.

The chronic homeless are those who have been homeless for some time and scarcely able to mount any sort of social renewal without, at the very least, a place to call home.

This concept was pioneered by the organization Pathways to Housing in New York and they have had success with it.

Sacramento has also embraced this concept, but in a way that we feel will have less success, which we wrote about in an article published in the Sacramento Bee on April 10, 2008 under the title of *Scatter homeless housing; don't concentrate sites*, and which is also posted to our website's news page on May 12, 2008.

The other is a call for a more vigorous policy of helping the homeless and providing for public safety in the Lower Reach of the Parkway—Discovery Park to Cal-Expo—outlined in our 2005 research report: *The American River Parkway Lower Reach Area: A Corroded Crown Jewel, Restoring the Luster*.

Over the past couple of years, the concept of providing a tent city for the homeless, has arisen and as the area in and around the Lower Reach has been the tent city, in fact if not legally, for several years, it is also an issue we are concerned about.

We posted a photo gallery on January 18, 2011, of pictures taken January 17, 2011—showing a large tent city which has been erected—and others dating back to 2008, of the impact of illegal camping in and around the Parkway, and the Sacramento Press published a story with photographs from January 20, 2011.

Sacramento can do better, for the homeless, for the Parkway adjacent neighborhoods and for Parkway users.

3) Published in Sacramento Press April 6, 2011

[http://www.sacramento.com/headline/48755/Water Auburn Dam Floods the Economy](http://www.sacramento.com/headline/48755/Water_Auburn_Dam_Floods_the_Economy)

Water, Auburn Dam, Floods & the Economy

There has been a lot of criticism in the media lately, in response to the supporters of building the Auburn Dam to store the vast amounts of water that are now, instead, flowing out to sea.

The critics say, as today's Sacramento Bee editorial did,

"It never fails that, during wet years or dry ones, the water buffaloes resume their stampede for more taxpayer-subsidized water projects. During a single year of drought, they purchase billboards warning of "dust bowls" if someone else doesn't help them build a new reservoir. And now that California has been blessed with a prodigious snowpack and plentiful rainfall, the same crowd is bemoaning all the water in the Sacramento River that "is just washing out to sea."

What critics forget is that the primary need for the Auburn Dam—much more important than water storage—is protection from life and property threatening floods.

They should remember that Sacramento is the most flood prone major river city in the country.

The Sacramento Bee did a story January 14, 2011 reporting on the results of a recent US Geological Survey Report and wrote:

"In the study, researchers used computer models and a composite of three historical storms to estimate a worst-case event: a torrent of tropical rain for nine straight days. It amounts to a 500-year storm. In the lingo of disaster managers, that does not mean it happens only once every 500 years, but that it has two-tenths percent chance of occurring in any given year. The Central Valley and the Sacramento region are likely to suffer the worst effects because they lie within a funnel for the state's biggest rivers."

In the same story, the Bee notes some of the impacts in Sacramento County include 527,885 evacuations, 200 days before waters recede from the Pocket area, and \$29.1 billion property loss.

There is a graph on our blog site parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2009/12/auburn-dam-for-flood-protection.html which says it all.

The print is small, but the cities listed, from the left are, Tacoma, St. Louis, Dallas, & Kansas City, who all have met the gold standard of a 500 year level of protection.

While New Orleans has, after their recent improvements, met a 250 year level of protection and Sacramento, in the red at a 100 year level, will have a 200 year level after the Folsom Dam improvements.

The numbers on the left representing the level of coverage, starting from the bottom, are 85, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500 & 600.

When a flood control system provides 100 year flood protection, it means there is a one in 100 chance that a storm will occur that is beyond the capacity of levees and reservoirs to contain. Therefore, 200 year flood protection means there is a 1 in 200 chance that a storm may occur which the system couldn't handle, and 500 year protection means there is only a one in 500 chance that a storm will overwhelm a system.

Giving Sacramento a 500 year level of flood protection will more than compensate for the construction costs of the Auburn Dam, estimated at between 5 - 10 billion dollars.

The water storage, hydroelectric power, and the economic benefit that will arise from the recreational usage of the new lake created behind Auburn Dam, are supplemental benefits.

So, of course, during rich rain years, Auburn Dam advocates will remind the public of the water storage capability of the dam, but we know that the primary reason for building Auburn Dam is to save the lives and property of those who might lose both when a 500 year flood hits Sacramento.

The major concern of the American River Parkway Preservation Society about this issue, beyond being Sacramento residents and wanting adequate flood protection for our community, is that the Auburn Dam will provide enhanced protection for the land and habitat of the American River Parkway and provide greater control maintaining the optimal level of water flow and water temperature for the salmon in the Lower American River.

David H. Lukenbill, Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society

4) Published in Sacramento Press May 15, 2011

http://www.sacramento-press.com/headline/50588/Funding_Sacramento_Parks

Funding Sacramento Parks

by David H. Lukenbill, published on May 15, 2011

According to a May 4th *Sacramento Bee* story, Sacramento County Supervisors are considering asking voters to raise the sales tax to pay for a regional park district.

This is a terrible idea, especially during such trying economic times.

A better idea would be to drop the proposal for the regional parks sales tax increase and consider bringing the largest regional park, the American River Parkway, under new management, with supplemental funding to be raised philanthropically.

The American River Parkway is a signature park, the most important recreational area in our region, the most valuable natural resource in our community, and potentially one of the nicest urban/suburban parks in the nation.

The Board of Supervisors could spearhead the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) comprised of representatives from Parkway adjacent governments and a representative of local nonprofit organizations with Parkway concerns.

The JPA then creates a nonprofit organization to provide daily management and supplemental fundraising for the Parkway.

The most successful model of a JPA governed river park is the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park JPA created in 1989 by San Diego County and five cities.

Once the JPA forms the new nonprofit and conducts a national search for the appropriate executive director, they will surely be able to discover someone with the experience and talent to take the American River Parkway into the future with secure and dedicated funding.

Providing this funding and management stability for the largest park in the regional parks department will eventually provide more available funding for the other parks in the department.

There are several reasons why raising taxes to support parks—especially during perilous economic times—is a bad idea, but just a couple should be mentioned.

Taxpayers are already paying for parks, have been for years, and will surely resist paying more.

Doug Ose made the point, as quoted in the Sacramento Bee story, "I don't believe there's a shortage of revenue. I believe there's a shortage of management creativity."

Government is very good at many things, but the ability to raise taxes, when hampered by the unwillingness of voters to approve the tax increase, is not one of them

Philanthropy is much more resilient, and as we have seen during this period of economic uncertainty, individual philanthropists continued to support those causes they found important.

For many Parkway users, generous financial support will come when it is clear the funding—and management—are dedicated solely to the Parkway.

Letters Published

**1) January 22, 2011
Sacramento Bee**

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/22/3342844/letters-to-the-editor.html>

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/14/3323275/the-big-one-might-be-a-flood.html>

Commuting by kayak

Re "The 'Big One' might be a flood"(Page A1, Jan. 14): I hope our new governor read the recent story about the U.S. Geological Survey report, which predicted California will likely experience a catastrophic storm that would put Sacramento and much of the Valley under 15 feet of water.

Our state has been unprepared for such a storm. Nothing short of raising Oroville Dam to its design height and completing a full service dam at Auburn will provide 500-year flood protection necessary to withstand such a storm.

Gov. Jerry Brown's appointment of eco-warrior Jerry Meral as deputy secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency makes it clear this governor is no more interested in flood protection than he was 40 years ago. Meral, a kayaker who opposes dams, will be able to paddle to work.

- Michael Rushford, [ARPPS President] Carmichael

2) February 6, 2011 Sacramento Bee

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/06/3378634/letters-to-the-editor.html>

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/30/3360930/big-surprise-blight-returns-to.html>

Address parkway safety – now

Re "Big surprise: Blight returns to river" (Editorial, Jan 30) : The underlying premise in this editorial regarding illegal camping in the lower reach of the American River Parkway is: Like it or not, the health of the American River Parkway and homelessness are inextricably tied.

If that means that our local homelessness issues need to be resolved before the public safety issue in the parkway is resolved, that is wrong.

Public safety in the parkway is a single, local issue that needs to be resolved – as are all public safety issues – immediately.

– David H. Lukenbill, Sacramento, senior policy director, American River Parkway Preservation Society

3) February 15, 2011 Sacramento Bee

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/15/3402957/letters-to-the-editor.html>

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/10/3390844/serna-steps-into-breach-on-homeless.html>

Get city's priorities straight

Re "Serna steps into breach on homeless" and "Kings must get back in the game on new arena" (Editorials, Feb. 10): As The Bee's editorial board opines for the millionth time on our arena fate, one wonders what it thinks about a "world-class city." Apparently the editorial board believes that a world-class city is more about arenas than about its "miserable place" rating, which is made worse by the fact that poor, working-class neighborhoods like North Sacramento bear the burden of homelessness. Shame on them.

– Robert Slobe, [ARPPS Parkway Advocate Award Namesake] Sacramento

4) June 22, 2011 Sacramento Bee

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/06/22/3718063/letters-to-the-editor.html>

Cut trees for public safety

Re "Groups sue over levee tree rule" (Our Region, June 21): Though the new policy, once implemented, will harm the familiar aesthetics of the parkway experience, the reasoning behind the decision appears sound.

While arguments about trees and levees appear right – healthy trees on the levees strengthen them and unhealthy trees on the levees weaken them – the appropriate course to take is to protect the public's safety and that does call for no trees.

– David H. Lukenbill, Sacramento, American River Parkway Preservation Society

5) Sept 28 2011 Sacramento Bee

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/09/28/3943567/letters-to-the-editor.html>

Donors can rescue parks

Re "Private donors' role in parks rises" (Capitol & California, Sept. 27): The nationwide trend of nonprofits helping parks is one that needs application in Sacramento, especially with our signature park, the American River Parkway.

We advocate forming a Joint Powers Authority of parkway- adjacent communities. The JPA would create a nonprofit organization for daily management and supplemental fundraising for the parkway.

It is a model with increasing resonance, especially in a time of severe public funding difficulty.

– David H. Lukenbill, senior policy director, American River Parkway Preservation Society

Financial Statement

AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY FINANCIAL STATEMENT

October 1 2010 to September 30, 2011

PART I Revenue, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets or Fund Balances

Revenue

1. Contributions, gifts, grants, and similar amounts received.....	\$3,415.00
2. Program service revenue including government fees and contracts.....	\$0
3. Membership dues and assessments.....	\$0
4. Investment income.....	\$0
5a. Gross amount from sale of assets other than inventory	\$0
b. Less: cost or other basis and sales expenses.....	\$0
c. Gain or (loss) from sales of assets other than inventory.....	\$0
6. Special events and activities.....	\$0
a. Gross revenue (not including contributions on line 1).....	\$0
b. Less: direct expenses other than fundraising expenses.....	\$0
c. Net income or (loss) from special events and activities.....	\$0
7a. Gross Sales of inventory, less returns and allowances.....	\$0
b. Less: cost of goods sold.....	\$0
c. Gross profit or (loss) from sales of inventory.....	\$0
8. Other revenue (describe).....	\$0
9. Total Revenue (Add 1, 2, 3, 4, 5c, 6c, 7c and 8).....	\$3,415.00

Expenses

10. Grants and similar amounts paid.....	\$0
11. Benefits paid to or for members.....	\$0
12. Salaries, other compensation, and employee benefits.....	\$0
13. Professional Fees and other payments to independent contractors.....	\$1, 805.00
(\$1,580.00, Capacity Building Consultant) (\$225.00 Web Services)	
14. Occupancy [web], rent, utilities, and [web] maintenance.....	\$0
15. Printing, publications, postage, and shipping.....	\$647.23
(\$599.00 Postage) (\$17.23; Publications) (\$31.00 Printing)	
16. Other expenses (describe) [Supplies, Meetings, Awards, Dues].....	\$932.89
(Printer Toner \$302.40) (Paper \$29.99) (Envelopes \$15.58) (Meetings \$266.79)	
(Awards \$198.14) Government Fees \$20.00) (Adobe Subscription, \$99.99)	
17. Total Expenses (Add 10-16).....	\$3,385.12
18. Excess or (deficit) for the year (Subtract 17 from 9).....	\$29.88
19. Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (from line 27, column A) must agree with end-of-year figure reported on prior year's return).....	\$44.67
20. Other changes in net assets or fund balances (attach explanation).....	\$0
21. Net assets or fund balances at end of year. Combine lines 18-20.....	\$29.88

PART II Balance Sheets

22. Cash, savings, and investments.....	\$29.88
23. Land and buildings.....	\$0
24. Other assets (describe).....	\$0
25. Total Assets.....	\$29.88
26. Total Liabilities (describe).....	\$0
27. Net assets or fund balances (line 27 of column B must agree with line 21)...	\$29.88

AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY BUDGET NARRATIVE

Revenue

1. Contributions, gifts, grants, and similar amounts received.....	\$3,415.00
2. Program service revenue including government fees and contracts.....	\$0
3. Membership dues and assessments.....	\$0
4. Investment income.....	\$0
5a. Gross amount from sale of assets other than inventory	\$0
b. Less: cost or other basis and sales expenses.....	\$0
c. Gain or (loss) from sales of assets other than inventory.....	\$0
6. Special events and activities.....	\$0
a. Gross revenue (not including contributions on line 1).....	\$0
b. Less: direct expenses other than fundraising expenses.....	\$0
c. Net income or (loss) from special events and activities.....	\$0
7a. Gross Sales of inventory, less returns and allowances.....	\$0
b. Less: cost of goods sold.....	\$0
c. Gross profit or (loss) from sales of inventory.....	\$0
8. Other revenue (describe).....	\$0
9. Total Revenue (Add 1, 2, 3, 4, 5c, 6c, 7c and 8).....	\$ 3,415.00

Expenses

10. Grants and similar amounts paid.....	\$0
11. Benefits paid to or for members.....	\$0
12. Salaries, other compensation, and employee benefits.....	\$0
13. Professional Fees and other payments to independent contractors.....	\$1,805.00
(\$1,580.00, Capacity Building Consultant, Lukenbill & Associates)	
(\$225.00 Web Services, Susan Henley Design)	
14. Occupancy [web], rent, utilities, and [web] maintenance.....	\$0
15. Printing, publications, postage, and shipping.....	\$647.23
(\$599.00 Postage)(\$17.23; Publications, Book) (\$31.00 Printing, Newsletter)	
16. Other expenses (describe) [Supplies, Meetings, Awards, Dues].....	\$932.89
(Printer Toner \$302.40) (Paper \$29.99) (Envelopes \$15.58)	
(Meetings, Board Members & Awards Luncheon \$266.79) (Awards \$198.14)	
Government Fees, Secretary of State S-100 Form \$20.00)	
(Adobe Subscription, one year \$99.99)	
17. Total Expenses (Add 10-16).....	\$3,385.12
18. Excess or (deficit) for the year (Subtract 17 from 9).....	\$29.88
19. Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (from line 27, column A) must agree with end-of-year figure reported on prior year's return).....	\$44.67
20. Other changes in net assets or fund balances (attach explanation).....	\$0
21. Net assets or fund balances at end of year. Combine lines 18-20.....	\$29.88

PART II Balance Sheets

22. Cash, savings, and investments.....	\$29.88
23. Land and buildings.....	\$0
24. Other assets (describe).....	\$0
25. Total Assets.....	\$29.88
26. Total Liabilities (describe).....	\$0
27. Net assets or fund balances (line 27 of column B must agree with line 21)...	\$29.88

Current Membership Status

FINANCIALLY SUPPORTING MEMBERS

The membership composed of students, individuals, families, businesses, nonprofit organizations, chambers of commerce, and foundations that provide financial support on an annual or one-time donation basis.

Subtotal **353 Members**

Retention Rate **67%**

HONORARY LIFETIME MEMBERS

Honorary memberships given to students, individuals, families, businesses, nonprofit organizations, chambers of commerce, and foundations that have provided extraordinary support to the organization.

Subtotal: **30 Members**

HONORARY LEADERSHIP MEMBERS

Memberships given to individuals in public leadership roles related to the Parkway.

Subtotal: **270 Members**

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

The membership comprised of community members who have donated time and support working on one of several committees and/or advisory groups, or who are part of a community leadership group.

Subtotal: **37 Members**

TOTAL MEMBERSHIP **690 Members**

Strategic Plan (2009-2014)

The American River Parkway Preservation Society Strategy & Implementation

Preserve, Protect & Strengthen the American River Parkway *For As Long As The River Runs Through It* 2009 – 2014

Introduction

The leadership in our community has a responsibility to create a vision that preserves, protects and strengthens the treasured resource of the American River Parkway in perpetuity.

We have invested our first five years—since our organization was founded in 2003—pursuing a strategy of organizational capacity building and conducting research in the practical approaches, emanating from our guiding principles, we've determined can address the critical issues impacting the Parkway, and communicating with our members and the public those results.

Six Critical Issues & Corresponding Guiding Principles

1) Continuing depletion of public funding to provide vital ongoing maintenance, facility repair, law enforcement presence, invasive plant management, and fully restore a sense of safety for those using our priceless public resource.

Our Guiding Principle: Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it's a necessity.

2) Continuing pressure on the river, whether through flooding, illegal sewage discharge, or taking water for new development, hurts the salmon and other aquatic life.

Our Guiding Principle: What's good for the salmon is good for the river.

3) Continuing habitat devastation, fires, and pollution from widespread illegal camping by the homeless, primarily in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway.

Our Guiding Principle: Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway: Social and environmental justice calls upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.

4) Continuing development pressure to build large homes along the Parkway edges, intruding on the view space, and encroaching into the commons.

Our Guiding Principle: If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.

5) Continuing exclusion of responsible usage by new Parkway user groups is contrary to the spirit upon which public ownership of a natural resource is predicated.

Our Guiding Principle: Regarding new parkway usages: Inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.

6) Continuing encasement of open space, restricting suburban community development upon which a sustainable tax base funding necessary public works is built, is contrary to sound future planning.

Our Guiding Principle: The suburban lifestyle—as surrounds the American River Parkway—which is imbued within the aspirational center of the California Dream and whose vision is woven into the heart of the American Dream, is a deeply loved way of life whose sustainability we all desire.

This past five year period resulted in the creation of our first strategic plan—designed to guide our work from 2004 to 2009—a stable membership base of about 700, designation of an annual parkway advocate (five individuals were acknowledged), and regular communications (letters, articles, daily blogging, monthly e-letters, quarterly newsletters, annual organizational reports and four research reports covering critical issues, and periodic planning position papers).

All of this information is available on our website.

Strategic Summary

We will be investing the next five years in two directions; one major, the other ongoing.

The major work will focus around trying to encourage local government to bring into reality the one idea from our research into approaches that can most significantly impact the major critical issues—funding and management—which is the creation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to govern the Parkway.

The ongoing work will focus on continuing to help build a community knowledge base around the results of our four research reports, buttressed by new information that becomes available.

The American River Parkway is the most valuable natural resource in our community and one of the most valuable in the nation.

Because of this singular nature, it has the potential to be governed through a singular process, a Joint Powers Authority (JPA), as other signature park areas in the country are governed.

This type of governance will give our Parkway the dedicated management and fund raising capability that are so necessary to retain and enhance its premier local and national status.

Implementation Summary

To help create an environment where the JPA policy concept we have presented become accepted public policy it is important to provide information about successful adaptations of the concept to other public park areas in the nation, to the public and public leadership through the following venues.

Community Information

- Daily blogging: The Parkway Blog at <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/> is part of the ongoing work of ARPPS public education and advocacy around public policy issues that

may be related to the Parkway and the adjacent communities along the American River in Sacramento, California. (365 blog postings annually)

- Daily letters to members of the public: We will be sending information to members of the public, concerning the advisability of creating a JPA to govern the Parkway. (1,100 letters annually)
- Monthly e-letters to membership and public leadership: We will continue the monthly e letters, with a focus, when possible, on JPA governance. (12 annually)
- Quarterly newsletters to membership and public leadership: We will continue the quarterly newsletters with a focus, when possible, on JPA governance. (4 annually)
- Regular letters to the editor: We will seek opportunities to send letters that focus on JPA governance. (4-10 annually)
- Occasional articles in local publications: We will seek to have articles published that look at governance by a JPA and a nonprofit conservancy as a viable option for the Parkway. (1-3 annually)
- Occasional policy planning papers: We will, when possible, cover the viability of Parkway governance by a JPA. (1-3 annually)
- Organizational report (1 annually)

Public Forums

- Regular forums around Parkway issues: We will seek opportunities to conduct public forums around the issue of JPA governance. (1-2 annually)
- Presentations to local business and neighborhood organizations: We will seek the opportunity to present information about JPA governance. (1-2 annually)
- Meetings with public leadership: We will meet with public leadership to discuss the option of JPA governance. (4-6 annually)

Study Mission

- Advocate for a study mission to the San Dieguito River Park in San Diego, which is governed by a JPA.

Review & Update

This plan is subject to annual review and updating every five years.

Status Summary

Our Guiding Principles, Critical Issues & Suggested Solutions: Status of Progress

Guiding Principles

- 1) *Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it's a necessity.*
- 2) *What's good for the salmon is good for the river.*
- 3) *Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway: Social and environmental justice calls upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.*
- 4) *If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.*
- 5) *Regarding new parkway usages: Inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.*
- 6) *The suburban lifestyle—as surrounds the American River Parkway—which is imbued within the aspirational center of the California Dream and whose vision is woven into the heart of the American Dream, is a deeply loved way of life whose sustainability we all desire.*

Status: These guiding principles—Number 6 was added in 2011—still animate our work, being prioritized as warranted.

Critical Issues/Solutions

We encourage policy discussions about the Parkway, addressing the five critical issues and our proposed solutions.

1) Continuing depletion of public funding to take care of the Parkway.

Solution: *Create a Joint Powers Authority and nonprofit organization for daily management and fundraising.*

Status: Being discussed by a designated committee with representation from Sacramento County and the cities of Sacramento, Folsom, & Rancho Cordova.

2) Continuing pressure on the river, whether through flooding, illegal sewage discharge, or taking water for new development, hurts the salmon and other aquatic life. **Solution:** *Build the Auburn Dam.*

Status: On hold, but still a congressionally approved dam site which could be revived by Congress.

3) Continuing habitat devastation, fires, and pollution from widespread illegal camping by the homeless in the Lower Reach.

Solution: *Strengthen and enforce laws against illegal camping.*

Status: While the legal argument—that has had some success—that sleeping in public is not illegal, has given some pause to some local jurisdictions in enforcement and strengthening laws against public camping in the Parkway, the increase in the aggressiveness of panhandlers congregating in struggling downtown areas, has caused other local areas to *increase* their efforts to restrict public camping.

4) Continuing development pressure to build large homes along the Parkway edges, intruding on the view space, and encroaching into the commons.

Solution: *Prohibit such new building.*

Status: The new Parkway Plan strengthened the restrictions.

5) Continuing exclusion of responsible usage by new Parkway user groups is contrary to the spirit upon which public ownership of a natural resource is predicated.

Solution: *Give such groups an opportunity to make their case.*

Status: New groups seeking access to the Parkway, such as dogs-without-leases groups, mountain-bike groups, disc-golf groups, mini-train groups, etc. are still finding little opportunity to present their proposals—which almost always includes doing the maintenance and initial set-up themselves—to the Parkway governing agency which has traditionally favored passive recreation over active.

6) Continuing encasement of open space, restricting suburban community development upon which a sustainable tax base funding necessary public works is built, is contrary to sound future planning.

Solution: *Support the growth of suburban communities.*

Status: There is an advocacy element in the Sacramento region which does not support suburban communities, and we shall continue to note that they are where the majority of people wish to live, and that planning decisions need to reflect this.

Conclusion

Our work continues to resonate with public leadership and in July ARPPS founder David Lukenbill was honored to hear from Mayor Kevin Johnson of Sacramento requesting a meeting to talk about the American River Parkway, and on August 1st David hosted a private one-on-one meeting at his home with the Mayor and was very much heartened by the direction of their discussion.

It is obvious Mayor Johnson has thought a lot about the Parkway and the various issues surrounding its current troubles, from the illegal camping issue, about which he has been hosting a Mayoral Task Force to address, to the larger-picture issue of someday seeing a county encompassing bike trail.

Both of these issues are thorny and have historically been somewhat immovable, but what they also both share is a crying need for executive level leadership and it appears that the start he has taken on homelessness will possibly now be applied to regional trails and this is really great news for the Parkway.

Any county encompassing bike trail will clearly be centered through the Parkway, continue down the Sacramento River Parkway/Greenway, perhaps amble over to the Cosumnes River Preserve and, based on the visionary map from the Sacramento Valley Conservancy, connect up with the Deer Creek Hills Preserve and turn north through the East Sacramento County Woodlands to Folsom and the connection to the Parkway.

ARPPS has envisioned a larger trail system written about in our 2007 report—on our website—*The American River Parkway: Governance, Ecoregionalism, and Heritage, A Vision & Policy Primer*.

As an avid bicyclist, Mayor Johnson yearns for a more extensive system of local trails and in that respect he can carry the visions of many of us—bicyclists or not—who hope to see the wonderful and historical natural areas of our community become more accessible to all.

His leadership around this issue is eagerly anticipated.

Appendix I: E-Letters

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #101: October 6, 2010

Auburn Dam: Still an Option

Even though most observers have written off the Auburn Dam, the fact remains that it is still the only option available that can provide the water storage that will allow dam operators to control river flow appropriately.

Fortunately, there is one local congressman—Tom McClintock—who still understands the importance of building the Auburn Dam, which will stabilize the water temperature and flow in the Lower American River—crucial for the salmon and the physical integrity of the Parkway—as well as provide Sacramento a 500 year level of flood protection, currently at the 200 year level.

A July 2010 editorial from the Sacramento Bee, notes Congressman Tom McClintock's unwavering commitment to the dam.

An excerpt.

“Rep. Tom McClintock of Elk Grove is a rock-ribbed Republican who staunchly opposes expanding the federal government, even if a project benefits his district.

“So it gets attention when he teams up with Democratic Sen. Barbara Boxer, of all people, to push for a national historic site near Coloma....

“Now that McClintock has crossed that Rubicon, there's another urgent matter in his district that deserves his attention.

“The Auburn State Recreation Area, one of the most popular treasures in the state parks system, draws nearly a million hikers, rafters, mountain bikers, horseback riders and others to its rugged canyons each year. But it is in jeopardy because the federal Bureau of Reclamation plans to cut off funding next year.

“The area needs more facilities and some tender loving care – and the best approach could very well be to get the National Park Service or National Forest Service to partner with the state.

“Granted, it might be a bridge too far for McClintock, who still desperately wants someone – federal taxpayers, perhaps? – to build the colossal Auburn dam. (“The Auburn recreation area is destined to become Lake Auburn,” he says.)

“On that, however, he's swimming against a strong current. There's intense, vocal opposition, and no apparent state or federal money to pay for the project. Until the state water board reverses its December 2008 revocation of water rights, the plan is officially dead.”

Retrieved July 25, 2010 from <http://www.sacbee.com/2010/07/25/2911615/mcclintock-crosses-a-wide-rubicon.html>

In a February 2010 talk to the California Association of Water Agencies, Congressman McClintock said:

“Here is my fourth concern: the outrageous decision by the State Water Resources Control Board to withdrawal the federal development rights for the Auburn Dam. If we are to take the position that the Auburn Dam will never be completed – the footing for which was constructed more than three decades ago – then it is clear there will be no new dams of any significance.

“The Auburn Dam promises 2.3 million acre feet of water storage, 800 megawatts of hydroelectricity – again, the cleanest and cheapest electricity it is possible to produce – and 400 year flood protection for the Sacramento Delta. As long as the Auburn Dam sits uncompleted, promises of any significant new dam construction in the future ring utterly hollow.”

Retrieved July 25, 2010 from <http://mcclintock.house.gov/2010/02/association-of-california-water-agencies.shtml>

It is summed up well in this recent letter to the editor of the Sacramento Bee

“Auburn dam resurfaces

“Re "Katrina lessons yet to be learned" (Editorial, Aug 25): The Bee laments that not enough is being done to protect New Orleans from another flood like Katrina that destroyed the city. The editorial states the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency is working for 200-year flood protection in Natomas, and comments "even that may not be enough."

“All involved in local flood protection know we need flood protection from at least a 500-year storm, and that an Auburn dam would provide much of the protection.

“Sacramento is the most poorly protected city in the United States. Further, an Auburn dam would provide additional water storage to protect the Delta, and for local use. Added would be environmentally clean electric power generation, and a new recreational facility on the north and middle forks of the American River.

“Yet the governor and the state's elected congressional delegation seem unwilling to approach the federal government to provide its 50 percent share of the money for the dam. The rest of the cost would be 25 percent from the state, and 25 percent from the local water, power and recreational interests benefiting from its facilities. It's time to begin for our own safety.

– Joe Sullivan

Auburn Dam Council”

Retrieved August 27, 2010 from <http://www.sacbee.com/2010/08/27/2986010/letters-to-the-editor.html#ixzz0xp4W7bkn>

P.S. #1: The latest Parkway Rangers Report can be accessed here:
<http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> (scroll to bottom of page)

P.S. #2: The ARPPS Annual Organizational Report for 2010 has been posted to our website,
http://www.arpps.org/ARPPS_Annual_Report_2010.pdf

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #102: November 8, 2010

Illegal Camping by the Homeless in Parkway

The two Parkway rangers that had been assigned to patrol the illegal camping in the Lower Reach area of the Parkway—from Discovery Park to Cal Expo—have been let go due to county budgetary concerns.

These rangers had been given that assignment largely due to the continued public safety concerns and energetic advocacy from the North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, (see their Parkway page at <http://www.northsacramento-chamber.org/speaking-5.html>) the Woodlake Neighborhood Association and our organization.

What we now fear, is that the situation will return to that of 2004, when this article from former ARPPS board member Marie Wilson was published in the *Sacramento News and Review*.

Guest Comment

Can't see the river for the trash

By Marie Wilson

My companion opened the door of the car to let his dog out. Immediately, someone began shouting expletives at us, and two dogs began snarling and growling in our direction. Several homeless people appeared to be permanently camped in the shade of the trees with nearby trash strewn everywhere.

That was my introduction to the “pristine” entry to the American River Parkway in North Sacramento. The definition of pristine is: “uncontaminated by civilization; free from soil or decay, fresh and clean.”

Although the American River itself was clear, clean and quiet, the rest of the area, from the trail to the banks of the river, was anything but pristine. We walked on the trails for about two miles, during which time I saw one campsite after another. There were campfires, broken tree branches, piles of trash, shopping carts, human excrement, abandoned bicycles, a weed-cutter and a broken bike lock, plus three separate locations where fires had burned the brush and trees--in one instance, right down to the riverbank.

Conversely, I recently sat at the bank of the American River in Fair Oaks near the Capitola Bridge, where I felt safe and saw no signs of homeless campers, trash, etc.

Why is one area of the river so well cared for and truly deserving of the description “pristine,” while another area near the confluence of the American and Sacramento rivers, and at the beginning of the bike trail, is a disgrace? I would never return to an area overrun with trash and illegal campers and fraught with crime.

In the past two years, a number of crimes have occurred in that general area, including numerous robberies and rapes, and there was a homicide about two years ago. The offenders are rarely caught.

In the early 1980s, I lived in the Santa Cruz area, where a “no-tolerance zone” was established in the popular downtown Pacific Street Mall. In a recent conversation with Len LaBarth, city editor for the Santa Cruz paper, he said that the success of such a zone depends on enforcement. In Sacramento County, we have a law that says camping along the American River Parkway is illegal. Why do we have to wait for additional crimes to occur before such enforcement takes place?



Marie Wilson is active in the North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce and the American River Parkway Preservation Society

Retrieved November 15, 2004 from <http://www.newsreview.com/issues/sacto/2004-11-11/guest.asp>

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #103: December 8, 2010

New Group Working on Parkway Funding

Parkway Funding

A new group working to develop options for funding county parks has been meeting—replacing the old group who met for several years without success—and one of the options they are considering is a nonprofit conservancy, which is a very good thing.

We were invited to become part of this group in its beginning stages a couple of years ago, but the precondition for inclusion was acceptance of a tax increase strategy, which we could not agree to do, knowing that there is a better way to help the Parkway. <http://www.arpps.org/strategy.html>

Once you enter into a tax-increase strategy, it becomes normative, and future increases are certain, but our approach, utilizing philanthropy and social enterprise, is much more resilient.

The group's first progress report has been posted at http://www.sarariverwatch.org/progress_report_1.doc and their draft report at

An excerpt from the first progress report.

“Progress Report No. 1 SUMMARY

September 7, 2010

“Clearly, this is a time of both crisis and opportunity. The continuing County budget crisis threatens our Regional Parks and Open Space System. Either we rise to the challenge of funding our Regional Parks and Open Space System or bear witness to the loss of our magnificent public Parkways and Open Space throughout the Sacramento region. The Grassroots Working Group is a response to this crisis.

“Mandated Time Line: County Regional Parks Department staff has advised that any proposal needing voter approval must be submitted to the voters at the November 2012 general election.

“Grassroots Working Group: Membership of the Grassroots Working Group is listed in the report. Persons serving on the Grassroots Working Group serve as individuals.

“Trust for Public Land: The Trust for Public Land (TPL) has been engaged to provide (a) feasibility research for options selected by the Working Group, (b) conduct professionally administered, statistically valid public opinion survey through telephone interviews of randomly selected voters in Sacramento County, and (c) provide recommendations for a finance strategy, ballot language, including legal parameters, examples of successful ballot questions and assist in presentation of results. Major milestones for the TPL work and associated Grassroots Working Group activities are as follows:

- Conduct Feasibility Study and submit Draft Report to the Grassroots Working Group November 1, 2010
- Complete Public Opinion Survey December 10, 2010
- TPL provides recommendations to Grassroots Working Group December 21, 2010
- Grassroots Working Group provides recommendations to public and Board of Supervisors January 28, 2011

- Summit Meeting for public consideration of Grassroots Working Group recommendations February 5, 2011"
-

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #104: January 5, 2011

Versailles & Gibson Ranch

The ARPPS Board of Directors voted to support the Ose proposal for Gibson Ranch at our meeting of 1/3/11.

In The Sunday, December 26, 2010 issue of the *New York Times*, we are informed that:

“Versailles, one of the most visited monuments in the world, will soon be able to offer tourists a place to rest for the night...

“The Hotel du Grand Controle, an annex building on the edge of the Versailles estate, will be transformed into a 23-room hotel, administrators of the publicly owned palace announced recently.

“The restoration and modernization of the 17th-century building will be overseen by a Belgian company called Ivy International, which has taken out a 30-year lease on the property. **The project is a rare transfer of control of a French public heritage site to the private sector.**

“It’s a pioneer initiative,” Jean Jacques Aillagon, the chairman of the Versailles palace, said in a news conference in Paris. **“The building was given to us in a dilapidated state; my concern was to save it.”** (page TR. 2, highlighting added)

Saving shuttered Gibson Ranch from further dilapidation and whether the County should approve management by a forprofit entity led by former Congressman Doug Ose is the issue.

It is an issue which has been of interest to our organization as it addresses much of what we have also found lacking in local government management of the American River Parkway.

Our organization has long called for the use of innovative funding and management practices for the Parkway that are being used successfully with other parks and the concepts embedded in the Ose proposal are congruent with those practices.

When the board of supervisors agreed to study the privatization proposal in November of 2010, the opposition—County Parks and aligned nonprofits—appeared to build their case primarily from the damage it might do to their in-house regional park proposal, which would increase taxes, while the Ose proposal would save taxpayers money.

The proposal to open the Ranch to the public under a lease management agreement comes from a family with a long-established record of public service and philanthropy, is supported by many locally, and is aligned with standard lease management agreements involving some form of privatization.

Given that, the opposition—especially that voiced in the editorial pages of the *Sacramento Bee*—seemed overwrought.

We were very pleased when the county agreed to move forward in their consideration of the plan to turn over management of the park to a forprofit entity.

With final approval, which we wholeheartedly support, it will be refreshing to see innovation and creativity become part of the mix of local parks management which, if it is as successful as we anticipate, may also impact future decisions regarding the American River Parkway.

If it's good enough for Versailles, it's good enough for Gibson Ranch!

P.S. #1: The latest Parkway Rangers Report can be accessed here:

<http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> (scroll to bottom of page)

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #104-A: January 15, 2011

Versailles & Gibson Ranch, Addendum

As noted in our January 5th e letter, ARPPS supports the Ose proposal to manage Gibson Ranch as it represents the type of innovative management—by a forprofit—congruent with social enterprise strategies utilized by innovative nonprofits.

Social enterprise—see Wikipedia at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_enterprise , is exactly the type of thinking able to bring market-level funding to bear on essentially social goals; which the Ose proposal, at its core, is—revitalizing a valuable community resource which will remain part of the public commons, but benefit from private market strategies.

An extended version of our eletter has been posted to the Sacramento Press website at <http://www.sacramentoexpress.com/tag/politics> , and the original, shorter version is on our website at <http://www.arpps.org/news.html>

Gibson Ranch has set up a website to allow those who support the proposal to sign a petition of support and it is at <http://www.gibson-ranch.com/> and we urge all those who support this innovative proposal for a major part of our regional parks system to do so.

Remember, if it's good enough for Versailles, it's good enough for Gibson Ranch!

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #105: February 7, 2011

The What If Floods...That Have Already happened

Two letters were recently published in the Sacramento Bee.

The first one is by ARPPS President, Michael Rushford, published January 22, 2011, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/22/3342844/letters-to-the-editor.html>

Commuting by kayak

Re "The 'Big One' might be a flood" (Page A1, Jan. 14): <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/14/3323275/the-big-one-might-be-a-flood.html>

I hope our new governor read the recent story about the U.S. Geological Survey report, which predicted California will likely experience a catastrophic storm that would put Sacramento and much of the Valley under 15 feet of water.

Our state has been unprepared for such a storm. Nothing short of raising Oroville Dam to its design height and completing a full service dam at Auburn will provide 500-year flood protection necessary to withstand such a storm.

Gov. Jerry Brown's appointment of eco-warrior Jerry Meral as deputy secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency makes it clear this governor is no more interested in flood protection than he was 40 years ago. Meral, a kayaker who opposes dams, will be able to paddle to work.

- Michael Rushford, Carmichael

The second one is by ARPPS senior policy director, David H. Lukenbill, published February 6, 2011, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/06/3378634/letters-to-the-editor.html>

Address parkway safety – now

Re "Big surprise: Blight returns to river" (Editorial, Jan 30): <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/30/3360930/big-surprise-blight-returns-to.html>

The underlying premise in this editorial regarding illegal camping in the lower reach of the American River Parkway is: Like it or not, the health of the American River Parkway and homelessness are inextricably tied.

If that means that our local homelessness issues need to be resolved before the public safety issue in the parkway is resolved, that is wrong.

Public safety in the parkway is a single, local issue that needs to be resolved – as are all public safety issues – immediately.

– David H. Lukenbill, Sacramento, senior policy director, American River Parkway Preservation Society

The What If Floods...That Have Already happened

We are certain to see, at some point in the future, more major winter storms at a 500 year level comparable to those of the 19th century that hit the West Coast, noted in the Sacramento Bee story excerpted and linked below.

Sacramento was then and would be again, in very deep water!

We believe dams are the solution:

Raising Shasta to its originally engineered height, posted on here <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2006/04/shasta-dam-tripling-its-water-storage.html>

Building the Auburn Dam giving us the 500 year protection necessary to protect us against such storms, posted about here <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2009/02/auburn-dam.html> and here <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2009/03/auburn-dam.html>

The US Geological Survey studied the what if, and has published a report, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/> which the Sacramento Bee reported on, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/14/3323275/the-big-one-might-be-a-flood.html> and the last two paragraphs of the excerpt (highlighting added) are the bottom line for us.

An excerpt.

“California has more risk of catastrophic storms than any other region in the country – even the Southern hurricane states, according to a new study released Thursday.

“The two-year study by the U.S. Geological Survey is the most thorough effort yet to assess the potential effects of a "worst-case" storm in California.

“It builds on a new understanding of so-called atmospheric rivers, a focusing of high-powered winds that drag a fire hose of tropical moisture across the Pacific Ocean, pointed directly at California for days on end. The state got a relatively tame taste of the phenomenon in December.

“The team of experts that developed the scenario can't say when it will happen. But they do say it has happened in the past and is virtually certain to strike again.

"This storm, with essentially the same probability as a major earthquake, is potentially four to five times more damaging," said Lucy Jones, USGS chief scientist on the study. "That's not something that is in the public consciousness."

“The study aims to fix that.

“A conference on the subject, ending today at California State University, Sacramento, brings together hundreds of emergency planners to discuss the worst-case storm and how to prepare for it.

“The USGS is assessing a variety of natural hazards across the country. California was chosen for the latest project, called ArkStorm, because the state "has the potential for the biggest rainfall events in the country," Jones said.

“In December, an atmospheric river threw a series of wet storms at the state, breaking rainfall records in many areas across California. One part of Los Angeles County got 17 inches of rain in three days. Disasters were declared in 11 counties.

“In the study, researchers used computer models and a composite of three historical storms to estimate a worst-case event: a torrent of tropical rain for nine straight days.

“It amounts to a 500-year storm. In the lingo of disaster managers, that does not mean it happens only once every 500 years, but that it has two-tenths percent chance of occurring in any given year.

“The Central Valley and the Sacramento region are likely to suffer the worst effects because they lie within a funnel for the state's biggest rivers.”

P.S.: The latest Parkway Rangers Report can be accessed here:

<http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> (scroll to bottom of page)

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

*The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet,
duties at your hand, the path of God just before you.* Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #106: March 7, 2011

Illegal Camping in the Parkway

As reported February 9, 2011, by the *Sacramento Bee*, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/09/3387997/homeless-must-leave-camp.html> removal of the illegal tent city established by the homeless, is a very positive sign that public safety in the Parkway remains a central focus of some public leadership, but as this article <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/03/05/3451201/safe-ground-offers-strength-in.html> from March 5, 2011 notes, the campers are just moving to other sites on the Parkway.

As can be seen in our blog posts, [here http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping.html](http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping.html), [here http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_05.html](http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_05.html) and [here, http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_07.html](http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_07.html) of earlier *Sacramento Bee* articles from as far back as 2001, the issue remains a difficult one.

Sacramento, with nice weather as a backdrop, has allowed the creation of a Parkway homeless camping magnet, providing easy access to domestic services by programs in the Richards Blvd/12th Street area within walking distance of the camping areas in the Parkway.

Based on strategies that have worked elsewhere, we proposed solutions in our 2005 report: *The American River Parkway Lower Reach Area: A Corroded Crown Jewel, Restoring the Luster*, (pages 25-42) <http://www.arpps.org/report.pdf>

The contrast between the March 5, 2011 article in the *Sacramento Bee* and the March 3, 2011 article by Bob Slobe in *Sacramento News & Review*, which is included here, is remarkable.

What is also remarkable is how few public leaders, excepting County Supervisor Phil Serna and the North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, and Parkway advocacy groups, other than ARPPS, are taking a public stand protecting the Parkway, rather than, by their silence, the illegal camping that is slowly destroying it.

No one is against those who are truly homeless and wish to improve their life (most Sacramentans care for and pray for their suffering to cease, offering significant help to ensure that) but all of us also have a stake in ensuring public safety and environmental protection in the Parkway.

A strong round of kudos are deserved by Bob Slobe, who has never given up on his vigorous advocacy for public safety in the Parkway, and for County Supervisor Phil Serna who is making the removal of tent cities from the Parkway a reality.

Here is Bob's article published in the *Sacramento News & Review* on March 3, 2011, with permission, in its entirety.

Sac homeless advocates have it wrong

North Sac resident thinks homeless advocates have it wrong when it comes to the Parkway

By Bob Slobe, a developer, community activist and a longtime resident of the once-separate city of North Sacramento

This article was published on 03.03.11

The very first thing a poor North Sacramentan thinks when considering a walk or hike or boat-fishing outing in our section of the American River Parkway is, “Will I be safe?” The second thought is, “No, I won’t.” Here, it is never, “Should I bring a jacket?” It is, “I hope I’ll make it out alive.”

This is our reality, because a group of homeless advocates, none of whom live near our struggling community—none who eat here, shop here or even drive through this part of town regularly—want the poorest of the poor to give over to the “homeless” their closest park and nature area, the Woodlake Reach of the American River Parkway.

Well, to date, they have succeeded; they have turned the Woodlake Reach into “Unsafe Ground.”

I grew up near the Reach, in the once-separate city of North Sacramento. We had everything a family could want: good schools, nearby shopping, a main street, safe streets and parks that were an embarrassment to our neighbor, the city of Sacramento. Our schools were top rate, too; Grant Union High School was a gem. All of that changed after 1964 when we were subsumed by the city of Sacramento in a merger. We all watched as our brand-new police and fire trucks were taken over the river the day after the merger and replaced by the city of Sacramento’s aging ones. Our per-capita median income went from a point above that of the city of Sacramento’s to less than a third in a flash.

Today, North Sacramento has become the ultimate repository for a growing city’s ills: huge concentrations of low-income housing and painfully unsuccessful social programs. It’s no surprise that our schools and public facilities are in relative ruins. Sacramento has managed to dump every possible challenge to health and prosperity on our community, taking the Archie Bunker approach to social programming: “Edith, put ‘em all on an island.” And apparently Sacramento is not yet done. The Parkway’s Woodlake Reach may be the last victory ... or failure, depending on your point of view.

I’m passionate about this issue, because my family gave over what is now 10 percent of the Parkway, back in 1986. At the time, we envisioned our entire community—including North Sacramento—taking full advantage of the out of doors and our rivers, in perpetuity. We knew the potential, because at my grandmother’s invitation, there were summer camps and other nature activities organized along the river near Woodlake.

To our dismay, we watched as the area became a haven for camping, crime and drugs. Bums burned the oldest native walnut grove west of the Mississippi to the ground, and looted centuries-old Maidu sacred sites. Our Parkway recreation became a game of dodge-the-discarded-needles and steer clear the pile of feces. Our attention was diverted away from the native kite or hawk and towards the litter of porn and the garbage pile. It is impossible not to conclude that the county has been a failed steward of the Woodlake Reach, turning its back on this wretched stretch, akin to the county’s own deformed thalidomide babies. I know some

will shrink at this comparison. But experience has shown that it's only through uncivil discourse that we can draw attention to the problem.

What North Sacramento needs is recreational experiences equal to those of tony neighborhoods elsewhere, not bum camping that denies it. Given the challenges facing the working poor population in North Sacramento, a respite from the tough jobs and neighborhoods they face every day should be a given. We should not be burdened with solving problems of illegal camping and the homeless. We should just be able to enjoy a walk, or lie down in the grass in our part of the Parkway and pick animals out of cloud formations—without worrying about getting stuck by a dirty needle, or raped, or even murdered. But that's North Sacramento's Parkway today. Ever in fear.

Real compassion for the homeless is inviting them to your doorstep, in equal shares across rich and poor neighborhoods throughout the region. That is not what the so-called homeless advocates will ever support, because they know that filth, spent drug needles, human feces, environmental destruction and trails littered with pornography will follow. No one wonders why our swell neighborhoods like Curtis Park, Land Park, McKinley Park and Fair Oaks are not burdened by this problem in the same way North Sacramento is. I can't help but conclude it's a form of racism and elitism. Do as I say, not as I do.

If Sacramentans really want to prove we've "got game," we have to rise above endless talk about arenas and the Kings, dive bars and mermaid bars. In the end, what should define us is owning up equally to our biggest challenges. We should return some form of dignity to our poor communities—by sharing the burdens mutually across *all* communities. With respect to the Woodlake Reach of the American River Parkway, I challenge Sacramento and its so-called homeless advocates to take up their share of the burden North Sacramento now carries.

For more information on the history of the American River Parkway and the homeless issue, go to <http://www.northsacramento-chamber.org/speaking-5.html>

Retrieved March 3, 2011 from

<http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=1931840>

P.S.: The latest Parkway Rangers Report can be accessed here:

<http://www.msa2.sacounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> (scroll to bottom of page)

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #107: April 7, 2011

Gibson Ranch Reopens

At the March 23, 2011 Sacramento County Board of Supervisor's Meeting the Ose Proposal for Gibson Ranch Park was approved unanimously

This is a wonderful outcome for this innovative way to provide for Gibson Ranch Park and perhaps a way forward for the other parks in our region suffering from lack of funding and dedicated management.

Congratulations are due to all involved: Doug Ose for a great proposal; the Dry Creek Parkway Advisory Committee, the County Parks Commission and the County Parks Department, for seeing the potential and supporting the plan; for the County Board of Supervisors who helped create a great final product which they approved unanimously; and most of all, for the many residents of the communities adjacent to Gibson Ranch who came out in force to advocate for their beloved park.

As the hearing was wrapping up and Dog Ose was still at the podium, he said that the first thing he was going to do once the Board of Supervisor's approval was in hand was to get on the phone and "order lumber", and so the work to restore the ranch has begun.

We will be periodically visiting the ranch to see how progress is moving along as this very innovative public/private partnership is exactly the type of creative thinking also needed to be brought to the table for the American River Parkway.

It is a sad commentary on the roots of American exceptionalism—which market based capitalism and government innovation has done so much to build and sustain—that the discussion about the private sector partnering with the public can be portrayed as something *not* to be desired.

It is our hope that the success of this public/private parks venture will be the ending of that normative media response in respect to the wonderful parks in our region.

Gibson Ranch reopened April 1st and the Grand Opening is April 23rd

P.S. #1: The latest Parkway Rangers Report can be accessed here:

<http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> (scroll to bottom of page, though no new reports, usually produced monthly, have been released since December 2010.

P.S. #2: A new ARPPS Auburn Dam article was published in *Sacramento Press* at

http://www.sacramento.com/headline/48755/Opinion_Why_we_should_build_the_Auburn_Dam

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

*The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet,
duties at your hand, the path of God just before you.* Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #108: May 9, 2011

Open Letter Sent to County Supervisors on Park Tax Increase Idea

May 6, 2011

OPEN LETTER TO THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

In relation to the May 4, 2011 story in the Sacramento Bee <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/05/04/3599932/sacramento-county-park-district.html> about your possibly considering asking voters to raise the sales tax to pay for a regional park district, we would offer—not a proposal for all of the regional parks—but a proposal for the largest, the American River Parkway.

We propose that you spearhead the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) comprised of the adjacent governments, and the JPA creates a new nonprofit organization to provide daily management and supplemental fundraising for the Parkway.

We have offered details on this strategy—including sample agreement language and JPA membership composition—on our website at <http://www.arpps.org/strategy.html>.

The Parkway is a signature park, with a national reputation, and, by conducting a nationwide search for the appropriate executive director of the nonprofit, you will be able to discover someone with the experience and talent to take the American River Parkway into the future with secure and dedicated funding.

This, of course, will eventually provide more available funding for the other parks in the regional parks department.

Sincerely,

Michael Rushford, Board President
Kris Lea, Board Officer/VP
David Lukenbill, Board Officer/CFO
Rebecca Garrison, Board Member

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: DLukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #109: June 6, 2011

ARPPS Article Published

Funding Sacramento Parks

by David H. Lukenbill, published on May 15, 2011 in Sacramento Press @

http://www.sacramentoexpress.com/headline/50588/Funding_Sacramento_Parks

According to a May 4th *Sacramento Bee* story, Sacramento County Supervisors are considering asking voters to raise the sales tax to pay for a regional park district.

This is a terrible idea, especially during such trying economic times.

A better idea would be to drop the proposal for the regional parks sales tax increase and consider bringing the largest regional park, the American River Parkway, under new management, with supplemental funding to be raised philanthropically.

The American River Parkway is a signature park, the most important recreational area in our region, the most valuable natural resource in our community, and potentially one of the nicest urban/suburban parks in the nation.

The Board of Supervisors could spearhead the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) comprised of representatives from Parkway adjacent governments and a representative of local nonprofit organizations with Parkway concerns.

The JPA then creates a nonprofit organization to provide daily management and supplemental fundraising for the Parkway.

The most successful model of a JPA governed river park is the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park JPA created in 1989 by San Diego County and five cities.

Once the JPA forms the new nonprofit and conducts a national search for the appropriate executive director, they will surely be able to discover someone with the experience and talent to take the American River Parkway into the future with secure and dedicated funding.

Providing this funding and management stability for the largest park in the regional parks department will eventually provide more available funding for the other parks in the department.

There are several reasons why raising taxes to support parks—especially during perilous economic times—is a bad idea, but just a couple should be mentioned.

Taxpayers are already paying for parks, have been for years, and will surely resist paying more.

Doug Ose made the point, as quoted in the *Sacramento Bee* story, "I don't believe there's a shortage of revenue. I believe there's a shortage of management creativity."

[More reasons why this is a bad idea were posted to our blog at <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/05/tax-increase-for-regional-parks.html>]

Government is very good at many things, but the ability to raise taxes, when hampered by the unwillingness of voters to approve the tax increase, is not one of them

Philanthropy is much more resilient, and as we have seen during this period of economic uncertainty, individual philanthropists continued to support those causes they found important.

For many Parkway users, generous financial support will come when it is clear the funding—and management—are dedicated solely to the Parkway.

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

*The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet,
duties at your hand, the path of God just before you.* Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #110: July 6, 2011

The Parkway, the Homeless, & Taxes

Two items in the news recently that impact the Parkway, the call by some to raise sales taxes for a special parks district for regional parks <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/06/05/3675870/board-needs-to-move-quickly-to.html> and the lawsuit against the city <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/06/06/3679128/after-ruling-sacramento-must-figure.html> to pay the homeless--those who were camping illegally in the Parkway and others roused by police—for any belongings they had that may have been lost or destroyed in the process.

Regarding the regional sales tax, it is a bad idea. It is a bad idea to raise taxes and it is a bad idea to shift control of parks from one public entity to another in the hopes that somehow things will be better managed and funded.

County leadership has recently shifted management and funding responsibility (while retaining public ownership and oversight) of two major pieces of regional parks—Gibson Ranch Park and Effie Yeaw Nature Center—to forprofit and nonprofit control respectively, and so far, both efforts appear to be successful.

This is the model that should be used for funding and management of regional parks, spin off those with potential for forprofit or nonprofit management and fundraising and then decide what to do with the remaining elements.

Regarding homeless lawsuits, we hope the city appeals, and we do not agree with the County choosing to settle, as it is in the interest of the city and county to have the ability to enforce the laws against illegal camping—especially in the Parkway which is bearing the brunt of

illegal camping—without having to resort to laborious efforts involving the identification and storage of property that may or may not be salvageable.

One man's junk is another man's treasure, and it is incumbent upon all of us to treat each other's person and property—including the homeless and their property—with the dignity and respect due to all human beings.

That being said, we cannot over-burden local public safety authorities in the furtherance of their duties to the point where it becomes a utilitarian decision to not enforce the laws rather than to enforce the laws.

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #111: August 9, 2011

Ose on Parks

What Doug Ose has started and been able to accomplish, even in the few months of operating Gibson Ranch, is the type of innovation that should be part of any discussion managing and funding other regional parks, including the American River Parkway.

His recent article in the *Sacramento Bee* presents a compelling strategy to solve the problems currently facing our parks and perhaps the recently vacated county park director's position should be in play, if not by Mr. Ose himself, at the very least, his strategy.

An excerpt.

“For the past year, observers from the Grassroots Working Group to the editorial board of The Bee have consistently suggested that there are significant operational problems within the Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks and Open Space. I couldn't agree more.

“The primary argument has been that there is inadequate funding being allocated by the Board of Supervisors to the parks department to properly maintain the parklands under their control, and voters should therefore pass an increase in local sales taxes dedicated to parks. I couldn't agree less.

“In my view, the essential problem is that the world has changed and the parks department hasn't. Years ago, the department's charter was to acquire land and provide services funded by the county's general fund. In the last few years, it has become apparent that such an approach is not sustainable. The department has been slow to change – or actively resisted it – and now is in a financial corner. On top of that fiscal challenge, the department is saddled with work rules that constrain how it can respond to changing conditions.

“Here are the basic facts. The department controls more than 15,000 acres. Some years ago, a policy decision was made that county parklands shall not be allowed to have any commercial activities within their boundaries. Subsequent public outcry in favor of golf courses and raft rentals and the like has caused that policy to evolve over time, so we now have a hybrid policy where certain commercial activities are allowed but others aren't.

“Why are some commercial activities allowed and others not? If a proposal to develop a portion of the 15,000 acres noted above were to generate significant net revenue to Sacramento County, would that be a good thing or a bad thing?

“This is the crux of the problem.

"Somebody" determined that accumulating vast acreages of land is a good thing.

"Somebody" determined that revenue-generating enterprises located within publicly owned parklands is a bad thing.

“Now, "somebody" is struggling with how to fund the maintenance and operations of these vast acreages.

“Fortunately, there is a path out of this morass.

“First, stop making the problem larger. Place an immediate moratorium on further parkland acquisition/development or acceptances of parkland donations, which cost the county money.

“Second, decide what you want to be as a parks department. Given the long-term challenges of funding for collective bargaining agreements, health care and pensions, the department should evolve into a contract manager of partnerships with third-party operators that meet defined operating standards.

“Third, determine on a case-by-case basis which currently owned parklands are meeting a minimum level of active and passive recreational use by the public. Use actual numbers rather than estimates. Don't game the system to favor "treasured icons." Categorize each property as high-cost/low-use, low-cost/low-use, high-cost/high-use or low-cost/high-use. Keep the low-cost/high-use properties. If you have a property that is not meeting expectations, then get rid of it.

“Fourth, use proceeds from the sale of underutilized properties to fund the necessary repairs and/or maintenance for the retained properties. Concurrently, seek out a partner or partners who can operate the properties more efficiently – the agreement covering Effie Yeaw can serve as a model for such partnerships – and make a business deal with those partners.”

Retrieved July 19, 2011 from <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/07/19/3778071/heres-a-path-to-help-county-retool.html>

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916-486-3856
Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>
Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

American River Parkway Preservation Society

E-Letter #112: September 6, 2011

Nonprofit Management of Parkway: The Model

The model used by us and many others (San Francisco <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2009/12/31/MNGD1B8C54.DTL&> & Pittsburgh <http://www.pittsburghparks.org/the-conservancy> for example) in their discussion and implementation respectively, for having a nonprofit manage their signature parks, is the Central Park Conservancy, <http://www.centralparknyc.org/about/> which has been managing Central Park in New York City for years—raising 85% of the money the park needs—under contract with New York City.

In this recent article from the *New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/16/business/media/16adnewsletter1.html?_r=2 the strategy to renew their fund raising presence is unveiled (and it gives a sense of what could be done here for the Parkway if our strategy <http://www.arpps.org/strategy.html> was implemented) as our Parkway is surely as loved by Sacramentans as is Central Park by New Yorkers.

An excerpt from the *Times* article.

“The nonprofit organization that manages, maintains and raises money for Central Park is using a new campaign to embrace a new identity.

“The campaign got under way early this month. The theme declares that the organization, the Central Park Conservancy, is “Central to the park.”

“The campaign seeks to rebrand the organization, which was founded in 1980, by spotlighting a new logo. Echoing the word play in the theme, the logo is being called a “park mark”; it is a bright-green rectangle, in the shape of Central Park, set against a white background.

“The campaign is being created by a team at the conservancy working with McGarryBowen in New York, part of the Dentsu West unit of Dentsu. McGarryBowen, which creates ads for marketers like Kraft Foods and Verizon Communications, is volunteering its services for the campaign.

“The media agency for the campaign — Zenith Media, part of the ZenithOptimedia Group division of the Publicis Groupe — is also donating its services.

“The campaign is extensive, appearing in both traditional and nontraditional media.

“On the traditional side, there are print advertisements, direct mail and posters for bus shelters and subway platforms.

“On the nontraditional front, there are ads online; apps for the iPhone and Android; a presence on the conservancy’s Web site, centralparknyc.org; and social media like Facebook (facebook.com/centralparknyc) and Twitter (twitter.com/CentralParkBuzz).

“The campaign is indicative of efforts by nonprofit organizations to stand out amid all the ads from profit-making marketers.

“Once, appealing to the altruistic side of the public was often enough for them to elicit a response. Now, organizations, associations, charities and causes need to do more to get the attention of busy, distracted consumers.

“For the conservancy, the emphasis is on conveying the unusual nature of its mission: keeping up Central Park under the terms of a contract with the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation.

“It’s a challenge,” says Douglas Blonsky, president of the conservancy and the Central Park administrator, because “people are not used to understanding that a private organization could be managing a public park.”

“Of the \$37 million annual budget for Central Park, he adds, 85 percent comes from the conservancy.”

David H. Lukenbill, CFO & Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,

Our Community's Natural Heart

2267 University Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95825

Phone: 916-486-3856

Email: Dlukenbill@msn.com

Weblog: <http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/>

Website: <http://www.arpps.org/>

The best things are nearest: breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Robert Louis Stevenson

Appendix II: Newsletters

American River Parkway Preservation Society Newsletter

Issue 28 – Fall 2010

Contents

Announcements	Page 1
1) <i>Parkway Ranger's Monthly Report Posting &</i>	
2) <i>Tax Increase for Parks</i>	
Annual Report: Executive Summary	Page 1
Essay:	Page 2
<i>Homelessness in Sacramento</i>	
Society Information	Page 6

Announcements

- 1) The latest Parkway Rangers report on crimes in the Parkway can be accessed at <http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> , scroll to the bottom of the page.
 - 2) The latest tax increase for state parks would increase car registration fees, but it still does not resolve the same old issue; that any dedicated funding for parks in government coffers is subject to taking when budgets are stretched; which is why our preferred option—especially for the Parkway and other signature parks—is nonprofit management and supplemental funding through philanthropy.
-

Annual Report Executive Summary

Our work over the past year has accomplished two things: **1)** Increased the focus on public safety in the Parkway by placing attention on the illegal camping of registered sex offenders in the Parkway, resulting in their removal; (p. 37) and **2)** continued the focus on a new governance and funding model for the Parkway resulting in further concrete work towards that eventuality, (p. 31)

We continue to keep attention on the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) for governance and the JPA's formation of a nonprofit organization for daily management and supplemental philanthropic fundraising for the Parkway—the model we use, the Central Park Conservancy, raises 85% of funding—and we will continue that focus also.

Our public educational work continues primarily through the written word, and public meetings when available. ARPPS President Michael Rushford and Senior Policy Director,

David H. Lukenbill were able to speak at the April 7, 2010 Woodlake Neighborhood Association meeting, the neighborhood most impacted by illegal camping.

The Senior Policy Director, David H. Lukenbill was interviewed by Laura Brown of *YubaNet.com* for an article about the American River Parkway on January 11, 2010.

Inside Arden, a monthly news magazine distributed to neighborhoods along the Parkway, printed an interview with ARPPS President Michael Rushford in its July 2010 issue, nicely bookending the meeting in Woodlake.

As a policy development organization, our work consists in communicating ideas through available formats, and as this report will show, we have done that. Utilizing daily posting to the Parkway blog, sending open letters to public leaders and editors of local media, having articles published in local media, newsletters and e-letters to membership and community leaders, and the publication of public reports, we hope to enrich public dialogue seeking a comprehensive solution to the problems all agree burden the Parkway; funding, management, and preservation.

The full report is on our website at [http://www.arpps.org/ARPPS Annual Report 2010.pdf](http://www.arpps.org/ARPPS%20Annual%20Report%202010.pdf)

Essay ***Homelessness in Sacramento***

The homelessness issue and the long-term illegal camping by the homeless, which is having a corrosive impact on the Lower Reach of the Parkway—from Discovery Park to Cal Expo—continues to play a role in local politics, as evidenced by this quote from a recent article in the Sacramento Bee regarding mayoral strategy:

For now, that means concentrating on a handful of projects launched by his office over the past 20 months, most notably a push to attract green technology jobs to the region and find more permanent housing options for the homeless.

Retrieved September 26, 2010 from

<http://www.sacbee.com/2010/09/26/3056911/kevin-johnson-still-learning-on.html>

To give us some context in thinking about “permanent housing options for the homeless”, let’s look at two articles written in 1997 (but still very relevant) examining the roots of the two dominant philosophies regarding how to help the homeless—give them fish or teach them how to fish—as a way to reveal some history about this issue to help us in our decision making now.

One of the most important thought leaders in the homelessness issue is Heather McDonald, Senior Fellow and Contributing Editor of *City Journal*, the quarterly magazine published by the Manhattan Institute.

In the first article, *Homeless Advocates in Outer Space*, she wrote:

In eighteenth-century London, aristocratic elites visited the mad in Bedlam Hospital and called it entertainment. In twentieth-century New York, professional elites visit the mad in the streets and call it homeless outreach. The results in both cases are the same: the objects of attention are left to rot in their own filth, perhaps to lose a limb or two to gangrene, or to die. The intention, however, could not be more different: in modern times, such hands-off treatment shows "sensitivity" and "respect."

Only by entering the realm of political myth can one understand how such deliberate neglect could constitute professional treatment. Contemporary homeless policy is one of the odder expressions of utopian political fantasy since Rousseau famously denounced society as oppressive and corrupting. For their advocates, the homeless are potent symbols of heroic alienation, concrete embodiments of the advocates' own adolescent longing for rebellion and nonconformity. The plight of the homeless, in the advocates' view, is a searing indictment of American culture. Should the left ever lose interest in dramatizing the Rousseauian myth—an unlikely event—the homeless will disappear, removed to safer abodes....

A sane homeless policy would acknowledge two basic realities. First, many people on the streets need treatment, not housing. For the sickest, legislators need to change rules against involuntary confinement, and states need to recommission mental hospitals emptied by deinstitutionalization. Second, for the rest of the homeless the best medicine is the expectation of responsible behavior—the expectation of work and of civil and lawful conduct in public spaces. (See "*Who Says the Homeless Should Work?*" Summer 1997.) Accordingly, opinion leaders, from politicians to ministers, should decry all types of no-strings-attached handouts, such as no-demand soup kitchens and indiscriminate alms-giving to beggars, which simply subsidize self-destructive behavior. They should oppose allowing the homeless to turn public spaces into hobo encampments. Effective charity asks for reciprocity from the recipient, building patterns of work and discipline; to exempt the homeless from the rules that everyone else lives by infantilizes them permanently.

The advocates, clouded by ideology, may see the homeless as martyrs to American injustice or as free spirits marching to a different drummer, but by now most of the rest of us see them as disordered or confused souls who, for more than a decade, thanks to advocate-designed policies, have been marching to disaster.

Retrieved September 26, 2010 from http://www.city-journal.org/html/7_4_a1.html

In reaching a decision about housing for the homeless, it is hoped mayoral thinking will embrace the time-tested values of hard work and personal responsibility that have helped people down on their luck rise in life, while acknowledging the mental help needed by many living on the streets and secluded away in thickets along the Parkway.

The concept of working your way out of trouble is embodied by the program Ready Willing & Able, whose mission is built upon the simple concept:

...that a formerly homeless person could create a viable existence if he were able to obtain even a minimum wage low skill job, rent an affordable room and stay off drugs.

Retrieved September 26, 2010 from <http://www.doe.org/about/?aboutID=2>

Ready Willing & Able is a concept that could be implemented in Sacramento and we facilitated a series of meetings around it that are summarized in our 2005 Research Report in the section about Illegal Camping in the Lower Reach (pages 25-37) that is available on our website at <http://www.arpps.org/report.pdf> .

Helping those who—for whatever reason—are not helping themselves, and doing it effectively, requires an acknowledgement that all human beings have the potential to help themselves and given a chance, given a push, will respond.

George McDonald, the founder of Ready Willing & Able, encountered the mentality of the no-personal responsibility approach early in his work, as noted in this second article, “*Who Says the Homeless Should Work?*” by a *City Journal* colleague of Heather McDonald, Sol Stern:

The political arguments often get testy on New York 1's popular evening TV talk-fest, The Road to City Hall. But it's hard to remember anything quite like the recent confrontation between George McDonald and Steven Banks, two of the founding fathers of the city's homeless-rights movement. McDonald instantly went on the attack, accusing the city's oldest homeless-advocacy group, the Coalition for the Homeless, of trying to torpedo the work-training program that his own organization, the Doe Fund, runs for residents of the Harlem Men's Shelter. Banks, the Coalition's high-profile lawyer, countered that McDonald and the Doe Fund were exploiting the shelter residents by charging them \$65 a week for rent. Dumbfounded by the charges and countercharges, the show's genial, ultraliberal host pleaded, "You're supposed to be on the same side. What's going on here?"

What's going on is a sea change in attitudes toward the homeless. The Coalition and other advocates remain wholly committed to the entitlement-oriented culture of the old shelter system, along with the belief that the cause of homelessness is a lack of affordable housing. But the Giuliani administration has other ideas. It has been contracting with tough-love programs like the Doe Fund to take over city homeless shelters, a new and, so far, quite successful approach that fundamentally challenges the old culture of dependency. Rejecting the Coalition's insistence that "housing, housing, housing" is the only solution for homelessness, George McDonald's program is based on the premise that the only real answer to the problem is work and personal responsibility. As McDonald recently told me, "My experience with homeless people has brought me to the conclusion that they are more capable of helping themselves than I thought, and than the advocates still think."

George McDonald's public challenge to the Coalition's entitlement philosophy and his unexpected emergence as an ally of the Giuliani administration represent a breathtaking 180-degree political turn. For no one, not even Steven Banks, has agitated more relentlessly in the trenches of the homeless-rights movement than he. ...

McDonald contends—breaking once more with advocate orthodoxy—that New York, like the rest of America, offers his charges a sufficiency of jobs. "I believe that motivated people in the city of New York who are drug-free and reliable and show up every day for work can always find opportunity," McDonald told me. "Even with high unemployment rates and all the barriers our people have to overcome—prison records, substance-abuse episodes, and spotty employment histories—still they wind up with jobs, because they are so motivated."

But, as Steven Banks suggested on the New York 1 program, aren't these jobs of the "dead-end" variety, leading nowhere? The concept infuriates McDonald: "Going to work, even picking up leaves or sweeping the streets, anybody who says that's a dead end doesn't have any understanding of the difference between the work culture—the free-enterprise culture—and the welfare culture. I mean, drugs lead to nowhere—to the grave. Yet the attitude of the advocates is, well, the homeless person has a right to lie on the street. The person has a right, a right, a right. That's our basic philosophical difference."

Retrieved September 26, 2010 from http://www.city-journal.org/html/7_3_a3.html

The narrative seemingly embraced by many among public leadership in our region who are dealing with the issue of homelessness, is not one of hard work and personal responsibility; but it is those values which inform the time-tested and common-sense approach to changing your life, and they are values that work.

Society Information

The American River Parkway Preservation Society is a 501 (C)(3) nonprofit organization. Donations are tax deductible to the fullest extent of the law. As a member, you will receive a monthly e-letter, quarterly newsletter, and periodic planning position papers.
Federal ID # 20-0238035

Newsletter Editor: David H. Lukenbill, CFO/Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society
2267 University Avenue * Sacramento, CA 95825
P. (916) 486-3856 * E-Mail: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Website: www.arpps.org * Blog: www.parkwayblog.blogspot.com

Our Mission

Preserve, Protect, & Strengthen the American River Parkway, Our Community's Natural Heart.

Our Vision

We want our Parkway, seven generations from now, to be a vibrant, accessible, and serene sanctuary, nourishing and refreshing the spirit of all who enter it.

Our Guiding Principles

- (1) Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it's a necessity.
- (2) What's good for the salmon is good for the river.

- (3) Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway, social and environmental justice call upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.
- (4) If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.
- (5) Regarding new Parkway usages, inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.

Support Our Work

*The Society depends solely on its membership to accomplish what needs to be done to preserve the Parkway in perpetuity, and we deeply appreciate any additional financial support you can provide, or by encouraging others to become members.
Thank You!*

Support our Sponsors

Copy service for our newsletter is generously donated by University Copy & Print (on the web at www.universitycopyprint.com) in the University Village Courtyard, located at 446 Howe Avenue and owned by ARPPS Charter Member, Stan Goman, a Sacramento native and an important part of Sacramento business history as a 37-year veteran of Tower Records when he retired as its Chief Operating Officer. *Thanks Stan!*

© 2010 American River Parkway Preservation Society

American River Parkway Preservation Society Newsletter **Issue 29 – Winter 2010**

Contents

Announcements	Page 1
<i>Parkway Ranger's Monthly Report Posting</i>	
Essay	Page 1
Regulatory Capture, Gibson Ranch & the Parkway	
Book Notes Deja Vu	Page 2
<i>War on the Dream: How Anti-Sprawl Policy Threatens the Quality of Life</i>	
Society Information	Page 6

Announcement

The latest Parkway Rangers Report from November 2010, can be accessed at <http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> (scroll to bottom of page)

Essay

Regulatory Capture, Gibson Ranch & the Parkway

An odd series of events unfolded over the past couple of months related to the proposal to lease and manage county-owned Gibson Ranch by a forprofit corporation, about which we've posted a Press Release to our website's News Page.

The current controversy over the Ose proposal to manage Gibson Ranch—now shuttered and slowly degrading—by a forprofit organization with solid support from the surrounding community, illuminates much of what we have been saying regarding parks management.

The opposition comes from the *Sacramento Bee* editorial page, the affected parks agency and its affiliated nonprofits, who characterize the proposal as virtually unworthy of consideration as it comes from a forprofit, even though the forprofit is headed by former congressman Doug Ose, from a long-established family with a history of public service and philanthropy.

Reading some of the over-wrought comments from the opposition gives one the impression that 19th century robber barons have swooped in to steal away our parks.

What has happened here is similar to what has happened to the Parkway and many open space areas over the past several years, whose management and use policies have been effectively captured by special interests which seek to restrict public access and enjoyment of them except under very strict conditions they define as natural—generally excluding as many people as possible, especially organized active recreational activities.

This could be called regulatory capture and is defined as:

Regulatory capture occurs when a state regulatory agency created to act in the public interest instead acts in favor of the commercial or special interests that dominate in the industry or sector it is charged with regulating. Regulatory capture is a form of government failure, as it can act as an encouragement for large firms to produce negative externalities. The agencies are called Captured Agencies.

For public choice theorists, regulatory capture occurs because groups or individuals with a high-stakes interest in the outcome of policy or regulatory decisions can be expected to focus their resources and energies in attempting to gain the policy outcomes they prefer, while members of the public, each with only a tiny individual stake in the outcome, will ignore it altogether. Regulatory capture refers to when this imbalance of focused resources devoted to a particular policy outcome is successful at "capturing" influence with the staff or commission members of the regulatory agency, so that the preferred policy outcomes of the special interest are implemented.

Regulatory capture theory is a core focus of the branch of public choice referred to as the economics of regulation; economists in this specialty are critical of conceptualizations of governmental regulatory intervention as being motivated to protect public good. Often cited articles include Bernstein (1955), Huntington (1952), Laffont & Tirole (1991), and Levine & Forrence (1990). The theory of regulatory

capture is associated with Nobel laureate economist George Stigler, one of its main developers.

The risk of regulatory capture suggests that regulatory agencies should be protected from outside influence as much as possible, or else not created at all. A captured regulatory agency that serves the interests of its invested patrons with the power of the government behind it is often worse than no regulation whatsoever.

Retrieved June 10, 2010 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regulatory_capture

While most people able to use the Parkway and Gibson Ranch, might like to see a much higher level of activity than is allowed under the passive recreational approach taken by the County—acting largely at the behest of the environmentalist movement driving most parks advocacy groups—they stick with a limited access approach which, in one case, has inadvertently encouraged large-scale illegal camping by the homeless in the Parkway rendering it unsafe.

While the passive recreational model was appropriate for the Parkway when it was formed in the 1960's and continued appropriate through the 1980's; the increasing population drawn by our wonderful climate, relatively low housing costs, extensive services connected to an attractive retirement destination, and the growing political importance as the capital of California, have made it not appropriate at all, currently or for the future.

Book Notes, Deja Vu:

War on the Dream: How Anti-Sprawl Policy Threatens the Quality of Life

Wendell Cox

Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse, Inc.

(2006) 255 pages Paperback

Yes, we reviewed this book in January of 2009, but due to the author's recent intervention into Sacramento urban policies, we will visit it again with some new information.

Mr. Cox commented on an August 10, 2010 article in the Bee, *Viewpoints: County plan sets up next bubble*, (<http://www.sacbee.com/2010/08/10/2947955/county-plan-sets-up-next-bubble.html>) concerning the planned expansion of suburban growth in Sacramento County, in an article, "Misunderstanding the bubble and burst in Sacramento", on the *New Geography* blog site.

An excerpt:

An opinion piece in the *Sacramento Bee* by Sean Wirth of the Environmental Council of Sacramento could not have been more wrong in its characterization of the causes of the housing bubble in Sacramento.

The article starts out promisingly, correctly noting that:

- The housing bubble spawned the Great Recession
- Demand exceeded the inventory of houses in the Sacramento area
- Sacramento prices "soared sky high"

But it is all downhill from there, with the suggestion that the extraordinary price increases in Sacramento were the result of too much suburbanization (the theological term in urban planning circles is "sprawl"). In fact, all things being equal, house prices tend to escalate where the supply is more constrained, not less. Where suburbanization is allowed, the market can supply enough housing to avoid inordinate house price increases. Where suburbanization is severely constrained, a legion of evidence indicates that house prices are prone to rise. It is all a matter of basic economics. George Mason University economist Daniel Klein puts it this way:

Basic economics acknowledges that whatever redeeming features a restriction may have, it increases the cost of production and exchange, making goods and services less affordable. There may be exceptions to the general case, but they would be atypical.

Housing is not atypical and Sacramento house prices soared in response to the tough use regulations. By the peak of the bubble, the Median Multiple (median house price divided by median household income) had risen to 6.8, well above the historic norm of 3.0. Many houses were built, but not enough to satisfy the demand, as Mr. Wirth indicates. Building many houses is not enough. There need to be enough houses to supply the demand, otherwise land prices soar, driving up house prices.

Unless a sufficient supply is allowed, speculators and flippers will "smell the blood" of windfall profits, which are there for the taking in excessively regulated markets.

During the housing bubble, house prices rose well above the historic Median Multiple norm *only* in metropolitan areas that had severe constraints land use constraints (called "smart growth" or "growth management"). This included Sacramento, other California markets, Miami, Portland, and Seattle and other markets around the country. (Retrieved August 14, 2010 from <http://www.newgeography.com/content/001718-misunderstanding-bubble-and-burst-sacramento>)

Wendell Cox's book is a must read for the countering arguments around the fallacies of the type of urban planning that wants to get us all into small apartments and mass transit; the type of planning trying to get a stranglehold in Sacramento.

Here is the Afterward of his seminal book:

The Universal Dream, in its American, Australian, New Zealand, Canadian, European and other forms around the world has been associated with an unprecedented improvement in the quality of life for hundreds of millions of people.

Yet, there is a "War on the Dream, the result of policies that seek to control urban sprawl or suburbanization. The campaign operates under various names, such as "smart growth" or "urban consolidation." The proponents and governments that

implement anti-suburban policies do so with little debate. Ideological dogma provides the foundation of much of the foundation of these initiatives, rather than rational, objective analysis. There is rarely any serious analysis of consequences. However, anti-suburban policies do have consequences, what are called “negative externalities” in economics. The most important consequences are:

- **Substantially higher housing costs relative to incomes.** Anti-suburban policies outlaw development on large swaths of land, creating scarcity and increasing housing prices. This must inevitably reduce home ownership and thereby the creation of wealth among millions of middle and lower-income households.
- **Less productive urban areas.** Anti-suburban policies seek to force people to use mass-transit services that simply do not go where they are going, by failing to provide the roadway capacity necessary to accommodate rising demand. This increases the intensity of both traffic congestion and air pollution. Beyond the health and quality of life consequences, greater traffic congestion leads to lower levels of economic growth in urban areas.
- **Higher consumer prices.** Anti-suburban policies seek to limit or ban expansion of the big-box retail stores. This will lead to more strained budgets, with the greatest negative effects on low-income households.

All of this may sound somewhat abstract. However, it is very serious. Urban planning has already destroyed housing affordability in many urban areas and the intense traffic congestion it generates is driving businesses and economic growth away. Less economic growth means fewer jobs. Less productive urban areas are likely to lead to lower wages and more unemployment. All of this, when combined with higher product prices means that many households are likely to be less well off in the future. In short, the anti-suburban agenda aims economies toward fewer middle-income households and greater concentrations of wealth. The pity is that the Dream is being threatened for virtually no reason. Virtually all of the justifications for anti-suburban policies are without foundation.

The supreme accomplishment of the high-income economies has been the democratization of prosperity that has occurred since World War II. With most of the world still living in comparative poverty, it is clear that neither economic growth nor wealth creation can be taken for granted. Moreover, economic growth is not a luxury; it is, as Benjamin Freidman has shown, crucial for social cohesion.

Thus, the imperative is to:

- Restore good planning that facilitates the preferences of people, rather than attempting to command and control them.
- Reject anti-suburban policies where they have not been implemented.

- Repeal anti-suburban policies where they have been enacted.

Only by such actions will economies and their urban areas be positioned to ensure that future generations live better than ours. (pp. 203-204)

Another recent article in *New Geography*—Faith-Based City Planning: Exorcising the Suburban Dream—notes the faith-based aspect of anti-suburban urban planning

We're coming to the end of the season when we focus a great deal of attention on faith. What is faith? The Biblical definition calls it the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen (Hebrews 11:1, KJV). Humans have the capacity to firmly believe in something that cannot be explained by reason and is not visibly evident. Faith is the basis of the world's major religions, and often is a cause for war, and today, terrorism. But though the season of faith may be winding down, there is still a place where faith remains strong year round: It is often the basis of the way we plan our communities.

Over the past two decades, our city planning has become faith based. A new preacher has evolved in the form of the Architect or Planner who evangelizes to the congregation that they can all live in serenity if they have faith in the teachings. Their sermons of architectural commandments introduce dimensional ratios that can deliver a utopian existence, promising a wonderland for families.

To enforce faith, you of course need an evil entity to oppose. The evil entity in the faith of land planning is The Suburbs. Those that believe in the suburbs are inherently evil and must be converted or they may spend eternity damned to a cul-de-sac. The automobile is sacrificed on this altar, with the chant "Space – Space – Space."
(Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.newgeography.com/content/001959-faith-based-town-planning>)

Society Information

The American River Parkway Preservation Society is a 501 (C)(3) nonprofit organization. Donations are tax deductible to the fullest extent of the law. As a member, you will receive a monthly e-letter, quarterly newsletter, and periodic planning position papers.
Federal ID # 20-0238035

Newsletter Editor: David H. Lukenbill, CFO/Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society
2267 University Avenue * Sacramento, CA 95825
P. (916) 486-3856 * E-Mail: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Website: www.arpps.org * Blog: www.parkwayblog.blogspot.com

Our Mission

Preserve, Protect, & Strengthen the American River Parkway, Our Community's Natural Heart.

Our Vision

We want our Parkway, seven generations from now, to be a vibrant, accessible, and serene sanctuary, nourishing and refreshing the spirit of all who enter it.

Our Guiding Principles

- (1) Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it's a necessity.
- (2) What's good for the salmon is good for the river.
- (3) Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway, social and environmental justice call upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.
- (4) If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.
- (5) Regarding new Parkway usages, inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.

Support Our Work

The Society depends solely on its membership to accomplish what needs to be done to preserve the Parkway in perpetuity, and we deeply appreciate any additional financial support you can provide, or by encouraging others to become members.

Thank You!

Support our Sponsors

Copy service for our newsletter is generously donated by University Copy & Print (on the web at www.universitycopyprint.com) in the University Village Courtyard, located at 446 Howe Avenue and owned by ARPPS Charter Member, Stan Goman, a Sacramento native and an important part of Sacramento business history as a 37-year veteran of Tower Records when he retired as its Chief Operating Officer. *Thanks Stan!*

© 2011 American River Parkway Preservation Society

American River Parkway Preservation Society Newsletter Issue 30 – Spring 2011

Contents

Announcements	Page 1
<i>Parkway Ranger's Monthly Report Posting</i>	
Essay	
<i>Homelessness: Matrix Program & Political Maturation</i>	
Society Information	Page 6

Announcements

Parkway Ranger's Monthly Report Posting

These important monthly reports of Parkway law enforcement activity including: Enforcement, Crimes Reported, Parkway Violations, and Other Incidents, are posted on the Parkway Rangers website at <http://www.msa2.saccounty.net/parks/Pages/AboutRangers.aspx> , but none have been posted since that of December of 2010.

Essay

Homelessness: Matrix Program & Political Maturation

We have always believed one of the major problems facing the American River Parkway was the virtually unrestrained illegal camping by the homeless in the Lower Reach, and addressed this in our first research report (on our website) as part of our public safety strategy.

What we wrote then:

2) Safety with Compassion Program.

a) One of the few programs that has actually seemed to work at stopping the chronic homeless from camping illegally in public parks and getting them into community treatment programs, has been the Matrix program in San Francisco, described by Gaskin (1994):

San Francisco's septuagenarian columnist Herb Caen has likened it to a sixteenth-century English law that required public flogging of vagrants; the ACLU has condemned it as a violation of the basic constitutional rights to freedom of travel and association; members of the clergy have denounced it as a cold and uncaring attempt to sweep a desperate problem away. Yet ordinary citizens seem to like it. Last August Mayor Frank Jordan instituted the Matrix Program, a sort of tough-love approach to the growing problems caused by the homeless in San Francisco. The professionally indignant have been nipping at his heels ever since.

Walking down Market Street or up Powell Street, tourists and local citizens used to run a gauntlet of panhandlers, drunkards, drug addicts, and the mentally ill, who would line the sidewalks requesting (or demanding) money. Petty and serious street crimes were becoming commonplace in areas that were supposed to attract tourists. Union Square, surrounded by upscale stores in the heart of downtown, was increasingly avoided by anyone who didn't want to run the risk of being panhandled into penury. Every downtown park was becoming the property of the indigent as they set up tents and makeshift shelters.

Amid growing complaints by city businesses, tourist groups, and members of the general public, Mayor Jordan started the Matrix Program, which offers the homeless a chance to obtain shelter and services but also treats them as adults, asking them to take responsibility for their own lives. The program's many opponents are upset because it reasserts the public's right to safe streets and a decent quality of life by actively enforcing public-nuisance laws.

Even with all of the controversy it generated, most observers agree that the program cleaned up the streets and helped many of the chronic homeless who would not seek help on their own.

The program model calls for entering illegal camping areas, led by local homeless service providers backed up by police, and move campers, even those resisting, into public services.

As many programs have found, being resistant to help does not always equate to not taking help when it is offered vigorously.

Vigorous help is exactly what is needed in the Lower Reach to allow the homeless illegally camping there begin to reclaim their lives, and the citizens of the community begin to reclaim their Parkway.

The American River Parkway Lower Reach Area: A Corroded Crown Jewel; Restoring the Luster, September 25, 2005 (pp.40-42)

The controversy surrounding this program is seen as one of the reasons Willie Brown beat the incumbent mayor Frank Jordan to become the mayor of San Francisco.

Many years later, Willie Brown wrote in his book, *Basic Brown*, words that could be taken to heart by local leadership.

San Francisco is a city that really cares about people. It wishes to be as generous, as socially conscious, as it can be. So for 25 years, ever since the closing of state mental facilities and the influx of addictive drugs began to drive afflicted people out onto the streets where they lived homelessly, the city has tried to do its best for these people. Cash grants, a vast array of social services, and a lenient attitude about people camping out in parks and on streets marked San Francisco's approach. Instead of ameliorating the condition of these afflicted people, this policy seemed only to increase their numbers and the danger, distress, and demoralization of the whole population.

In 1993 my predecessor (and in 1995, my opponent for the mayoralty), Frank Jordan, began a program called Matrix to get the homeless off the streets. Reflecting Jordan's origins as a career police officer, Matrix was essentially a police action, an aggressive police action designed to displace the homeless from their spots on the streets and in the parks. It was unsuccessful and also awfully unpopular with much of the city's population, who saw it as nearly brutal and not much of a social solution. Matrix was a major issue during the 1995 mayoral campaign.

I campaigned honestly and accurately against Matrix. Matrix helped defeat Jordan. It seemed to me and to thousands of others that homelessness could be more effectively addressed through something more helpful to the homeless than law enforcement. I earnestly believed that we could do more than displace already placeless people. I was sure we could in fact do the job of freeing people of the horror of having to live on the streets. I thought there was a real possibility we could do that. I was naive.

Once I became mayor, it soon became painfully clear to me that three-fourths of the folk living out there on the streets were out there without any possibility of ever getting off the streets. Not because there was no opportunity. Not because there was no shelter or housing available. Not because there were not enough mental health programs. Not because there were no drug abuse programs. We were providing those and, of course, we could do more. The will to provide services and shelter was there.

I discovered factors - some bureaucratic, some political - working in a kind of evil synthesis with each other that really prevented the long-term homeless from entering the system. For one, the rules and regulations of the welfare system wouldn't let us require people to go into the treatment protocols or processes that could lead to their maybe breaking out of the cycle of poverty, hopelessness, homelessness. To me this was tantamount to condemning people to a prison of the streets.

Backing this up was a collection of so-called activists with heavy political clout who absolutely believed (and still believe) that homeless people should have a right to live on the street. They believed that homeless people had an absolute right to do everything they were doing, no matter how harmful to themselves or to the rest of the citizenry.

(Brown, W. (2008). *Basic Brown: My life and our times*. New York: Simon & Schuster. pp. 271-273)

As local leadership struggled with the emergence of the tent cities in the Parkway, there were efforts at removal, as reported February 9, 2011, by the *Sacramento Bee*, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/09/3387997/homeless-must-leave-camp.html> . The removal of the illegal tent city is a very positive sign that public safety in the Parkway remains a central focus of public leadership, but as this March 5, 2011 article in the *Sacramento Bee* noted <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/03/05/3451201/safe-ground-offers-strength-in.html> the campers are just moving to other sites on the Parkway.

As can be seen in the blog posts, [here http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping.html](http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping.html) , [here http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_05.html](http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_05.html) and [here, http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_07.html](http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/02/some-history-of-parkway-illegal-camping_07.html) of earlier *Sacramento Bee* articles from as far back as 2001, the issue remains a difficult one.

Sacramento has allowed the creation of a country-wide magnet for homeless—as one example, note the paragraphs in the 2/9/11 *Bee* article about the fellow who came here from Massachusetts—partially due to nice weather, but largely due to the easy access to non-means-tested domestic homeless services provided by the conglomeration of programs in the Richards Blvd/12th Street area within walking distance of the camping areas in the Parkway.

A strong round of kudos to Bob Slobe, who has never given up on his vigorous advocacy for public safety in the Parkway and for County Supervisor Phil Serna (Phil was presented with the 2011 Slobe Parkway Advocate Award March 17th, see the Press Release on our website news page) and the other public leaders who are making public safety in the Parkway a priority.

Bob's article about the issue, published in the *Sacramento News & Review* on March 3, 2011 is included here, with permission, in its entirety.

Sac homeless advocates have it wrong

North Sac resident thinks homeless advocates have it wrong when it comes to the Parkway

By Bob Slobe, a developer, community activist and a longtime resident of the once-separate city of North Sacramento

This article was published on 03.03.11

The very first thing a poor North Sacramentan thinks when considering a walk or hike or boat-fishing outing in our section of the American River Parkway is, "Will I be safe?" The second

thought is, “No, I won’t.” Here, it is never, “Should I bring a jacket?” It is, “I hope I’ll make it out alive.”

This is our reality, because a group of homeless advocates, none of whom live near our struggling community—none who eat here, shop here or even drive through this part of town regularly—want the poorest of the poor to give over to the “homeless” their closest park and nature area, the Woodlake Reach of the American River Parkway.

Well, to date, they have succeeded; they have turned the Woodlake Reach into “Unsafe Ground.”

I grew up near the Reach, in the once-separate city of North Sacramento. We had everything a family could want: good schools, nearby shopping, a main street, safe streets and parks that were an embarrassment to our neighbor, the city of Sacramento. Our schools were top rate, too; Grant Union High School was a gem. All of that changed after 1964 when we were subsumed by the city of Sacramento in a merger. We all watched as our brand-new police and fire trucks were taken over the river the day after the merger and replaced by the city of Sacramento’s aging ones. Our per-capita median income went from a point above that of the city of Sacramento’s to less than a third in a flash.

Today, North Sacramento has become the ultimate repository for a growing city’s ills: huge concentrations of low-income housing and painfully unsuccessful social programs. It’s no surprise that our schools and public facilities are in relative ruins. Sacramento has managed to dump every possible challenge to health and prosperity on our community, taking the Archie Bunker approach to social programming: “Edith, put ’em all on an island.” And apparently Sacramento is not yet done. The Parkway’s Woodlake Reach may be the last victory ... or failure, depending on your point of view.

I’m passionate about this issue, because my family gave over what is now 10 percent of the Parkway, back in 1986. At the time, we envisioned our entire community—including North Sacramento—taking full advantage of the out of doors and our rivers, in perpetuity. We knew the potential, because at my grandmother’s invitation, there were summer camps and other nature activities organized along the river near Woodlake.

To our dismay, we watched as the area became a haven for camping, crime and drugs. Bums burned the oldest native walnut grove west of the Mississippi to the ground, and looted centuries-old Maidu sacred sites. Our Parkway recreation became a game of dodge-the-discarded-needles and steer clear the pile of feces. Our attention was diverted away from the native kite or hawk and towards the litter of porn and the garbage pile. It is impossible not to conclude that the county has been a failed steward of the Woodlake Reach, turning its back on this wretched stretch, akin to the county’s own deformed thalidomide babies. I know some will shrink at this comparison. But experience has shown that it’s only through uncivil discourse that we can draw attention to the problem.

What North Sacramento needs is recreational experiences equal to those of tony neighborhoods elsewhere, not bum camping that denies it. Given the challenges facing the working poor population in North Sacramento, a respite from the tough jobs and neighborhoods they face every day should be a given. We should not be burdened with solving problems of illegal camping and the homeless. We should just be able to enjoy a walk, or lie down in the grass in our part of the Parkway and pick animals out of cloud formations—without worrying about getting stuck by a dirty needle, or raped, or even murdered. But that’s North Sacramento’s Parkway today. Ever in fear.

Real compassion for the homeless is inviting them to your doorstep, in equal shares across rich and poor neighborhoods throughout the region. That is not what the so-called homeless advocates will ever support, because they know that filth, spent drug needles, human feces, environmental destruction and trails littered with pornography will follow. No one wonders why our swell neighborhoods like Curtis Park, Land Park, McKinley Park and Fair Oaks are not burdened by this

problem in the same way North Sacramento is. I can't help but conclude it's a form of racism and elitism. Do as I say, not as I do.

If Sacramentans really want to prove we've "got game," we have to rise above endless talk about arenas and the Kings, dive bars and mermaid bars. In the end, what should define us is owning up equally to our biggest challenges. We should return some form of dignity to our poor communities—by sharing the burdens mutually across *all* communities. With respect to the Woodlake Reach of the American River Parkway, I challenge Sacramento and its so-called homeless advocates to take up their share of the burden North Sacramento now carries.

For more information on the history of the American River Parkway and the homeless issue, go to <http://www.northsacramento-chamber.org/speaking-5.html>

Retrieved March 3, 2011 from <http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=1931840>

The bottom line is two different perspectives on helping the homeless. One is taken by Loaves and Fishes, described by Steven M. Avella (2008), in his book *Sacramento and the Catholic Church: Shaping a Capital City*:

...a Catholic Worker-inspired food program that laid down no means test for the distribution of food and clothing...". (p. 249)

Another is the means tested approach exemplified by Cottage Housing in Sacramento, whose approach is described on their website:

We develop healing communities that are solution-focused, participant-driven and strength-based, where homeless people help themselves - and each other - through their transition from the streets to self-sustainability.

Solution Focused: Applicants commit to sobriety, self-defined personal development goals and voluntary service.

Participant Driven: Residents are engaged as participants rather than recipients in every aspect of program operations.

Retrieved March 9, 2011 from <http://www.cottagehousing.org/>

Both approaches are represented by people of good intentions, with the major difference being that the first approach attracts more homeless to the area—thus adding to the burden of surrounding homes and businesses—while the other reduces homelessness, thus relieving the burden.

Society Information

The American River Parkway Preservation Society is a 501 (C)(3) nonprofit organization. Donations are tax deductible to the fullest extent of the law. As a member, you will receive a monthly e-letter, quarterly newsletter, and periodic planning position papers.

Federal ID # 20-0238035

Newsletter Editor: David H. Lukenbill, CFO/Senior Policy Director

American River Parkway Preservation Society
2267 University Avenue * Sacramento, CA 95825
P. (916) 486-3856 * E-Mail: Dlukenbill@msn.com
Website: www.arpps.org * Blog: www.parkwayblog.blogspot.com

Our Mission

Preserve, Protect, & Strengthen the American River Parkway, Our Community's Natural Heart.

Our Vision

We want our Parkway, seven generations from now, to be a vibrant, accessible, and serene sanctuary, nourishing and refreshing the spirit of all who enter it.

Our Guiding Principles

(1) Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it's a necessity.

(2) What's good for the salmon is good for the river.

(3) Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway, social and environmental justice call upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.

(4) If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.

(5) Regarding new Parkway usages, inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.

The Society depends solely on its membership to accomplish what needs to be done to preserve the Parkway in perpetuity, and we deeply appreciate any additional financial support you can provide, or by encouraging others to become members.

Thank You!

Copy service for our newsletter is generously donated by University Copy & Print (on the web at www.universitycopyprint.com) in the University Village Courtyard, located at 446 Howe Avenue and owned by ARPPS Charter Member, Stan Goman, a Sacramento native and 37-year veteran of Tower Records when he retired as COO.

Thanks Stan!

© 2011

American River Parkway Preservation Society

American River Parkway Preservation Society Newsletter

Issue 31 – Summer 2011

Contents

July Roundup	Page 1
<i>Various Blog Postings with Background</i>	
Book Notes	Page 5
<i>New Towns for Old: Achievements in Civic Improvement in Some American Small Towns and Neighborhoods, John Nolen (1927) (2005 Edition)</i>	
Society Information	Page 6

July Roundup **Various Blog Postings with Background**

Parkway Blog, Tuesday June 21, 2011

<http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/06/parkway-trees-levees.html>

Parkway Trees & the Levees

Though the new policy from the Army Corps of Engineers about allowing no trees on levees, will, once implemented, harm the familiar aesthetics of the Parkway experience—until the eye adjusts to the grassy levees and the expanded view shed—the reasoning behind the decision appears sound.

While both arguments about trees and levees appear right—healthy trees on the levees strengthen them and unhealthy trees on the levees weaken them—the appropriate course to take is to protect the public's safety (as healthy trees invariably become unhealthy trees) and that does call for a policy of no trees.

Background

It all comes back to the Auburn Dam.

The original Bureau of Reclamation plan when Folsom Dam was built was to also build the Auburn Dam, as it was understood that without the additional flood protection capacity of the Auburn Dam, the storage and water release management of Folsom Dam and the Lower American River would have to serve as the primary flood protection strategy for Sacramento.

The American River levees, built close together, absorb tremendous corrosive pressure during high releases from Folsom in wet years to keep enough space for the snow melt, as is being done this year, and has in the past ripped out heritage trees along the river bank.

This invariably leads to levee weakening and in relation to public safety, keeping trees off of the levee has to be the priority, a position shared by countries who also use levees for flood protection, noted by UCD Environmental Engineering Professor Jay Lund:

Worldwide, in countries such as the Netherlands and China, serious levee systems are cleared of trees.

Parkway Blog, Wednesday June 1, 2011

<http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/06/folsom-dam-modifications.html>

Folsom Dam Modification

They are proceeding along, as reported by *Sacramento Press*, and will eventually increase our flood protection level to 200 years from the current 100, though we really need the 500 year level, which only an Auburn Dam can provide, as we've posted previously.

Background

The Folsom Dam project essentially allows the release of water sooner, as dam operators will not have to wait until Folsom is full to release water, so it may, during normal wet years, somewhat reduce the corrosive effect the releases have on the Parkway.

Parkway Blog, Wednesday May 25, 2011

<http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/05/mercury-fish.html>

Mercury & Fish

The oft repeated warnings of mercury in fish are revealed, in this article from the *Wall Street Journal*, to be often overwrought.

Background: An excerpt from the *Wall Street Journal* article.

The Environmental Protection Agency recently issued 946 pages of new rules requiring that U.S. power plants sharply reduce their (already low) emissions of mercury and other air pollutants. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson claims that while the regulations will cost electricity producers \$10.9 billion annually, they will save 17,000 lives and generate up to \$140 billion in health benefits.

There is no factual basis for these assertions. To build its case against mercury, the EPA systematically ignored evidence and clinical studies that contradict its regulatory agenda, which is to punish hydrocarbon use.

Mercury has always existed naturally in Earth's environment. A 2009 study found mercury deposits in Antarctic ice across 650,000 years. Mercury is found in air, water, rocks, soil and trees, which absorb it from the environment. This is why our bodies evolved with proteins and antioxidants that help protect us from this and other potential contaminants.

How do America's coal-burning power plants fit into the picture? They emit an estimated 41-48 tons of mercury per year. But U.S. forest fires emit at least 44 tons per year; cremation of human remains discharges 26 tons; Chinese power plants eject 400 tons; and volcanoes, subsea vents, geysers and other sources spew out 9,000-10,000

additional tons per year.

All these emissions enter the global atmospheric system and become part of the U.S. air mass. Since our power plants account for less than 0.5% of all the mercury in the air we breathe, eliminating every milligram of it will do nothing about the other 99.5% in our atmosphere.

Parkway Blog, Saturday May 21, 2011

<http://parkwayblog.blogspot.com/2011/05/tax-increase-for-regional-parks.html>

Tax Increase for Regional Parks

There are so many reasons why a tax increase, touted in the *Sacramento Bee*, is a terrible idea and in our recent article we noted two, but here are a few more questions.

If it is truly a 'regional' parks tax, then the entire region using the parks needs to also vote, which would bring in El Dorado, Placer & Yolo counties.

If it is truly a 'regional' parks tax, then why are virtually all the articles focusing on the American River Parkway? Answer, because it is the only true regional park that attracts visitors from beyond the immediate area still subject to the county parks department mismanagement, Gibson Ranch having been wisely transferred to effective management.

How can we expect any better management from the new entity—which will almost certainly be a staff transfer of the existing entity to the new—to justify an increase of taxes?

How can we guarantee that the new funds raised from a tax increase will not just result in a decrease in support from existing funding sources?

Finally, there are serious questions being raised about the survey results quoted in the *Bee* article, which said a substantial majority favor the new taxes.

These results, considering the history of recent local tax increase voting (which has failed widely) is highly questionable.

Since the survey results are being proposed as a reason for public leaders to make a decision, the details about the survey should be made available (routine in public surveys) which to this point they have not been.

This is a lack of transparency which should, in itself, always raise questions.

Background

Recent Article in *Sacramento Press*

Funding Sacramento Parks

by **David H. Lukenbill**, published on **May 15, 2011** at **5:39 PM**

According to a May 4th *Sacramento Bee* story, Sacramento County Supervisors are considering asking voters to raise the sales tax to pay for a regional park district.

This is a terrible idea, especially during such trying economic times.

A better idea would be to drop the proposal for the regional parks sales tax increase and consider bringing the largest regional park, the American River Parkway, under new management, with supplemental funding to be raised philanthropically.

The American River Parkway is a signature park, the most important recreational area in our region, the most valuable natural resource in our community, and potentially one of the nicest urban/suburban parks in the nation.

The Board of Supervisors could spearhead the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) comprised of representatives from Parkway adjacent governments and a representative of local nonprofit organizations with Parkway concerns.

The JPA then creates a nonprofit organization to provide daily management and supplemental fundraising for the Parkway.

The most successful model of a JPA governed river park is the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park JPA created in 1989 by San Diego County and five cities.

Once the JPA forms the new nonprofit and conducts a national search for the appropriate executive director, they will surely be able to discover someone with the experience and talent to take the American River Parkway into the future with secure and dedicated funding.

Providing this funding and management stability for the largest park in the regional parks department will eventually provide more available funding for the other parks in the department.

There are several reasons why raising taxes to support parks—especially during perilous economic times—is a bad idea, but just a couple should be mentioned.

Taxpayers are already paying for parks, have been for years, and will surely resist paying more.

Doug Ose made the point, as quoted in the Sacramento Bee story, "I don't believe there's a shortage of revenue. I believe there's a shortage of management creativity."

Government is very good at many things, but the ability to raise taxes, when hampered by the unwillingness of voters to approve the tax increase, is not one of them

Philanthropy is much more resilient, and as we have seen during this period of economic uncertainty, individual philanthropists continued to support those causes they found important.

For many Parkway users, generous financial support will come when it is clear the funding—and management—are dedicated solely to the Parkway.

Book Notes

New Towns for Old: Achievements in Civic Improvement in Some American Small Towns and Neighborhoods,
John Nolen (1927) (2005 Edition)
Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press in association with Library of American Landscape
History.
Hardbound, 228 pages

John Nolen was mentioned in a May 2010 *Sacramento Bee* editorial eulogizing Elmer Aldrich, an early visionary who was part of a local group who proposed a three point plan about our two rivers: (1) Promote development of areas along the rivers in city ownership. (2) Promote the acquisition and development of river recreation areas by the State, and (3) Promote the establishment of a Regional Park District.” (From “*The Observer*”, the newsletter of the Sacramento Audubon Society, in the March-April, 1952 issue, pages 2-3)

The mention of John Nolen came about midway in the Sacramento Bee editorial: “Aldrich was not the first to come up with this idea. Wanting to plan a city worthy of the capital of California, Sacramento in 1914 hired John Nolen, a renowned city planner and landscape architect, to design a park system to rival Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. The city never fully implemented it. But Aldrich had seen Nolen's maps outlining a river parkway.” (Sunday May 16, 2010, p. 6E)

I’ve have seen the map—which needs restoration—drawn by John Nolen, which is housed in the Sacramento City County Archives on Sequoia Avenue. The map’s restoration would be a very worthwhile project for one or more of the local historical societies.

Society Information

The American River Parkway Preservation Society is a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit organization. Donations are tax deductible to the fullest extent of the law. As a member, you will receive a monthly e-letter, quarterly newsletter, and periodic planning position papers.

Federal ID # 20-0238035

Newsletter Editor: David H. Lukenbill, CFO/Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society
2267 University Avenue * Sacramento, CA 95825
P. (916) 486-3856 * E-Mail: DLukenbill@msn.com
Website: www.arpps.org * Blog: www.parkwayblog.blogspot.com

Our Mission

Preserve, Protect, & Strengthen the American River Parkway, Our Community’s Natural Heart.

Our Vision

We want our Parkway, seven generations from now, to be a vibrant, accessible, and serene sanctuary, nourishing and refreshing the spirit of all who enter it.

Our Guiding Principles

(1) Preserving the Parkway is not an option, it’s a necessity.

(2) What's good for the salmon is good for the river.

(3) Regarding illegal camping by the homeless in the North Sacramento area of the Parkway, social and environmental justice call upon us to help the poor and distressed person but not at the expense of the adjacent community to visit the Parkway safely.

(4) If it can be seen from the Parkway, it shouldn't be built along the Parkway.

(5) Regarding new Parkway usages, inclusion should be the operating principle rather than exclusion.

The Society depends solely on its membership to continue our advocacy to preserve the Parkway in perpetuity, and we deeply appreciate any additional financial support you can provide, or by encouraging others to become members. Thank You!

© 2011

American River Parkway Preservation Society

APPENDIX III

American River Parkway Preservation Society

Planning Position Paper # 4, MAY 2, 2011

(A REVISION OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2007 PLANNING POSITION PAPER #3)

California Dams & Auburn Dam: Policy Environment

Contents	Page
I. Introduction	2
II. Dams & Auburn Dam: Policy Environment Since 2003	2
III. Conclusion	4
IV. APPENDIX I: ARPPS Auburn Dam Press Release	7
APPENDIX II: Auburn Dam Chronology	8
APPENDIX III: USBR News Release, Auburn Dam Report	11
APPENDIX IV: Governor's News Release, Water Plan	12
APPENDIX V: Senator Feinstein's News Release	14
APPENDIX VI: ARPPS Article: Sacramento Union	16
APPENDIX VII: New Auburn Dam Report	18
APPENDIX VIII: Overview of ARkStorm Scenario	19
APPENDIX IX: Congressman Tom McClintock, Chair, Water and Power Subcommittee, Opening Statement	21
APPENDIX X: Auburn Dam Article, Congressman Tom McClintock	24
APPENDIX XI: Organizations Supporting Auburn Dam	25

Report Prepared by

David H. Lukenbill, Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS)
*Preserve, Protect, and Strengthen the American River Parkway,
Our Community's Natural Heart*
2267 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: 916.486.3856
Web: www.arpps.org
Blog: www.parkwayblog.blogspot.com

Introduction

Encountering opposition when you are doing the right thing is not a new phenomenon and when it involves using human technology there will always be Luddites who oppose it.

Building a dam to protect your community from the disaster of flooding is surely the right thing, just as building an army to protect against a future enemy at the gate is surely the right thing.

Changing public policy from the current status of reducing water use as if there was a scarcity of water, to building dams to create more water storage because there is an abundance of water, will not be easy.

Scarcity is a norm that has been set into place over several decades of environmentalist warnings that are built upon an insidious philosophical base perceiving human beings as a cancer upon the earth, rather than the traditional perception of human exceptionalism and stewardship.

In our report from 2006 about the Auburn Dam, we noted:

Our report looks at the oppositional environment surrounding the building of the Auburn Dam, to shed light on its motivation and origin; as the public supports building Auburn Dam, as the 2006 J. D. Franz Research Inc. survey revealed (58% El Dorado County, 59% Placer County, 62% Sacramento County); and few fully understand the ongoing opposition to the project.

The two issues, Parkway protection and the protection of Sacramento, become fused as the primary value of the Parkway is its location in the heart of the Sacramento metropolitan area, and what threatens the whole threatens the heart.

We look at the oppositional environment as it is becoming increasingly common for those just learning of the threat Sacramento faces from flooding, and how only Auburn Dam can protect us at the 500 year level, to ask: "How can anyone be against this?" (ARPPS Report on the Auburn Dam Policy Environment at <http://www.arpps.org/Report2-AuburnDam.pdf> (page 8))

In that report we explore the historical roots of the environmentalist movement, but one can see the current results merely by examining the proclamations of the deep ecology movement, the philosophical base of the environmentalist movement writ large.

Number four and five of their platform of eight principles are:

4) Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.

5) The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease.

Retrieved April 10, 2011 from <http://www.deepecology.org/platform.htm>

Though the environmental movement has been ascendant for many years, lately it has been encountering its Waterloo of deepening public understanding through instant knowledge technology where the use of deception to control policy slowly loses its power.

California Dams & Auburn Dam: Recent Policy Environment

The most significant two events that have happened recently to increase the chance that the Auburn Dam will finally be built were the release of the *ARkStorm Scenario* by the U.S. Geological Survey in 2010 and Congressman Tom McClintock becoming Chair of the Water and Power Subcommittee in 2011.

A conclusion of the ARkStorm Scenario is:

The hypothetical storm depicted here would strike the U.S. West Coast and be similar to the intense California winter storms of 1861 and 1862 that left the central valley of California impassible. The storm is estimated to produce precipitation that in many places exceeds levels only experienced on average once every 500 to 1,000 years. (**Abstract, Appendix VIII**)

Congressman McClintock's leadership will be built on the reality that there is an abundance of water in California, but a scarcity of water storage capacity, which he will work to remedy. (**Appendix X**)

One of the major issues that stopped the building of the Auburn Dam as originally planned was the fear that an earthquake could destroy the dam. This issue was addressed in the 2007 report by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. (**Appendix III**)

The relevant excerpt.

Fault Displacements

Since the first studies of the proposed Auburn Dam, a number of groups have looked at the issue of surface fault displacement in the dam foundation. The deterministic estimates of fault displacement for Auburn Dam ranged from no displacement to 91 cm (U.S. Geological Survey). Department of Water Resources (DWR) Consulting Board recommended that the proposed Auburn Dam be designed for a surface displacement of 13 cm. The displacement might occur on a single fault or distributed over a zone of faulting. In the final design specified by the Secretary of Interior, 23 cm of normal oblique displacement was selected for

selected foundation features. In the event of a new dam, investigations for active faulting in the dam foundation would be mandatory. New age-dating techniques have emerged in the past three decades and our understanding of faults in the Sierran Foothills have improved such that an assessment of the most recent displacements in bedrock faulting have a greater likelihood for success. Also the hazard of surface faulting displacement is now being addressed probabilistically for important facilities (e.g., Yucca Mountain) and given the uncertainties of characterizing faulting of the nature that would most likely be found in a potential dam foundation; a probabilistic fault displacement hazard analysis is recommended. **If an Auburn Dam were to be built, it could be designed to withstand the most conservative design displacements appropriate for the Sierran Foothills seismotectonic setting assuming the proper type of dam and dam design.** (p. IV-7, highlighting added)

We can begin with the history of the Auburn Dam from 1920 to 1989 published as an appendix in our 2006 report. ([Appendix II](#))

Roger Canfield of the Auburn Dam Council takes it from there in his American River History, <http://www.americanriverauthority.org/outreach/AR%20History.pdf> and notes the changes from 2003 to 2005:

2003 — Agreement reached on federal project to raise Folsom Dam to increase downstream flood protection, raising flood safety level to 1 in 200 years.

2005 — \$1 million authorized by Congress for new study to determine cost to construct Auburn Dam today.

Since then, much has occurred:

2006 The Sacramento County Historical Society's *Sacramento History Journal* (Vol. VI. No. 1-4) was devoted exclusively to the water issue: *Water: Our History & Our Future*, online at http://www.sachistoricalsociety.org/journal_VI.cfm . It is the best overview I am aware of that addresses the struggle with flooding and other water issues Sacramento has dealt with since the city's founding and it includes an excellent debate on building Auburn Dam.

2007 (January) The update report on the Auburn Dam which Congress authorized in 2005 was released. ([Appendix III](#))

2007 (September 18) Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger came out in support of building dams in his water plan. ([Appendix IV](#))

2007 (October 15) A report from the Department of Water Resources, *A California Challenge: Flooding in the Central Valley*, concludes that Sacramento needs to plan for larger floods. <http://www.water.ca.gov/news/newsreleases/2008/101507challenge.pdf>

2007 (October 21) Senator Dianne Feinstein supports building dams in her Op Ed. (Appendix V)

2007 (October 21) Delta Vision Task Force Draft calls for dams to be built. http://deltavision.ca.gov/BlueRibbonTaskForce/Oct2007/Handouts/Item_4.pdf

2008 (June) American River Authority Commissioned Report on Auburn Dam, *American River Authority Auburn-Folsom South Unit Summary Report* reviews and analyzes the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation 2007 report, *Auburn-Folsom South Unit Special Report Benefits and Cost Update (AFSU Special Report)* (Appendix VII)

2010 U.S. Geological Survey releases their report, *Overview of ARkStorm Scenario*, which concludes that Sacramento needs to plan for a 500-1,000 year level of protection from flooding. (Appendix VIII)

2011 (March 2) California Congressman Tom McClintock, becomes Chair of the House of Representatives Water and Power Subcommittee, and in his Opening Statement changes policy planning direction from water scarcity to water abundance. (Appendix IX)

2011 (April 17) California Congressman Tom McClintock continues dismantling misinformation about the Auburn Dam reported by media opponents. (Appendix X)

Conclusion

The policy environment is changing in relation to the use of dams as a vital part of the future water policy for California and this will substantially increase the possibility that Auburn Dam will eventually be built.

With the closing of the diversion tunnel at the Auburn Dam site in 2007, many dam supporters felt dismayed. Don't be. Once the dam is allowed to move forward, the tunnel can be reopened, as noted in this story from the Auburn Journal of September 29, 2007.

**Channel project nearing completion
Finishing touches under way on river restoration
By: Gus Thomson, Journal Staff Writer
Saturday, September 29, 2007**

Just under a month after water started flowing again on a restored American River channel through the Auburn dam site, finishing touches are under way.

One of the major final projects was installation of steel beams on the face of the half-mile-long diversion tunnel that had channeled water underground through the canyon's dam construction area since the early 1970s.

While dam construction was halted nearly 30 years ago, the tunnel had continued

to channel the river's water away from its natural stream course - and left the area dangerous and off-limits to boaters.

Just under a month after water started flowing again on a restored American River channel through the Auburn dam site, finishing touches are under way.

One of the major final projects was installation of steel beams on the face of the half-mile-long diversion tunnel that had channeled water underground through the canyon's dam construction area since the early 1970s.

While dam construction was halted nearly 30 years ago, the tunnel had continued to channel the river's water away from its natural stream course - and left the area dangerous and off-limits to boaters. ...

While the closure of the diversion tunnel represents a current change in direction, the work has been undertaken with the idea that the tunnel could one day be re-opened as part of a revived Auburn dam project. (Highlighting added)

Our article on how the Auburn Dam would help the Parkway was published in the *Sacramento Union* in the October 26, 2007 issue, page seven. (Appendix VI)

There are several local organizations and government entities supporting the Auburn Dam and information about them is enclosed. (Appendix VII)

And, in closing, let me repeat what the famous bumper sticker from the Auburn Dam Council proclaims: **BUILD IT, DAM IT!**



APPENDIX I

ARPPS PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release May 22, 2006 Sacramento, California

THE AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY ANNOUNCES SUPPORT FOR AUBURN DAM, AMERICAN RIVER LEVEE STRENGTHENING, AND RAISING THE HEIGHT OF FOLSOM DAM

Sacramento, CA: May 22, 2006: The Society is announcing its support for the construction of the Auburn Dam, the strengthening of the American River levees, and the raising of Folsom Dam, to protect the natural and recreational integrity of the American River Parkway, the health of the salmon, and flood protection for Sacramento.

In January we announced our support for a major new dam on the American River to capture and control the American River Watershed run-off, which, through flood-condition releases from Folsom Dam, was devastating one of the most important parkways in the country.

Since then we have witnessed the following:

- Discovery Park closed more often than open since Christmas due to flooding.
- Continued erosion of the Parkway threatening many old growth trees, other habitat and wildlife, and the bike trail.
- Salmon deaths at Nimbus (1.2 million in the past month) due to dissolved gas supersaturation from the necessary and prolonged high run-off releases from Folsom and Nimbus Dams.

In January we felt that the proposed Auburn Dam design, planned for the North Fork of the American River, and the storage lake it would create, needed to be larger to accommodate the changing future conditions of climate, development, and public policy.

Since then, based on the continued and focused interest by national, state, and local government on flood protection and water supply in the Sacramento region, we are now confident that the planning for Auburn Dam will embrace the changing needs of the region, and, with the proposed raising of Folsom Dam and American River levee strengthening, will provide the storage, (and flow capacity when needed) to protect the integrity of the Parkway, the health of the salmon, and provide 500 year flood protection to the Sacramento region.

Michael Rushford, Board President & David H. Lukenbill, Senior Policy Director
American River Parkway Preservation Society (ARPPS) 2267 University Avenue,
Sacramento, CA 95825 **Phone:** 916.486.3856 **Web:** www.arpps.org
Blog: www.parkwayblog.blogspot.com

APPENDIX II

Chronology of Auburn Dam (1920-1989)

- 1920's Auburn Dam included in State water planning.
- 1940 MR=5.7 earthquake in Chico/Oroville area.
- 1944 Congress authorized Folsom Dam & Reservoir with 450,000 acre feet of storage.
- 1948 Congress increased Folsom Reservoir storage size to 1,000,000 acre feet.
- 1955 Folsom Dam was completed at cost of \$94 million. This dam prevented damage in the Sacramento area from the Christmas flood of the same year exceeding this cost. This Christmas flood helped initiate the need for additional flood protection studies and the Auburn Dam solution.
- 1963 Congressman Bizz Johnson introduced legislation to authorize the Auburn-Folsom South unit of the American River Division of the Central Valley Project.
- 1965 (July) Congress authorized the Auburn-Folsom South Unit for construction (PL 89-161). Acquisition of land and construction began in 1967.
- 1965 Another Christmas flood was minimized in the Sacramento area due to Folsom Dam. This again saved the capital area from flood damage which far exceeded the cost of Folsom Dam
- 1966 MR=4.6 earthquake in Chico/Oroville area.
- 1972 California State Water Resources Control Board established Directive-1400 to be implemented when Auburn Dam is completed. Until completion, Directive-893, requiring 250 & 500 cubic feet per second flows would continue as required flow levels in the Lower American River.
- 1974 (May 13) United States Bureau of Reclamation awards contract for foundation excavation and treatment of Auburn Dam to the Auburn Contractors (Ball, Atkinson & Arundel)
- 1975 (Aug 1) MR=5.7 earthquake occurs near Oroville; 50 miles north of Auburn.
- 1975 (Aug 11) A United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) engineers and geologists task force start internal reviews of Foothills fault system and the potential EQ activity at the Auburn Dam site. Task force members were R. Farina, A. Viksne, L. Cast, & J. Gilbert.
- 1975 (Nov) USBR task force recommends studies of the Foothills fault system and potential EQ activity.
- 1976 (May 5) USBR contracts with Woodward Clyde Consultants (independent geological consultants) to study seismicity of region around Auburn Dam site.
- 1976 (Jun 9) Failure occurred of USBR's newly completed earth and rockfill Teton Dam in Idaho.
- 1976 (July) USBR hires five-member board of independent geological and engineering consultants to guide and review the investigations and findings. They include: **Drs C. Allan**-California Institute of Technology, **Ray Clogh**-University of California, Berkeley; **R. Johns**- Stanford University; **L. Johnson**- University of California, Berkeley; and **L. Serafim**- Portugal.

- 1976 (Sept 1) California Department of Water Resources advises USBR that earthquake design parameters used for Auburn Dam were inadequate.
- 1976 (Dec 3) USBR sponsors geologic tours of Auburn Dam site to review status of seismic investigations. They included: United States Geologic Service; USCB; California Division of Mines & Geology, and California Department of Water Resources.
- 1977 (Feb 22) President Carter reveals he will cut \$39.7 million from fiscal year 1978 Auburn Dam budget along with eliminating some 18 other water projects in the western United States.
- 1977 (Jun 28) Woodward-Clyde revealed their findings and recommended earthquake design criteria: MR=6.5, FM=0.8 ft.
- 1977 (mid) California retained a consulting board of eminent geologists, seismologists & design engineers. The six members included: **G. Housner, J. Blum, D. Cambell, A. O'Neil, and H. Seed.**
- 1977 (Aug) President Carter approves the \$39.7 million for Auburn Dam. USBR releases their 3 volume Report on Auburn seismic evaluation.
- 1978 (Jan 17) Woodward-Clyde (after 16 months of study) deliver their final volume of an 8 volume seismic report: "Earthquake Evaluation of the Auburn Dam Area".
- 1978 (Jul 13) United States Geologic Services presents their technical review of Woodward-Clyde's study and recommends: MR=6.5-7.0, FM=3.0 ft.
- 1978 (Jul 28) USBR releases a 6 volume supplemental report of the earthquake study, and the findings of the 5 independent Auburn consultants.
- 1978 (Sept 14) USBR proposed design criteria as: MR=6.5 (2 miles from dam site), FM=1.0 inch.
- 1979 (Jan 4) California Department of Water Resources: Consulting Board for Earthquake Analysis, recommended: MR=6.5, FM=5.0 inches.
- 1979 (Jan 25) Secretary of the Interior, C. Andrus says Auburn Dam will have to be redesigned because of earthquake hazards.
- 1979 (Mar 5) California Department of Water Resources: Consulting Board for Earthquake Analysis, recommended: MR=6.5, FM=5.0 inches minimum and 9.0 inches preferred.
- 1979 (Jul 30) Secretary Andrus approved the earthquake design parameters: MR=6.5, FM=9.0 & Ground Response Acceleration (GRA) =0.5 g in the one second portion of the spectrum.
- 1980 (Aug 11) Feasibility level designs were completed for a rockfill and curved gravity alternatives for Auburn Dam.
- 1980 (Dec 30) Andrus announces a safe dam can be built at Auburn but we must resolve the Lower American River controversy. Selection of the alternate dam was 'Curved Gravity-3' with 600 megawatt power plant.
- 1984 President Reagan announced a new national policy calling for non-federal cost sharing for financing water projects. A Federal-State Auburn Dam Task Force was established to find ways to accomplish this.
- 1985 Bechtel International hired to determine a less costly option to Curved Gravity-3, such as Rolled Compacted Concrete.

- 1986 (Feb) Record runoff floods demonstrate that Sacramento Metropolitan area is extremely vulnerable to flooding from the American River. Folsom Dam was hours away from losing control.
- 1987 (July) USBR released the “Auburn Dam Alternative Study” which evaluated five alternative sizes. Purpose was to assist in making informed judgments on the level of flood protection needed.
- 1987 (Sept) After 3 Congressional hearings, U. S. Corps of Engineers initiated a ‘dry dam’ study for the Auburn Dam site.
- 1988 (Sept) American River Authority (ARA) informed USBR that it could contribute \$700 million to cost-share water and power costs for the 2.3 million acre feet multipurpose dam.
- 1988 (Sept) Interior Department’s Assistant Secretary announced an Auburn dam cost-sharing negotiating team to negotiate with interested California parties and in particular, the ARA.
- 1989 (Dec) The Central Valley Project Water Association passed a resolution to oppose integration of Auburn Dam into the Central Valley Project.
- 1989 (Apr) ARA, San Joaquin County and Sacramento area water agencies said they’d support funds for water supply.

Abbreviations: MR = Magnitude on Richter Scale
FM = Foundation (horizontal) Movement

Acknowledgements: This chronology was compiled by Mike Schaefer for his presentation to the Auburn Dam Council on (10/2/05) and to the American River Authority on (6/17/06). Most of the information came from USBR’s geology consultant Wendel Carlson in his report titled, INTERIM CONSTRUCTION GEOLOGY REPORT, AUBURN DAM, dated November 1990.

APPENDIX III

Bureau of Reclamation News Release

Released On: January 30, 2007

Auburn-Folsom South Unit Special Report Released

The Bureau of Reclamation announces the availability of the Auburn-Folsom South Unit Special Report – Benefits and Cost Update. Through the Energy and Water Appropriations Act FY 2006, Congress directed Reclamation to prepare this report based on the 1978 design for a multi-purpose Auburn Dam. The report updates benefit values to current levels, identifies changes in design standards from 1978, assesses risks and uncertainties associated with the 1978 design, and recalculates the cost of the 1978 design to current dollars. The report does not reformulate any of the features of the Auburn-Folsom South Unit, nor does it reassess the water demands for the associated service areas.

Statutory requirements, project operations, demographics, and science have all changed significantly since the original formulation. The 1978 design was adapted to meet current conditions which, along with the projected future conditions, are different than what was known or projected previously. The analysis was based on various assumptions selected from a broad set of possibilities; therefore, the report presents a range of outcomes, particularly cost and benefit values. The report does not include a benefit-cost (b-c) analysis, nor does it calculate a revised b-c ratio. In addition, the analysis revealed several general conclusions that could be addressed if any future study on the Auburn-Folsom South Unit is undertaken.

The report is available online at

http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cao/docs/auburn_rpt/index.html. For additional information, please contact Mr. Mike Finnegan, Area Manager, Central California Area Office, at 916-989-7200, TDD 916-989-7285. To request a paper copy or compact disk of the report, please contact Ms. Sammie Cervantes at 916-978-5189, TDD 916-978-5608, or via e-mail at scervantes@mp.usbr.gov. If you encounter problems accessing documents online, please contact Ms. Lynnette Wirth at 916-978-5102 or e-mail lwirth@mp.usbr.gov.

Retrieved October 27, 2007 from:

<http://www.usbr.gov/newsroom/newsrelease/detail.cfm?RecordID=15341>

APPENDIX IV

Governor's Office News Release

09/18/2007 GAAS: 733:07 FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Governor Schwarzenegger Submits Comprehensive \$9 Billion Water Infrastructure Proposal for Legislative Special Session

Governor Schwarzenegger announced a \$9 billion comprehensive water infrastructure proposal to be introduced in the legislative special session that he called in response to California's water crisis. The plan invests \$600 million from Propositions 50, 84 and 1E to immediately relieve pressure on the Delta from environmental challenges and to respond to a recent federal court ruling that will reduce water deliveries to Southern California. It also includes \$5.6 billion in water storage, nearly \$2 billion in Delta restoration (in addition to the above-mentioned \$600 million), \$1 billion in grants for conservation and regional water projects and \$500 million for specific water restoration projects. Written in two bills authored by Assembly Republican Leader Michael Villines (R– Fresno) and Senator Dave Cogdill (R – Modesto), the proposal represents a combination of ideas previously detailed in proposals by the Governor and legislative leaders.

“Our water crisis has gotten worse with the dry conditions and the recent federal court action that is going to have a devastating impact on the state's economy and the 25 million Californians who depend on Delta water. We need a comprehensive fix,” said Governor Schwarzenegger. “That is why we are introducing two bills to solve California's water crisis in both the short and long-term. I look forward to working and negotiating with my partners in the Legislature so we can approve a comprehensive upgrade to California's water infrastructure.”

Details of the \$9 billion comprehensive water infrastructure proposal include:

- \$600 million from Propositions 50, 84 and 1E to immediately relieve pressure on the Delta from environmental concerns
- \$5.6 billion in above and below ground water storage
 - \$5.1 billion in surface storage
 - \$500 million in groundwater storage
 - Identifies three locations for surface storage (Sites, Temperance Flat Reservoir and Los Vaqueros Expansion Project.)
 - Specific criteria to assure public benefits and environmental benefits
- \$1.9 billion for Delta Restoration and water supply reliability
 - \$1.4 billion for habitat restoration
 - \$500 million in early actions to address environmental concerns in the Delta

- \$1 billion in grants for conservation and regional water projects
- \$500 million in grants for specified watersheds throughout the state, including the San Joaquin River, Klamath River, Los Angeles River and others

In January, building on his Strategic Growth Plan from last year, the Governor introduced a comprehensive plan to invest in additional surface and groundwater storage to meet the needs of population growth and manage the effects of climate change on California's hydrology and water delivery systems. The plan will help communities protect against flooding, and capture water from storms and snowmelt run-off to supply cities, farmers and business with water during drought conditions.

The Governor's comprehensive plan also includes significant funding toward restoration of the ailing Delta and would lead to the development of a new conveyance system. Twenty five million Californians rely on the Delta for clean, safe water. It also irrigates hundreds of thousands of acres of Central Valley farmland and it is the backbone of California's \$32 billion agricultural industry.

Last year, the Governor directed the Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force to develop a Delta management plan. The task force will present its findings and recommendations by January 1, 2008 and its Strategic Plan by October 31, 2008. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan is also underway, being developed with broad participation from water agencies, environmental organizations and local representatives.

Retrieved October 27, 2007 from <http://gov.ca.gov/index.php?/press-release/7461/>

APPENDIX V

Senator Dianne Feinstein's News Release

Dams Provide One Key Element for State's Future Water Supplies

San Jose Mercury News

Sunday, October 21, 2007

California needs every drop of water possible to ensure a healthy future for our state.

Yet - unless Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, Senate President Pro Tem Don Perata and Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez come together on a single water bond proposal - California may be left high and dry.

So I'm urging both sides to sit down, find a compromise and work this out.

Here's the good news: Both sides in Sacramento recognize the need for action. Schwarzenegger has a plan to rebuild California's water infrastructure, as do Perata and Núñez.

Both plans provide for conservation, recycling and local solutions to water quality and supply issues. Any effective plan needs these features.

But the key difference is this: The governor's plan allows for surface water storage - where it is economically feasible and beneficial - while the Perata/Núñez plan does not.

Given our uncertain water future, I believe you've got to allow for surface water storage.

This could help increase our water supplies and help restore the ailing Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. Three of the projects contemplated - Sites Reservoir, Los Vaqueros and Temperance Flats - have the potential to produce new fresh water to help the deteriorating delta water ecosystem.

I've spoken to both sides and urged them to reach an agreement.

I'm no water expert. But I've legislated long enough in the field - rebuilding our levees, restoring the San Joaquin River and ensuring adequate water for farmers - to have learned that there are certain significant facts that must be grappled with:

- California is largely a dry state. To be sure, we get bursts of precipitation in the northern part of the state during winter months. So it's absolutely critical that we be able to save that water from the times when it is wet, and be able to move it to the places that need it when it is dry.
- California has an insatiable thirst for water. We've got 37 million people now, and more and more people come every day. Yet, we essentially have the same water infrastructure that we had when we were 16 million people. Where are we going to find

enough water for residents, for fish, for farms? Conservation and recycling are critical, but will not be enough.

- I just visited Santa Clarita, a booming city just north of Los Angeles. A developer came up to me at a town hall event and said he is building a new community of 20,000 homes. I asked the question: Where does the water come from? And this question is being asked in every fast-growing community across the state.
 - We've got a melting Sierra Nevada due to global warming, which will only reduce our water supplies. As a result of global warming, two-thirds of the Sierra Nevada snowpack may disappear. That's an amount sufficient for 16 million people. Where, in the future, will this water come from if we can't store water from wet years to use in dry years?
 - Lake Tahoe is a harbinger of what's to come for the rest of the state. A recent report found that, since 1911, the percentage of precipitation that falls as snow has dropped by 18 percent. And we will see similar trends across the state.
-

So what should be done?

This fight can't turn into one based on political, regional or economic differences - north vs. south; west vs. east; farms vs. fish; Republicans vs. Democrats.

We need to see the state as a whole. That means protecting all those things that make our state great - our precious environment; our agricultural industry, the largest in the nation; our great cities; and our economic growth.

If there are two conflicting proposals, the likelihood is that both will go down to defeat.

So my message is this - find a solution that ensures that California has an adequate water supply for the future. Doing nothing is not an alternative.

So we must have a plan that includes conservation, recycling, desalination, groundwater recharge and, yes, surface storage. There is no one silver bullet. All must be done to ensure that California is not left scrambling for water.

Retrieved Monday October 22 from:

<http://feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=NewsRoom.OpEds>

APPENDIX VI

Auburn Dam Helps the Parkway

October 26, 2007
Sacramento Union (Page 7)

The Auburn Dam Helps the Parkway

By DAVID H. LUKENBILL
American River Parkway Preservation Society

One of the most contentious issues in local and regional water matters is the Auburn Dam and it will be more so this year with the reported onset of La Nina, the weather phenomenon that creates the conditions in which the flooding rainstorms called the Pineapple Express occurs.

Positions have been staked out on one side or the other (we support building the Auburn Dam) but generally they have all focused on the flood protection or power generating aspect.

Our concern is how it will help the American River Parkway and the salmon in the lower American River.

Building Auburn Dam – in addition to providing 500 year flood protection – will preserve the recreational and natural assets of the Parkway as the building of Folsom Dam helped create them.

Prior to the completion of Folsom Dam in 1956, the American River could be virtually walked across in dry years. However once the dam was built – allowing the river running through it to have regular summer flows – the American River Parkway Plan became viable and it was adopted in 1962.

The power of high water during flood conditions, or Folsom Dam releases to meet increasingly demanding water contracts during dry years has a corrosive impact on the levees, destroying habitat, Parkway recreational assets, and creating dangerous conditions for the salmon.

Heritage trees along the river are being lost, and during even normal rainy seasons – such as the one last winter – much of the area around Discovery Park remained flooded and unusable until spring.

The levees on the lower American River were built close to the river channel to flush the residue from hydraulic gold mining that had clogged the river for years. This has long been flushed out and lovely communities now surround the land along the river and Parkway, but without a strategy to establish greater control over the American River by building the Auburn Dam, the Parkway will continue to degrade.

The American River Parkway Preservation Society is encouraging Sacramento area public leaders to recognize that the only means for guaranteeing the integrity of the Parkway and the safety of the public it serves is the construction of the Auburn Dam.

We are the only parkway-focused organization advocating this solution.

Our members share a concern about the future of the Parkway and the entire American River Watershed, whose health and effective management are so crucial to the human and natural resources adding so much to our quality of life.

Our enjoyment of a vibrant year-round Parkway, optimal conditions for the salmon, a Folsom Lake full enough for regular summer boating, combined with our vulnerability to a catastrophic flood make the argument to build the Auburn Dam as solid, in our opinion, as the concrete that will hold back the floods.

*David H. Lukenbill is the Senior Policy
Director for the American River Parkway Preservation Society.*



APPENDIX VII

AMERICAN RIVER AUTHORITY AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT SUMMARY REPORT June 2008

An excerpt.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The Auburn Dam and Reservoir has long been recognized to provide benefits in addressing regional and statewide water resource needs. The Auburn Dam Project was authorized in 1965 and was under construction until halted in 1975. Construction of the Auburn Dam was not re-started due to seismic concerns, engineering redesign, concern for environmental impacts, changing political ideologies, and changing priorities.

The United States Bureau of Reclamation released the *Auburn-Folsom South Unit Special Report Benefits and Cost Update (AFSU Special Report)* in December 2006. The report summarizes an analysis purporting to update the costs and associated benefits of the Auburn Dam and Reservoir. However, the analysis documented in the *AFSU Special Report* was based on an outdated dam configuration, outdated operating assumptions, and outdated benefits assumptions. The report provides estimates of project costs and benefits that are unreliable. As such, the *AFSU Special Report* cannot be relied upon to draw any conclusions as to the viability of the Auburn Dam.

Because the technical assumptions and analyses in the various studies and designs of Auburn Dam are from nearly 30 years ago, when water resources development and management were conducted under a drastically different economic, environmental, legal, and public policy framework, it is impossible to utilize these past studies to estimate the feasibility of an Auburn Dam in tomorrow's world. It is the conclusion of the authors of this report that no valid analysis exists to prove whether a dam at

Auburn is either feasible or infeasible.

Full report at <http://www.americanriverauthority.org/admin/upload/AUBURN-FOLSOM.SOUTH.UNIT.SUMMARY.REPORT.pdf>

APPENDIX VIII

Overview of the ARkStorm Scenario

By Keith Porter, Anne Wein, Charles Alpers, Allan Baez, Patrick Barnard, James Carter, Alessandra Corsi, James Costner, Dale Cox, Tapash Das, Michael Dettinger, James Done, Charles Eadie, Marcia Eymann, Justin Ferris, Prasad Gunturi, Mimi Hughes, Robert Jarrett, Laurie Johnson, Hanh Dam Le-Griffin, David Mitchell, Suzette Morman, Paul Neiman, Anna Olsen, Suzanne Perry, Geoffrey Plumlee, Martin Ralph, David Reynolds, Adam Rose, Kathleen Schaefer, Julie Serakos, William Siembieda, Jonathon Stock, David Strong, Ian Sue Wing, Alex Tang, Pete Thomas, Ken Topping, and Chris Wills; Lucile Jones, Chief Scientist, Dale Cox, Project Manager

ABSTRACT

The U.S. Geological Survey, Multi Hazards Demonstration Project (MHDP) uses hazards science to improve resiliency of communities to natural disasters including earthquakes, tsunamis, wildfires, landslides, floods and coastal erosion. The project engages emergency planners, businesses, universities, government agencies, and others in preparing for major natural disasters. The project also helps to set research goals and provides decision-making information for loss reduction and improved resiliency. The first public product of the MHDP was the ShakeOut Earthquake Scenario published in May 2008. This detailed depiction of a hypothetical magnitude 7.8 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault in southern California served as the centerpiece of the largest earthquake drill in United States history, involving over 5,000 emergency responders and the participation of over 5.5 million citizens.

This document summarizes the next major public project for MHDP, a winter storm scenario called ARkStorm (for Atmospheric River 1,000). Experts have designed a large, scientifically realistic meteorological event followed by an examination of the secondary hazards (for example, landslides and flooding), physical damages to the built environment, and social and economic consequences. The hypothetical storm depicted here would strike the U.S. West Coast and be similar to the intense California winter storms of 1861 and 1862 that left the central valley of California impassible. The storm is estimated to produce precipitation that in many places exceeds levels only experienced on average once every 500 to 1,000 years.

Extensive flooding results. In many cases flooding overwhelms the state's flood-protection system, which is typically designed to resist 100- to 200-year runoffs. The Central Valley experiences hypothetical flooding 300 miles long and 20 or more miles wide. Serious flooding also occurs in Orange County, Los Angeles County, San Diego, the San Francisco Bay area, and other coastal communities. Windspeeds in some places reach 125 miles per hour, hurricane-force winds. Across wider areas of the state, winds reach 60 miles per hour. Hundreds of landslides damage roads, highways, and homes. Property damage exceeds \$300 billion, most from flooding. Demand surge (an increase in labor rates and other repair costs after major natural disasters) could increase property losses by 20 percent. Agricultural losses and other costs to repair lifelines,

dewater (drain) flooded islands, and repair damage from landslides, brings the total direct property loss to nearly \$400 billion, of which \$20 to \$30 billion would be recoverable through public and commercial insurance. Power, water, sewer, and other lifelines experience damage that takes weeks or months to restore. Flooding evacuation could involve 1.5 million residents in the inland region and delta counties. Business interruption costs reach \$325 billion in addition to the \$400 billion property repair costs, meaning that an ARkStorm could cost on the order of \$725 billion, which is nearly 3 times the loss deemed to be realistic by the ShakeOut authors for a severe southern California earthquake, an event with roughly the same annual occurrence probability.

The ARkStorm has several public policy implications: (1) An ARkStorm raises serious questions about the ability of existing federal, state, and local disaster planning to handle a disaster of this magnitude. (2) A core policy issue raised is whether to pay now to mitigate, or pay a lot more later for recovery. (3) Innovative financing solutions are likely to be needed to avoid fiscal crisis and adequately fund response and recovery costs from a similar, real, disaster. (4) Responders and government managers at all levels could be encouraged to conduct risk assessments, and devise the full spectrum of exercises, to exercise ability of their plans to address a similar event. (5) ARkStorm can be a reference point for application of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and California Emergency Management Agency guidance connecting federal, state and local natural hazards mapping and mitigation planning under the National Flood Insurance Plan and Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. (6) Common messages to educate the public about the risk of such an extreme disaster as the ARkStorm scenario could be developed and consistently communicated to facilitate policy formulation and transformation.

These impacts were estimated by a team of 117 scientists, engineers, public-policy experts, insurance experts, and employees of the affected lifelines. In many aspects the ARkStorm produced new science, such as the model of coastal inundation. The products of the ARkStorm are intended for use by emergency planners, utility operators, policymakers, and others to inform preparedness plans and to enhance resiliency.

Retrieved April 9, 2011 from <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/>

The U.S. Geological Survey Full Report: http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/of2010-1312_text.pdf

APPENDIX IX

Tom McClintock, Chair

Water and Power Subcommittee Hearing - Opening Statement

March 2, 2011 12:07 PM

WASHINGTON, D.C. – The Subcommittee on Water and Power held an oversight hearing today to examine the FY 2012 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation. Subcommittee Chairman Tom McClintock made the following opening statement at the hearing:

Opening Statement
Congressman Tom McClintock
Chairman
House Water and Power Subcommittee

Oversight Hearing on “Examining the Spending, Priorities and the Missions of the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Geological Survey’s Water Resources Program”

With today’s hearing, the Water and Power Sub-Committee will begin the process of restoring abundance as the principal objective of America’s Federal water and power policy. We meet today to receive testimony from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Geological Service on their plans for the coming year. We do so in conjunction with our responsibility under the Federal Budget Act to provide guidance to the House Budget Committee as it prepares the 2012 budget and with our responsibility under House Resolution 72 to identify regulations and practices of the government that are impeding job creation and burdening economic growth.

In my opinion, all of these hearings and all of the actions stemming from them must be focused on developing the vast water and hydro-electric resources in our nation. The failure of the last generation to keep pace with our water and power needs has caused chronic water shortages and skyrocketing electricity prices that are causing serious economic harm.

In addition, willful policies that have deliberately misallocated our resources must be reversed.

California’s Central Valley, where 200 billion gallons of water were deliberately diverted away from vital agriculture for the enjoyment and amusement of the 2-inch Delta Smelt is a case in point. These water diversions have destroyed a quarter million acres of the most fertile farmland in America, thrown tens of thousands of farm families into unemployment and impacted fruit, vegetable and nut prices in grocery stores across America.

In Northern Arizona, 1,000 megawatts of hydroelectricity – enough to power a million homes – has been lost due to environmental mandates for the humpback chub.

In the Klamath, the federal government is seeking to destroy four perfectly good hydroelectric dams at the cost of more than a half billion dollars at a time when we can't guarantee enough electricity to keep refrigerators running this summer. The rationale is to save the salmon, but the same proposal would close the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery that produces 5 million salmon smolt each year.

Meanwhile, funds that ought to be going to water and power development are instead being squandered on subsidizing low-flow toilets, salmon festivals, tiger salamander studies and grants to private associations whose principal activity is to sue the federal government.

We have also thrown hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars into wildly expensive conservation programs that do little or nothing to develop new water and power resources.

Those days are over.

It is the objective of this sub-committee to restore the original – and as yet unfulfilled -- mission of the Bureau of Reclamation – to develop and utilize our nation's vast water and hydroelectric resources to build a new era of abundance and prosperity for our nation.

And, I might add, to complete the greening of the west, to tame the environmentally devastating cycle of floods and droughts and to assure the perpetuation and propagation of all species through expansion of fish hatcheries and other cost-effective means.

We will seek to inventory all of our potential water and power resources, establish and apply a uniform cost-benefit analysis to prioritize financing for those projects that produce the greatest benefits at the lowest costs, and to restore the “beneficiary pays” doctrine that assures those who benefit from these projects pay for these projects, protecting general taxpayers of one community from being plundered for projects that exclusively benefit another.

With these policies in place, we can fulfill the Bureau's original mission, to make the desert bloom and to open a new era in America where water and power shortages – and the policies that created them -- are a distant memory.

I also want to acknowledge the past work of the U.S. Geological Survey that produced accurate and reliable data necessary for sound resource policy and management. Today I will merely express the expectation that it will take stronger steps to resist efforts to politicize or compromise its work. I especially endorse Mr. Werkheiser's statement that “the public deserves to know whether its investments are having tangible results.”

I hope that this administration will become a partner in this new era of abundance rather than an obstacle. The rationing of shortages has never solved a shortage – only a policy of abundance can do that. We have wasted not only money but time, and we can afford to waste no more of either.

Retrieved May 1, 2011 from <http://mcclintock.house.gov/2011/03/water-and-power-subcommittee-hearing-opening-statement.shtml>

APPENDIX X

Another View: Bee ignores benefits and misrepresents costs of an Auburn dam

Published Sunday, Apr. 17, 2011

By Congressman Tom McClintock

Re "Water 'dumped into the ocean' – shocking!" (Editorial, April 6):

Stripped of its adolescent vitriol, The Bee's editorial makes two substantive charges: first, that my proposals for renewed water projects like the Auburn dam would reduce water flows and harm fish populations; and second, that they would be cost-prohibitive, benefiting "wealthy San Joaquin Valley farmers" at the expense of local taxpayers.

The first charge betrays a breathtaking lack of understanding of the contributions that dams make to stabilizing water flows, improving water quality, reducing river temperatures and improving habitat. Before the Folsom Dam, for example, the American River would shrink to a trickle in drought years and flood the entire Delta in wet ones. The Auburn dam would provide 400-year flood protection for the Sacramento Delta, store 2.3 million acre-feet of cold, clean water that can be released during hot, dry periods – enough water to fill an acre to a depth of 435 miles – generate enough clean, cheap and reliable electricity to power nearly a million homes and create a major new recreational lake for the region.

The second charge borders on prevarication. The Bee's editorial board is well aware that as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Water and Power I have announced that all projects – including the Auburn dam – will first be evaluated under a uniform cost-benefit analysis that establishes the amortized cost of construction, and annual operations and maintenance balanced against the value of water, hydroelectricity, recreational leases and flood control protection afforded by these projects. It is also well aware that I have called for restoring the "beneficiary pays" doctrine to all future projects to assure that all federal dollars spent on these projects are repaid with interest by the users of the projects and thereafter provide a permanent revenue source to participating local communities.

Perhaps underlying The Bee's rage is the realization that projects it finds ideologically "progressive" will, for the first time, be subjected to these cost-benefit and "beneficiary pays" requirements. Sadly, the status quo squanders Northern California taxpayer dollars to subsidize outrageously expensive Southern California water recycling projects without a peep of criticism from The Bee.

Retrieved April 17, 2011 from <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/04/17/3556673/bee-ignores-benefits-and-misrepresents.html>

APPENDIX XI

Organizations Supporting Auburn Dam

1) *The American River Authority*

“The American River Authority (ARA) was formed in 1982 to support construction of the Auburn Dam, and has since expanded its scope to also include a variety of other water issues. The ARA is a joint powers authority comprised of Placer, El Dorado and San Joaquin counties, and the Placer and El Dorado County Water Agencies.” **Website:** <http://www.americanriverauthority.org/index1.asp>

2) *The Auburn Dam Council*

“Hurricane Katrina has clearly identified the level devastation and misery that can be brought about by rising water. Without a doubt our citizens are concerned about their safety and economic welfare. This has created renewed interest in the Auburn Dam because, as we have maintained for fifty years, it is the only long term solution to both flood and drought conditions.” **Website:** <http://www.auburndamcouncil.org/index.html>

3) *The Sacramento County Taxpayers League*

“The Taxpayers League has supported the Auburn Dam for years. The advent of the Sacramento Water Forum, whom worked for over six years to formulate the policy and agreements for water supply for the County through the year 2030, and my job as the League's representative, makes it incumbent on me to keep members informed as to the likelihood that the dam will ever be built. To make sense of the controversy over the dam, you must be aware of the different dams proposed, factions supporting each, and what motivates them”. **Website:** <http://sactax.org/auburndam/index.asp>

4) *American River Parkway Preservation Society*

“Sacramento, CA: May 22, 2006: The Society is announcing its support for the construction of the Auburn Dam...to protect the natural and recreational integrity of the American River Parkway, the health of the salmon, and flood protection for Sacramento.” **Website:** <http://www.arpps.org/news.html>
