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OPENING STATEMENT

ASSEMBLYMAN JIM COSTA, CHAIRMAN
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE
PUBLIC HEARING ON THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY PROJECT
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA
OCTOBER 14, 1988

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee's follow-up hearing on the San Joaquin River Parkway. I would first like to introduce and thank the members of the hearing panel for their participation today, Congressman Rick Lehman, Mike Chrisman representing Assemblyman Bill Jones, Tom Bohigian representing Assemblyman Bruce Bronzan, Jim Collin representing Senator Vuich, and Marie Escola, a member of the State Park and Recreation Commission. We also have representatives of Congressman Chip Pashayan and Senator Ken Maddy in the audience—I appreciate their attendance.

At the Committee's meeting last fall, we heard the opinions and ideas of many public agencies, interest groups and individuals regarding the Parkway. A number of important issues were brought to light, such as the public trust issue which the State Lands Commission has jurisdiction over, the need to maintain an adequate floodway, the importance of mining operations on the river bottom, and the need to protect critical wildlife habitat, to name a few. We must continue to deal thoughtfully and carefully with these issues while we move forward with the Parkway project.

In the last year, a number of significant things have happened to benefit the Parkway. The State Legislature has formally endorsed the concept of the Parkway through the enactment of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 87. Proposition 70, which was overwhelmingly approved by the voters in June, earmarked $5 million for acquisition of wildlife habitat along the San Joaquin River and also provides funding for other elements of the Parkway project. The San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust has been formed, and significant progress has been made toward the development of a conceptual plan for the Parkway.
TODAY'S MEETING WILL PROVIDE US WITH AN UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF THE PARKWAY, INCLUDING RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE VARIOUS PUBLIC AGENCIES INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT. THE HEARING WILL ALSO PROVIDE A PUBLIC FORUM FOR CLARIFYING AND RAISING ADDITIONAL ISSUES WHICH NEED TO BE ADDRESSED AS WE CONTINUE OUR EFFORTS.

BEFORE WE BEGIN THE HEARING, I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE THE MEMBERS OF THE PANEL AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE STATEMENTS IF THEY SO DESIRE.

WE WILL START OUT THIS MORNING WITH A SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION BY DONN FURMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER COMMITTEE, FOLLOWED BY A STATEMENT FROM TWO MEMBERS OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY AND CONSERVATION TRUST--COKE HALLOWELL AND JOHN WISSLER.
STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD H. LEHMAN
BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE COMMITTEE
ON THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY
OCTOBER 14, 1988

MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS AN HONOR TO BE WITH YOU TODAY AS YOU
CONTINUE YOUR OVERSIGHT ROLE OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY.
WE CAN ALL BE PROUD TODAY OF OUR COMMUNITY AND ITS CITIZENS FOR
STANDING TOGETHER TO MAKE THE SAN JOAQUIN PARKWAY A LEGACY FOR
FUTURE GENERATIONS. WE HAVE A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO TRANSLATE
OUR VISION OF A QUALITY ENVIRONMENT INTO REALITY, AND I AM PROUD
TO BE A PART OF THAT COMMITMENT.

THE PARKWAY CONCEPT HAS COME A LONG WAY SINCE YOUR FIRST
HEARING JUST A YEAR AGO. MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY FROM ALL WALKS
OF LIFE HAVE STEPPED FORWARD TO HELP CREATE THE SAN JOAQUIN PARKWAY.
PEOPLE HAVE DONATED TIME AND MONEY AND LAND FOR THIS FINE CAUSE.
THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY AND CONSERVATION TRUST HAS BEEN
FORMED. A PLAN FOR PARKWAY DEVELOPMENT IS UNDERWAY. PROPOSITION
70 HAS RESULTED IN THE AVAILABILITY OF $5 MILLION FOR LAND ACQUISITION
ALONG THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER. A TRAIL HAS BEEN PROPOSED WHICH WILL
RUN FOR 22 MILES ALONGSIDE THE RIVER. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE JOINED
TOGETHER TO DEMONSTRATE THEIR SUPPORT FOR A REGIONAL PARK. SUPPORTERS
OF THE PARKWAY HAVE LEARNED OF A NETWORK OF OTHER COMMUNITIES ACROSS
THE NATION WHO HAVE FORMED SIMILAR LAND TRUSTS SO THAT URBAN AND
SUBURBAN RESIDENTS WILL ALWAYS HAVE A "GREENSCAPE" CLOSE TO HOME.
(JACKSON HOLE, PENINSULA OPEN SPACE, COLORADO OPEN LANDS FOUNDATION,
MONTANA LAND RELIANCE, ETC., ETC.)
This is an exciting time for those of us who have lived in the Valley all our lives and who wish to give something back to the land which has given us so much. I am delighted that a spokesman for the National Park Service is here today to share the Park Service's experience with us. I would note that one of the best things about the San Joaquin Parkway is that it is a grass-roots idea and that the state--with the leadership of Assemblyman Costa and his Parks Committee--will be taking a strong role in funding.

I pledge to do everything I can at the federal level to lend the support of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and other technical assistance programs to this effort. But to succeed the San Joaquin Parkway must join all levels of government with the time and talent of our local citizens. The lower San Joaquin River can become a showplace for natural resources in an urban environment. And this can happen in our lifetime. Thank you.
THANK YOU FOR INVITING ME TO SPEAK AT THE HEARING ON THE PROPOSED SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY.

THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION HAS BEEN VERY ACTIVE IN THE LAST YEAR IN VARIOUS ISSUES INVOLVING THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, MANY OF WHICH COULD DIRECTLY BEAR UPON THE PARKWAY. OUR ACTIVITIES HAVE OCCURRED IN SEVERAL AREAS: 1) SURVEYING; 2) BOUNDARY LINE SETTLEMENTS; 3) ADVISING OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ABOUT THE LOCATION OF LANDS SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC TRUST; AND 4) ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTATION ON PROJECTS WHICH MAY HAVE AN EFFECT ON THE RIVER, SUCH AS THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT, OUR WORK IN THESE AREAS IS DETAILED IN OUR RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS YOU HAVE POSED TO US.

IN THE PAST YEAR WE HAVE WORKED CLOSELY WITH CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND STATE RECLAMATION BOARD STAFFS TO DEFINE MORE CLEARLY THE CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT SITES BOTH WITHIN THE PARKWAY AND DOWNSTREAM OF IT. WE ARE ALSO AWARE THAT ENGINEERING WORK HAS BEGUN WHICH IS INTENDED TO SUBSTANTIATE THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT AND THE SELECTION OF SITES. AS THE RESULT OF THE CORPS'S ENGINEERING EFFORTS, THE NUMBER OF SITES AND THE EXTENT OF VEGETATION REMOVAL HAVE BEEN REDUCED ALTHOUGH THE REMOVAL SITES WITHIN THE PARKWAY REMAIN. WE WILL CONTINUE TO ASK THAT PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WITHIN THE PARKWAY AND ELSEWHERE BE FULLY DEVELOPED AND THAT ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE BE HELD TO A
MINIMUM. AS TO PROJECT MITIGATION, WE HAVE CONSISTENTLY TAKEN THE POSITION THAT PUBLIC TRUST LANDS CAN BE USED TO MITIGATE THE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT ONLY WHERE PUBLIC TRUST LANDS ARE PRESENTLY DEGRADED AND MITIGATION FUNDS WILL BE SPENT TO IMPROVE THEIR CONDITION. WE HAVE ALSO ASKED FOR LANGUAGE IN MITIGATION EASEMENTS WHICH ASSURES THAT ALL MITIGATION LANDS WILL BE PERMANENTLY FREE OF PRIVATE USES AND WILL BE ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME.

THE COMMITTEE HAS RAISED SEVERAL QUESTIONS. THE QUESTIONS AND OUR RESPONSES FOLLOW:

1. PLEASE CLARIFY THE ISSUE OF STATE OWNERSHIP VERSUS PUBLIC TRUST RIGHTS OF CALIFORNIA’S INLAND LAKES AND RIVERS.

WHEN CALIFORNIA WAS ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES AS A STATE OF THE UNION, IT GAINED OWNERSHIP IN TRUST FOR THE PUBLIC OF ALL LANDS UNDERLYING TIDAL AND NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS. THIS SOVEREIGN OWNERSHIP INCLUDES THE BEDS OF ALL NAVIGABLE, NON-TIDAL INLAND WATER BODIES SUCH AS LAKES AND RIVERS. THE BED OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BELOW THE ORDINARY HIGH WATER MARK IS AN EXAMPLE OF THE TYPE OF SOVEREIGN LANDS THAT CAME TO THE STATE ON ITS ADMISSION IN 1850.

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA HAS A DUAL OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN SUCH SOVEREIGN LANDS. IT OWNS SUCH LANDS MUCH THE SAME AS ANY
PRIVATE LANDOWNER. HOWEVER, THE STATE’S OWNERSHIP OF SOVEREIGN LANDS IS HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR CERTAIN BROADLY DEFINED PURPOSES. THIS PUBLIC TRUST INTEREST, IN THE NATURE OF A PUBLIC EASEMENT, CANNOT BE SOLD OR CONVEYED TO PRIVATE PERSONS FOR PURELY PRIVATE PURPOSES. THIS EASEMENT IS A PROPERTY INTEREST WHICH THE STATE OR ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC CAN EXERCISE. THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE STATE HOLDS THIS EASEMENT AND FOR WHICH THE EASEMENT CAN BE USED ARE QUITE VARIED. THEY INCLUDE COMMERCE, NAVIGATION, FISHERIES, RECREATION, OPEN SPACE, AND ECOLOGICAL PRESERVATION.


IN SUMMARY, IN NON-TIDAL, NAVIGABLE WATER BODIES, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA HOLDS FEE SIMPLE ABSOLUTE TITLE TO SUCH LANDS WATERWARD OF THE ORDINARY LOW WATER MARK; THAT TITLE IS HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PUBLIC. LANDWARD OF THE ORDINARY LOW WATER MARK AND WATERWARD OF THE ORDINARY HIGH WATER MARK, THE STATE RETAINS AND HOLDS A PUBLIC TRUST EASEMENT IN SUCH LANDS. THUS, WHILE THE FEE TITLE OF RIPARIAN PROPERTY OWNERS EXTENDS TO THE ORDINARY LOW WATER MARK, THAT FEE TITLE REMAINS SUBJECT TO THE INALIENABLE PUBLIC TRUST EASEMENT OF THE STATE.
IF YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THIS SUBJECT, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL BRUCE S. FLUSHMAN IS WITH ME TODAY AND WILL BE AVAILABLE TO RESPOND.

2. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE COMMISSION’S BOUNDARY STUDY OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER?

A) WHEN WILL MAPPING BASED ON CONTROLLED AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY BE COMPLETED?

B) WHEN WILL THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS BE COMPLETED ON A WORKING BASIS TO RESOLVE OWNERSHIP QUESTIONS?

AFTER ACCUMULATING THE NECESSARY SURVEY DATA AND SUFFICIENTLY COMPLETING DETAILED OFFICE WORK PRELIMINARY TO GOING INTO THE FIELD, THE COMMISSION’S SURVEY STAFF BEGAN FIELD ACTIVITIES ON A CONTROLLED AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY MAPPING PROJECT IN AND ALONG THE RIVER FROM FRIANT DAM DOWNSTREAM TO THE GRAVELLY FORD CANAL IN EARLY SEPTEMBER. APPROXIMATELY 65 MILES OF SURVEY LEVELING HAS BEEN COMPLETED AND 80 PHOTO CONTROL MONUMENTS HAVE BEEN SET ALONG THE RIVER CORRIDOR. DURING THE MONTHS OF DECEMBER AND JANUARY, THE STAFF WILL BE UTILIZING SATELLITE SURVEYING EQUIPMENT TO ACCURATELY POSITION THE PHOTO CONTROL MONUMENTS. IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT THE AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY WILL TAKE PLACE DURING THIS SAME TIME PERIOD, DEPENDING ON WEATHER CONDITIONS. CONTOUR MAPPING WILL FOLLOW. IT SHOULD BE STRESSED THAT WHILE THESE MAPS
WILL NOT DEPICT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SOVEREIGN TRUST LANDS, THEY WILL BE BASE TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS THAT WILL BE USED TO NEGOTIATE BOUNDARIES WITH UPLAND OWNERS AND TO ASSIST ANY PUBLIC ENTITY WHICH MAY BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PARKWAY. ADDITIONALLY, THESE MAPS COULD PROVIDE A SOLID BASIS FOR PARKWAY PLANNING.

3. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF ANY ONGOING NEGOTIATIONS WITH PROPERTY OWNERS?

AS MENTIONED AT THE LAST HEARING BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE, WE HAVE MADE OURSELVES AVAILABLE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS TO DETERMINE THE LOCATIONS OF THEIR BOUNDARIES WITH THE STATE. THIS SETTLEMENT PROCESS OFTEN TAKES PLACE WHEN CERTAINTY OF LAND TITLE IS NECESSARY FOR A SALE OR WHEN CONSTRUCTION FINANCING IS SOUGHT BY THE RIPARIAN LANDOWNER. SINCE THE HEARING LAST FALL, SEVERAL RECORD OWNERS OF RIPARIAN PROPERTIES HAVE CONTACTED US.

IN ONE CASE, THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION HAS FORMALLY APPROVED A BOUNDARY LINE AGREEMENT. THE SETTLEMENT DOCUMENT HAS BEEN FULLY EXECUTED BY ALL PARTIES, INCLUDING THE GOVERNOR, AND IS IN ESCROW AWAITING TITLE REPORTS BEFORE RECORDATION. IN THE OTHER CASES, NEGOTIATIONS ARE BEGINNING OR ARE ONGOING.

IN SOME CASES, THE EXTENT OF SOVEREIGN LANDS ALONG THE RIVER MAY BE BROAD ENOUGH TO SUPPORT A PARKWAY. IN OTHER CASES, IT MAY PROVE THAT THE PRESENT TOPOGRAPHY OF THE LAND AND HISTORIC
LOCATION OF THE NATURAL RIVERBED SIMPLY DO NOT AFFORD A WIDE ENOUGH STRETCH FOR PARKWAY IMPROVEMENTS. THE BIKE PATHS, HORSE TRAILS, BOAT ACCESS POINTS, AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS WHICH WILL COMPRISE THE PARKWAY ARE PROPER USES OF PUBLIC TRUST LANDS. PARKWAYS OF THE TYPE PROPOSED FOR THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER CAN FURTHER PUBLIC TRUST INTERESTS IN THE RIVER IN UNIQUE WAYS. THE AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY IN SACRAMENTO HAS PROVIDED AN IRREPLACEABLE UNIT FOR PRESERVING RIPARIAN HABITAT AND HAS FURTHERED BOATING, FISHING, SWIMMING, AND OTHER TRUST RELATED ACTIVITIES.

4. **WHAT IS THE COMMISSION'S AUTHORITY TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO PROPERTY WHICH IMPEDE THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO NAVIGATE ITS WATERWAYS (E.G., BRIDGES, CULVERTS, CAUSEWAYS)?**

PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 6301 CONFRS ON THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION OVER THE BEDS OF NAVIGABLE RIVERS SUCH AS THE SAN JOAQUIN. TITLE 2 OF THE CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SETS OUT IN MORE DETAIL SPECIFIC STANDARDS FOR THE LEASING OF PROPERTIES WITHIN CONTROL OF THE COMMISSION. THE NET EFFECT OF THOSE SECTIONS AND CASE LAW IS THAT THE COMMISSION HAS THE AUTHORITY TO LEASE PROPERTY FOR IMPROVEMENTS SUCH AS BRIDGES, CULVERTS, AND CAUSEWAYS IN THE NATURAL BED OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, TO CONTROL THEIR DESIGN, AND TO CHARGE RENT IF THEY SUPPORT A COMMERCIAL VENTURE.
EXAMPLE OF SUCH A LEASE IS THAT TO LONESTAR INDUSTRIES COVERING THE BRIDGE TO LEDGER ISLAND AT THE BALL RANCH. THE BRIDGE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A HAZARD TO NAVIGATION. OUR EXPERIENCE IN THIS CASE WILL BE USED TO GUIDE THE COMMISSION IN THE GRANTING OF SUBSEQUENT LEASES. ALL OUR LEASING AND PERMITTING ACTIVITIES ARE, OF COURSE, SUBJECT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY. WE STAND READY TO ASSIST IN ANY NEEDED EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THE PARKWAY'S DEVELOPMENT, TO CLARIFY BOUNDARY AND TITLE QUESTIONS, AND TO ASSIST IN THE NECESSARY MITIGATION FOR ANY NEEDED CORPS IMPROVEMENTS OR ACTIVITIES. WE WISH YOU THE BEST OF LUCK IN COMPLETING THE PARKWAY.
CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, MY NAME IS HENRY AGONIA AND I AM THE DIRECTOR OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION.

THE DEPARTMENT APPRECIATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY REGARDING THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY. IN OUR TESTIMONY IN SEPTEMBER OF 1987, WE SPOKE TO THE MERITS OF THE PROJECT WHICH WE LIKENED TO THE AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY, AN OUTSTANDING RECREATION RESOURCE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA.


1. WHAT ARE THE SOURCES OF FUNDING AVAILABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT AND LOCAL AGENCIES FROM PROPOSITION 70 FOR THE PROPOSED PARKWAY?

THE DEPARTMENT HAS $50 MILLION AVAILABLE FROM PROPOSITION 70 FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES WITHIN STATE PARK SYSTEM UNITS AND $4.7 MILLION FOR ACQUISITION OF LANDS ADJACENT TO STATE PARK SYSTEM UNITS. A PORTION OF THESE FUNDS COULD BE USED AT MILLERTON LAKE STATE RECREATION AREA, WHICH IS AN IMPORTANT LINK IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY PROPOSAL. MILLERTON LAKE SRA PROVIDES THE TIE TO THE FEDERAL LANDS ON THE UPPER
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WHICH WILL ALLOW TRAIL USERS TO CONTINUE FROM THE PARKWAY THROUGH TO THE SIERRA-NEVADA MOUNTAINS.

IN ORDER FOR THESE STATE PARK SYSTEM FUNDS TO BE USED AT MILLERTON LAKE SRA, IT IS NECESSARY FOR THE PROPOSAL TO BE NOMINATED BY A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE OR THE STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION. THOSE PROPOSALS NOMINATED FOR STUDY WILL BE EVALUATED BY THE DEPARTMENT AND RANKED IN PRIORITY ORDER. THE HIGHEST PRIORITY PROJECTS WILL BE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING FROM THIS BOND ACT IN THE BUDGET BILL.

REGARDING GRANT FUNDS AVAILABLE TO LOCAL AGENCIES, I AM ATTACHING A LISTING OF THE JURISDICTIONS IN FRESNO AND MADERA COUNTIES THAT ARE ELIGIBLE FOR PER CAPITA GRANT FUNDS AND THE AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO EACH.

PROPOSITION 70 ALSO PROVIDES TRAIL GRANT FUNDS ON A COMPETITIVE BASIS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. THERE WILL BE $2.5 MILLION AVAILABLE IN 1989/90 AND $2.5 MILLION AVAILABLE IN 1990/91. THE DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION IS DECEMBER 1, 1988 FOR CONSIDERATION FOR THE FIRST YEAR'S FUNDING.

SPECIAL DISTRICTS THAT PROVIDE A RECREATION SERVICE AND ARE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PER CAPITA FUNDS ARE ELIGIBLE TO COMPLETE FOR SPECIAL DISTRICT GRANT FUNDS. THERE WILL BE $5 MILLION AVAILABLE IN 1989/90 AND $5 MILLION AVAILABLE IN 1990/91. THE
DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION IS DECEMBER 1, 1989 FOR CONSIDERATION FOR THE FIRST YEAR'S FUNDING.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES ARE ALSO ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ROBERTI-Z'BERG-HARRIS GRANT PROGRAM UNDER PROPOSITION 70. THE ALLOCATION OF THE $20 MILLION WILL BE ANNOUNCED IN FEBRUARY AND WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR APPLICATION AND EXPENDITURE AFTER JULY 1, 1989.

THE DEPARTMENT HAS FORWARDED PROCEDURAL GUIDES FOR THESE PROGRAMS TO ALL ELIGIBLE AGENCIES. THE GUIDES FOR THE TRAIL GRANT PROGRAM HAVE ALSO BEEN FORWARDED TO VARIOUS NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

I AM PROVIDING A COPY OF THESE PROCEDURAL GUIDES TO THE COMMITTEE FOR YOUR INFORMATION.

THE DEPARTMENT HAS GRANTS ADMINISTRATION STAFF AVAILABLE TO ASSIST LOCAL AGENCIES OR NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE PREPARATION OF GRANT APPLICATION FORMS.

2. HOW CAN THE DEPARTMENT ASSIST IN THE PLANNING EFFORTS CURRENTLY UNDERWAY FOR THE PROPOSED PARKWAY?

THE DEPARTMENT HAS AN INTEREST IN THIS PARKWAY BOTH IN TERMS OF THE RECREATION AND PRESERVATION OPPORTUNITIES IT PROVIDES. AS MENTIONED EARLIER, THE PARKWAY HAS A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP
TO MILLERTON LAKE SRA. AS A RESULT, THE DEPARTMENT WOULD BE WILLING TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THOSE UNDERTAKING THE PARKWAY PLAN TO HAVE THE PARKWAY PLANNING INCLUDE A CONSIDERATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP AND THE LINKING OF THE PARKWAY TO MILLERTON LAKE SRA.

3. PLEASE DISCUSS ANY PROPOSALS OR OPTIONS FOR THE EXPANSION OF MILLERTON LAKE STATE RECREATION AREA AND LINKING THE SRA TO THE PROPOSED PARKWAY.

THE DEPARTMENT FEELS VERY STRONGLY THAT THERE MUST BE A LINK BETWEEN MILLERTON LAKE SRA AND THE PARKWAY. HOW THIS CAN BE MOST EFFECTIVELY REALIZED HAS NOT BEEN DETERMINED. WE WOULD EXPECT THE PLANNING EFFORT, DISCUSSED EARLIER, TO MORE CLEARLY IDENTIFY THAT LINK. AT THIS TIME, THE DEPARTMENT HAS NO PLANS TO EXPAND MILLERTON LAKE SRA. IT IS POSSIBLE, HOWEVER, THAT SOME MINOR ACQUISITION MIGHT BE NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES IDENTIFIED IN THE PARKWAY PLAN.

4. PLEASE DISCUSS THE FEASIBILITY OF ACQUIRING LOST LAKE PARK OR, ALTERNATIVELY, ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT TO OPERATE THE PARK. DISCUSS THE FEASIBILITY OF EXPANDING MILLERTON LAKE SRA BY LINKING THE SRA TO LOST LAKE PARK.

THE DEPARTMENT HAS NOT FULLY EVALUATED LOST LAKE PARK AS A POTENTIAL ADDITION TO MILLERTON LAKE SRA. THE DEPARTMENT FEELS THAT THE PARKWAY PLANNING STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE
CONSIDERATION OF AN OVERALL MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR THE PARKWAY. IT MAY BE DESIRABLE TO DIVIDE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY AMONG SEVERAL AGENCIES OR IT MAY BE MOST EFFICIENT TO HAVE A REGIONAL AGENCY ESTABLISHED FOR PURPOSES OF MANAGING THE PARKWAY. THE OUTCOME OF THIS PLANNING EFFORT SHOULD HELP THE DEPARTMENT IN DETERMINING ITS ROLE IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY PROJECT.

I WOULD BE PLEASED TO RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS THAT MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE MIGHT HAVE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percapita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRESNO COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALWA R.P.D.</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>9,119</td>
<td>$2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOVIS, CITY OF</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>44,900</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COALINGA-HURON R.P.D.</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIREBAUGH, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOWLER, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO, CITY OF</td>
<td>$931,000</td>
<td>308,700</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO, COUNTY OF</td>
<td>$997,000</td>
<td>606,000</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERMAN, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGSBURG, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAGA W.D.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>$13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENDOTA, CITY OF</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>$3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE COVE, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARLIER, CITY OF</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>$3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAISIN CITY R.P.D.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEDLEY, CITY OF</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>$3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANGER, CITY OF</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>$3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELMA, CITY OF</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>14,050</td>
<td>$2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MADERA COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOWCHILLA, CITY OF</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADERA, CITY OF</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADERA, COUNTY OF</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>81,600</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY
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George D. Nokes, Regional Manager
California Department of Fish and Game
October 14, 1988

A little over a year ago I reported to you that the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway has considerable potential to provide excellent benefits to fish and wildlife and to citizens of the San Joaquin Valley. That potential has been recognized by the public and we have received a mandate by the passage of Proposition 70 to protect and enhance this valuable riparian corridor.

During the past year the Department of Fish and Game has been involved in a number of activities associated with the San Joaquin River. We have worked with the City of Fresno in the development of a proposal to purchase a key parcel of land that will assist in the formation of a parkway. That proposal was forwarded to the Wildlife Conservation Board and negotiations for purchase of the property are in final stages. We have participated in the discussions and planning for the proposed "snagging and clearing" project in the river. It is our belief that with proper planning and adequate funding the project can be accomplished without a significant loss to fish and wildlife resources. A considerable amount of effort has been spent working with the sand and gravel mining industry. I am pleased to state there has been much progress made towards protecting and developing wildlife habitat; and in most cases, I have found a very sincere willingness to cooperate.

The Department has also been gathering information on wildlife populations and the various habitat types along the river corridor. This information is being used in the evaluation of different projects and proposed land use changes as well as the development of proposals to purchase land or obtain wildlife easements.

The San Joaquin River and adjacent land is a complex ecological network that comprises vital aquatic/riparian/upland communities. They are used for migration, feeding, resting and reproduction by a wide spectrum of wildlife.
Approximately 220 species of songbirds and upland game can be found in the area; egrets, herons, raccoon, opossum and waterfowl are common. The San Joaquin River riparian corridor is an important pathway for migratory birds, both latitudinal and altitudinal migrants. Beaver are present in substantial numbers as well as wood ducks throughout the riparian woodland strip. Ponded areas, the product of gravel mining operations, coupled with associated riparian habitat, provide resting areas for flocks of Canada geese during their winter migration. Sightings of the geese feeding and rafting are common although their numbers have declined over the years in this area.

Linear strips of wildlife habitat along the river include trees, shrubs, broadleaf annual plants and aquatic plants. This riparian vegetation is the mainstay of animal populations along the corridor and surrounding areas. It provides the necessary diversity to support insects, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals.

The river flood plain is home for several threatened and endangered species; the Valley Longhorn Elderberry Beetle and a small beautiful vernal pool plant called Orthocarpus compestris. The magnificent bald eagle is a frequent winter visitor and uses the river and Millerton Lake area to forage. Other animals of special interest and concern to the Department that are found in the river area include the Swainson’s hawk, marsh hawk, burrowing owl and mountain lion.

The river below Friant Dam contains a variety of fish (22 species) and other aquatic organisms. The area immediately below the dam supports a year-round trout fishery. The Department stocks about 70,000 catchable sized trout annually in this stretch of river. When additional public access becomes available, this program will be expanded downstream for at least part of the year. In river sections and adjacent ponds that are too warm during the summer for trout, a winter trout stocking program could be developed.

Warmwater fish such as bass, crappie, bluegill and catfish inhabit the river and can also be found in varying numbers in gravel excavation ponds. Public access to these areas is limited and consequently, angler use and harvest of fish is much less than it could be under a managed public use program.
The interest in and demand for fishing in California increases each year. The limiting factor for angling opportunity is usually public access and proximity to fishing waters. The metropolitan Fresno-Clovis area with its rapidly expanding urban population is lacking in close fishing opportunities, particularly for young anglers. A parkway with public access to the river and adjacent ponds coupled with a fish management program would be a very valuable asset to surrounding communities.

Development of the San Joaquin River corridor to its biological potential would serve to enrich the surrounding communities with a botanical and ecological natural area providing substantial recreational and education opportunities. The public could utilize the respite while participating in sightseeing, photography, hiking, picnicking, boating and fishing experiences.

There is a very significant potential in the river itself. The San Joaquin was once a beautiful and sometimes awesome river that needed control. Unfortunately, it has been over controlled and we now have only a remnant flow that derives its life from water discharged from the San Joaquin Trout Hatchery, leakage from Friant Dam and a small amount of irrigation water during most of the year.

There is no doubt that additional flows, depending upon the timing and magnitude, could provide an outstanding fishery for trout and bass and excellent water oriented recreation. Under certain circumstances, an augmented flow in the San Joaquin River could also improve water quality and quantity conditions for salmon and striped bass populations downstream from the confluence of the Merced River.

The Department has the technical capability to identify the stream flow needs for these resources and that process would require major stream flow studies. We would be most willing to work with the Friant Water Users Association and others who regulate water deliveries in the San Joaquin Valley to evaluate the potential for increasing river flows.

We have been in the process of evaluating wildlife habitat along the San Joaquin River corridor for the purpose of selecting areas to be considered for purchase. It has been a difficult but pleasant task since there are so many excellent areas. At this time we have chosen to concentrate on the river from Highway 41 upstream to Friant Dam. This area has the highest wildlife values and the greatest potential for improvement. Within this reach of the river we are currently focusing on habitat from Cobb Island upstream to Ledger Island.
Once we have completed our evaluations and purchase proposals here in Fresno, they will be forwarded to the Director for his consideration. After the Director has made his decision, the proposals will be forwarded to the Wildlife Conservation Board for its action.

As properties are purchased, a number of management activities such as selective fencing, water management, developing nesting cover and feeding areas, placement of wood duck nesting boxes and dove nest cones, and planting of selected native shrubs and trees can be undertaken to improve wildlife habitat.

Appropriate planning and proper management, combined with wetland development, will increase and diversify existing riparian habitat along the corridor. We could expect from such measures increased native plant and animal populations including waterfowl, songbirds, quail, pheasant, raptors and many types of mammals. Egret and heron rookeries would also likely expand.

In closing, I would like to stress the importance of the San Joaquin River to fish and wildlife resources. The inherent values of this riparian corridor need to be protected and its potential for recreation and education should be developed. We have an excellent opportunity to protect and enhance a very valuable asset of the San Joaquin Valley, Fresno and Madera counties in particular, that should not be lost.
I have been asked to testify before you on six specific questions. I plan to address each question individually and will be glad to answer any additional questions that committee members may have along the way.

1. Update on Proposed Acquisitions:

I am pleased that in response to your first question, I am able to announce some welcome news: Last Friday, the owners of the 286-acre property known as the Underdown parcel, signed an agreement to sell this property to the State, through the Wildlife Conservation Board. As many of you know, this property was used until just last year as a sand and gravel extraction site, and with the recent termination of activity, it already shows a significant level of revegetation to riparian habitat.

My staff plans to present the acquisition to the Wildlife Conservation Board at its next meeting, November 15, 1988, for approval and funding, and we foresee a close of escrow by mid December, 1988. The purchase will be funded through the recently passed Proposition 70 initiative bond act.

While I am mentioning funding, I should note that the acquisition comes with a substantial donation from the principal owner, Don Underdown, of Builder's Concrete here in Fresno. The market value of the property was determined to be just over $1.43 million, and Mr. Underdown offered the property to the State for a total of $860,000, which represents a full 40% discount.

In other acquisitions, two weeks ago, the Department of Fish and Game preliminarily identified three (3) additional sites for WCB consideration for inclusion in the San Joaquin River Acquisition Program. Full acquisition proposals are now being prepared, and we expect to commence negotiations before the end of this calendar year.
2. Proposition 70: A) Types of habitat that can be acquired; B) WCB time frame for acquisitions; C) Time frame for fund availability.

A. Generally stated, the Bond Act calls for expenditure of these funds for acquisition of land "pursuant to the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947" (which begins at Fish and Game Code Section 1300). Acquisitions under the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947 are made "... in order to effectuate a coordinated and balanced program resulting in the maximum revival of wildlife in the State and in the maximum recreational advantages to the people of the State."

We see Prop. 70 as providing the Board funding for rather wide-ranging authority to acquire lands for wildlife-oriented recreational activities and wildlife habitat preservation.

B and C:

As you know from my answer to your first question, our time line is the immediate future and funds are available now. The San Joaquin River funds in Prop. 70 were made available to the Board directly, without regard to legislative appropriation. Funding availability is subject to bond sales authority and a loan from the Pooled Money Investment Account. $15 M in loans has already been approved.

3. Grant Funds:

The WCB has no grant program or grant authority. Funds are limited to State acquisition.

But I should point out that the Board does have authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the DFG with local agencies to provide for management of its lands and facilities to carry out the purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Law.

4. Jurisdiction over WCB-Acquired Lands:

As a general rule, lands acquired by the WCB are turned over to the Department of Fish and Game for management purposes. However, as I mentioned, the Board does have authority to enter into construction, management or maintenance agreements of the Board's lands with counties, cities, public corporations and public districts.

5. O & M through Local Land Trusts:

The Board does not have authority to enter into operation and maintenance agreements with local land trusts.
6. **Involvement of the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust in the Acquisition Program for Prop. 70:**

Actually, the Trust can help greatly in the area of information gathering. The Department of Fish and Game is the Board's primary source of information, such as biological data, to serve as a basis for the Board's acquisition decisions. Proposition 70, while greatly increasing the Board's money supply, has also greatly increased the workload of the Board staff and, just as importantly, the staff of the Department of Fish and Game. Properly narrowing down choices among potential acquisition priorities will require accurate, current information, and in our experience, the best information seems to come from the local people. We would like to think that the interested local proponents of all the Prop. 70 projects would assist the Department of Fish and Game and the Board (just as the Parkway folks did on the Underdown property), by providing already-gathered data and by keeping track of day-to-day events that might affect acquisition priorities.

I hope this testimony has been helpful, and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.
TESTIMONY OF DIRECTOR BUD SHEELE¹, CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS
BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE

Interim Hearing
Proposed San Joaquin River Parkway
Fresno, California — October 14, 1988

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to provide a brief explanation of the California Conservation Corps' program and how we may assist in the proposed San Joaquin River parkway project.

The California Conservation Corps, the CCC, is modeled after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s, and grew out of the Ecology Corps established in 1971. In July 1976, legislation was passed which created the CCC, and in 1983, Governor Deukmejian made the CCC a permanent state department. It has a dual mission: the employment and development of young people, and the conservation and enhancement of the state's natural resources. California's CCC has surpassed the original CCC in years of operation, and is the largest program of its kind in the country.

The CCC provides more than three million hours of public service conservation work and emergency assistance to the state each year. Corpsmembers, who are California residents between 18 and 23 years of age, not on probation or parole and willing to work hard, may put in their day's work in the wilderness, planting trees, cutting trails, or clearing streams; in cities, building playgrounds, restoring historical buildings, or revitalizing downtown centers; or even indoors, answering an energy hotline or conducting energy audits. During emergencies, we sandbag levees, fight forest fires and mudslides, help eradicate agricultural pests, and provide clean-up assistance following major earthquakes. Our motto is "hard work, low pay, miserable conditions...and more."

¹ Presented by Deputy Director Ann S. Malcolm
The CCC works for state, federal, county, city and other local project sponsors, as well as for nonprofit agencies. Typically, these sponsors initiate projects locally to our 17 centers and 30 satellite operations spread throughout the state.

The funding for the CCC comes from the State General Fund and from project sponsor reimbursements for some of our work.

The Committee requested that the CCC respond to three specific questions about the proposed San Joaquin River parkway project. If you have any additional questions, I would be happy to respond to them also.

The first question is:

**What is the CCC's authority and experience in undertaking park and recreation projects?**

The Public Resources Code, beginning at Section 14000, authorizes the CCC to perform projects which "preserve, maintain, and enhance environmentally important lands and waters; conserve, maintain, improve, and develop natural resources in both urban and rural areas; and contribute toward making public facilities accessible to persons with disabilities."

These operating statutes also authorize the Director to "execute contracts for furnishing the services of the Corps to any federal, state, or local public agency; any local or statewide private organization concerned with the objectives of the Corps' program, ... and any person, firm, partnership or corporation concerned with these objectives."

During the past 11 years, corpsmembers have spent over 3.2 million hours on park improvements across the state for federal, state, county and city parks. Over 1,510 miles of trails in Sequoia, Kings Canyon and Yosemite National Parks have been constructed or rebuilt. I think the Committee will find that the CCC's reputation and experience as a supervised labor force providing quality park and recreation work difficult to match.

Corpsmembers work in crews consisting of approximately 6 to 12 men and women each, depending on the project, and are trained and supervised to work cooperatively together to accomplish the requested task. They arrive to
work on time and stay until the project is completed. The expectations of the work to be performed are discussed and understood through a project sponsor agreement prior to crews beginning the work. If any complications arise with the crew, a supervisor or crew leader is there to ensure that the work goes on uninterrupted.

The second question is:

What kind of assistance could the CCC provide in developing or maintaining park and recreation facilities in the area of the proposed San Joaquin River parkway?

The CCC could develop work agreements with sponsors of the San Joaquin River parkway to use corps members from our Sequoia Center, which is a residential center located in Porterville; it is the base operation for approximately 70 corps members. Thirty other young people live and work right here in Fresno. They are non-residential corps members who live at home in Fresno and travel to work from a CCC designated location each day. These Fresno crews could assist in projects planned for the proposed parkway.

Each project request would be evaluated and scheduled to meet the needs of the sponsor and the CCC. Each is rated by the CCC as to its conservation value, public benefit or access, and whether it will provide corps members with opportunities for training in employable skills. We perform only high quality projects that focus on skill development such as landscaping, trail building and construction projects. We avoid maintenance work and do not perform make-work projects.

Park development projects could include day use picnic areas, construction of gazebo shade structures, development of barbeque areas, physical fitness trails, landscaping and irrigation work. The CCC does a great job in making parks, including fitness trails, accessible to the handicapped by putting in ramps and curving structures as well. Also, landscaping could include tree planting or vegetation enhancement in the parks or, possibly, in the buffer zone area that may be necessary along the proposed parkway.
Other typical projects that could also be done for this endeavor include:

- Riparian enhancement along the river banks by adding vegetation or clearing the river of undesirable plants;
- Brush clearing where heavy equipment cannot be used; and,
- Trail construction including asphalt trails. The CCC could prepare the ground and the forms prior to having asphalt laid.

The last question that you requested to have discussed is:

**Could the CCC assist in related projects on the San Joaquin River, such as general cleanup projects or removal of debris and noxious weeds (e.g. bamboo) as part of flood control efforts in the area?**

Yes. The CCC is available to assist in related San Joaquin River projects and any flood control efforts for the city or county of Fresno. These projects may be requested at anytime, in fact, we have the necessary forms with us today. Once a request is made, a schedule is mutually agreed upon at the center level and the crews begin work. While bamboo is a very difficult weed to eradicate and is a maintenance problem, CCC crews could perform this kind of work on a limited basis. We discourage projects which involve the removal of poison oak, however, as these projects increase our workers' compensation costs dramatically.

Something to keep in mind when using corpsmember labor is that the CCC could be called to assist in emergencies at any time. Whenever a statewide emergency occurs, corpsmembers from every corner of the state may be called upon to respond. At these times, local projects are put on hold until the crews are no longer needed for the emergency.

Another point to keep in mind is the CCC's working relationship with local community employee unions. On any project where a local employee union raises an objection to the use of corpsmember labor, the CCC does not perform the job unless union representatives have agreed that corpsmember labor may be used on the project. It is the requesting sponsor's responsibility to obtain this agreement. The purpose of this is to avoid any conflicts or confusion about
whether union labor would be a more appropriate labor force. Generally speaking, once a union understands who CCC corpsmembers are, and the training and educational value of the project, union resistance is withdrawn. In fact, often times, unions are supportive of corpsmember labor once they see that we are not a competitive entity.

Thank you for this opportunity to tell you about the CCC's program and what we can do to help in the development of the San Joaquin River parkway. If there are further questions of the committee about the CCC program in general or about the work corpsmembers may perform, I would be happy to respond.
Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I am Stephen Hall, Vice President of The State Reclamation Board. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you at this follow-up hearing to discuss the idea of a parkway along the San Joaquin River and assure the Committee of the Board's interest in this area.

The Reclamation Board's primary interest in this parkway proposal is through the Board's designated floodway program. The floodway program is a non-structural approach to flooding problems. The intent of the program is to delineate areas along waterways that are subject to flooding and then, through the Board's permit authority, control development in the areas of risk. The program does not prohibit all development in these areas, but it does require that before anything is constructed, it receives an adequate engineering review to ensure that life and property will not be at substantial risk and that the remaining flood risk is equitably distributed along each floodway.

The Reclamation Board has a Designated Floodway on the San Joaquin River that covers the area we are discussing today. The floodway was adopted by the Board in June, 1976.

Presented by Board Vice President Stephen Hall at Fresno, California on October 14, 1988.
The Committee has asked for information about the boundaries of the floodway and the flood limits along this stretch of the river. Dee Davis of the Department of Water Resources is here with me to answer those questions.

(Presentation by Dee Davis)

There are certain activities allowed in the floodway that require very little review by the Board prior to approval. These activities are open space uses of the floodway such as parks, golf courses, farming activities, hiking and riding trails, and facilities for boating and fishing activities. Other uses of the floodway may be allowed if it can be proven that they are compatible with the intent of the Designated Floodway. Examples of uses that may be restricted include levees, buildings or other structures which could, either by design or incidentally, restrict flood flows or divert those flows to areas which had not previously been flooded. Allowable competing uses of the floodway that do not affect flood control are not controlled by the Board. For instance, choosing between the floodway for farming activities or a public use facility such as a park is not part of the Board's charge.

Another major aspect of the Board's responsibility is to insure that the river channel remains reasonably free of obstructions that could restrict or divert flood flows. The Board's staff annually inspects the river channel. If an encroachment is
found, it is noted and the responsible party directed to remove it. The Board also assists in programs to clean live and/or fallen vegetation from the channel. It is necessary from a flood control standpoint that periodic cleaning and maintenance continue and encroachments be regulated, regardless of how the floodway is used. Presently, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to complete the Lower San Joaquin River (Clearing and Snagging) Project. The role of The Reclamation Board for that project is as the non-federal sponsor.

Our goal here today is not to take a position for or against the parkway, but to advise the Committee of the flooding potential along this stretch of the San Joaquin River and to indicate that the parkway, as we understand it, is compatible with the existing designated floodway. We also need to let the Committee know of the Board's responsibility to see that the flood channel remains clear enough to pass projected flood flows. The Committee and others should know that will require annual inspections and removal of encroachments, as well as periodic clearing and snagging, such as the current Corps of Engineers project.

In our experience working with State Lands Commission, State Department of Fish and Game and other resource agencies we have found that The Reclamation Board's responsibility for protecting lives and property from flooding, can be discharged while preserving the natural features of a riverway if there is proper
planning and communication among the respective parties. It is our hope that as the Committee and others proceed in their plans to develop the parkway that they keep The Reclamation Board informed of the plans for development and seek the Board's input in how to make the parkway compatible with the existing designated floodway. We have every confidence that, given this committee's excellent record in balancing the needs of the citizens of California, that will be done.

We thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing and for inviting us to testify.
I have with me the San Joaquin River Designated Floodway Maps, Gavelly Ford Area to Friant Dam, sheets 26 to 57 and I'll leave them with the Committee. The Reclamation Board designates floodways for only the 100-year flood event. We don't study 200-year or 500-year flood events.

3) "Please provide any aerial photographs you may have showing the most recent flooding on the stretch of the river in the area of the proposed parkway."

Aerial photography of the San Joaquin River was flown on February 20, 1986. I have copies of the aerial photography from this flight, with The Reclamation Board Designated Floodway boundaries shown, which I will also leave with the committee.

4) "What is the discharge of the 100-year flood, 200-year flood, and 500-year flood? Have these flood discharges been recalculated in light of the 1986 floods?"

The design flood discharge for the 100-event for the designated floodway is 20,000 cubic feet per second. The flood discharge on
February 20, 1986 has been reported between 14,000 and 17,000 cubic feet per second. The 20,000 cubic feet per second design flood discharge was calculated in 1976 and The Reclamation Board has not recalculated the discharge.

5) "How much of the river bottom will be inundated in the 100-year event, 200-year event, and 500-year event?"

There were 450 acres inundated outside the designated floodway in the 1986 flood. The Reclamation Board's floodway encroachment lines establish the exterior limit of the designated floodway. Lands outside the designated floodway may be subject to flooding. The aerial photography for the 1986 flood shows the inundated area for a flood flow of 17,000 cubic feet per second. The 100-year event would have a flood flow of 20,000 cubic feet per second, which is not much more than the 86 event. I would not expect to see any large changes to the inundated area from the 1986 event to design event for 100-year floods. We don't have inundated area information for the 200 and 500-year event.

6) Please explain the roles of The Reclamation Board and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the river bottom and how they differ.

Steven Hall has explained the Clearing and Snagging Project which covers the role of The Reclamation Board and U.S. Corps of Engineers in the river bottom.
MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS:

I AM JAMES H. FINNEGAN REPRESENTING THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT INFORMATION TO YOU REGARDING THE EFFORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT IN CONNECTION IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY PROJECT.

THE DEPARTMENT'S DISTRICT OFFICE IN FRESNO IS WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER COMMITTEE AND WILL ACCOMMODATE A PROPOSED NEW BIKEWAY INTO THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ROUTE 41 CROSSING OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WHEN AN ALIGNMENT IS CHOSEN.

ALL THAT IS ENVISIONED NOW IS A BIKEWAY WHERE ROUTE 41 CROSSES THE RIVER. THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER COMMITTEE IS REPRESENTED ON THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM. THE COUNTIES OF FRESNO AND MADERA WILL ALSO BE CONSULTED AS PART OF THIS PROCESS.

ALTHOUGH EXISTING ROUTE 41 AT THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER HAS BEEN DESIGNATED AS A SUGGESTED BICYCLE ROUTE, THE DESIGNATION IS OLD. CURRENT TRAFFIC LEVELS AND THE NARROWNESS OF THE BRIDGE MAKE CROSSING THE RIVER DIFFICULT DURING HIGH VOLUME TRAFFIC PERIODS.
THE DEPARTMENT IS PRESENTLY STUDYING A NEW ROUTE ADOPTION FOR THIS PORTION OF ROUTE 41. BICYCLE TRAFFIC WILL EITHER BE ACCOMMODATED ON THE NEW STRUCTURE, OR MORE LIKELY, DIRECTED TO THE EXISTING BRIDGE WHICH WOULD BECOME A LOCAL ROAD.

THE DEPARTMENT HAS NO PLANS FOR A REST AREA WHERE HIGHWAY 99 CROSSES THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER.

REST AREAS ARE FUNDED BY A COMBINATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAXES. A REST AREA PROJECT MUST COMPETE WITH OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AND HAVE THE LOWEST PRIORITY.

CALTRANS AND THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ARE ACTIVELY PURSUING THE PRIVATE SECTOR'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF UP TO SIX NEW REST AREAS AS A JOINT DEVELOPMENT REST AREA DEMONSTRATION PROJECT AUTHORIZED BY THE LEGISLATURE. CURRENTLY THE ONLY FUNDING WHICH IS AVAILABLE FOR NEW REST AREA CONSTRUCTION REQUIRES THAT IT BE A JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT WITH OTHER SOURCES PROVIDING THE FINANCING.

A REST AREA COULD BE DEVELOPED AT THE HIGHWAY 99 LOCATION BY OTHERS AT NO COST TO THE DEPARTMENT AND ACCEPTED BY CALTRANS AS A PART OF ITS SAFETY ROADSIDE REST AREA SYSTEM. "OTHERS" COULD BE THE PRIVATE SECTOR, OTHER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT, A COMMISSION, OR A COMBINATION THEREOF.

NORMALLY THE FIRST STEP IN THE JOINT-DEVELOPMENT PROCESS IS TO DETERMINE THE ENGINEERING AND ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF AN
IDENTIFIED SITE. ONCE THE SITE IS DETERMINED TO BE VIABLE, THE DEPARTMENT MARKETS THE PROPOSED REST AREA. IT CAN CALL FOR BIDS OR PROPOSALS OR WORK WITH LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES FOR THE JOINT DEVELOPMENT.

A TYPICAL REST AREA IS ESTIMATED TO HAVE A COST RANGE OF FROM $3 TO $5 MILLION PER UNIT DEPENDING ON THE SITE AND MUST MEET SPECIFIC STANDARDS. TYPICAL IS DEFINED AS: APPROXIMATELY 25 ACRES OF LAND WHICH REQUIRES ONLY MINOR GRADING, ALL UTILITIES INCLUDING WATER AND OFF-SITE SEWER ARE READILY AVAILABLE, ACCESS IS SAFE AND DIRECT VIA SIMPLE OFF AND ON RAMPS, AND THERE ARE NO UNUSUAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE SITE. THE LOCATION OF A ROADSIDE REST AREA AT THE CROSSING OF THE RIVER AT ROUTE 99 WOULD HAVE DIFFICULTY MEETING THE NORMAL ENGINEERING AND ACCESS STANDARDS BECAUSE OF THE PROXIMITY TO THE RAILROAD ON ONE SIDE AND THE INDIRECT ACCESS WHICH WOULD BE REQUIRED; HOWEVER, THE DEPARTMENT IS RECEPTIVE TO FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF THE FEASIBILITY OF THE SITE IF FUNDS CAN BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER SOURCES.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE OUR COMMENTS. I WOULD BE PLEASED TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.
On behalf of the Madera County Board of Supervisors, I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed parkway.

My goal is to bring you up to date on the past actions of the Madera Board and to inform you of plans presently in progress on the Madera County side. More importantly, I want to provide you with a realistic picture of what Madera's situation and plans are for the "parkway".

The development of the riverbottom area, Madera bluff area, and the southeast area of Madera County is a major concern of this Board. Many of the property owners in the area support the concept of developing short and long range plans. There is strong interest in developing the area in a high quality fashion. We believe that this area is poised for significant growth in the next 3-15 years. Its population could grow by 25,000 in the next few years.

The southeastern section of Madera County presents an outstanding opportunity for the County. We believe it to be a unique area.

The issue for Madera County is to determine precisely how we want this area developed.

As of August, 1986, the Madera Board reaffirmed a commitment to maintain open space on the San Joaquin River bottom. In addition, the Board was most interested in a specific plan for the entire river area, including the Highway 41 corridor. The Board resolved to proceed with a "joint plan" limited to environmental standards and policies for open space, wildlife habitat preservation, water and flood issues, scenic resources, mineral resources, policies and transportation issues. But, I must stress that if there are decisions made as a result of the joint plan which are not positive and satisfactory to Madera County then the joint plan would not be followed.

Madera County has adopted a policy designating specific areas of the riverbottom as "significant mineral resources".

As to the benefits of the creation of a parkway, you must keep in mind several points:

1. There is presently no public access to the San Joaquin River from the Madera County side.
2. Madera County has only approximately 30% of the actual riverbottom area.

3. Madera County has no park system.

4. Neither the Madera County Board of Supervisors nor the Madera and Chowchilla City Councils have passed resolutions supporting the parkway.

Recently, a questionnaire was sent to over 2,000 homes in the southeastern Madera County area which encompasses over 100 square miles. One of the main purposes of this questionnaire was to establish the citizens' priorities in the area. Overwhelmingly, the citizens listed (1) law enforcement, (2) fire protection, and (3) roads as the top three priorities. You must understand that Madera County has been in a dismantling phase for several years because of lack of funds.

As of November 1, Madera County will have one paid county fire station. We presently have only approximately 30 deputies to patrol the county and our road budget has been cut over 66% in the last few years.

If there is ever going to be a "special tax district" in Madera County, it will be for either law enforcement, fire protection or road improvement. There is very little, if any, chance for a "special park district tax" to finance the parkway in Madera County.

A citizens committee made up of residents in the area is taking the local initiative to revise the current master plan for the area. It is our goal to have the committee create a balance between the needs of the County and the maintenance of the integrity of the environment. Obviously, this is a give and take proposition that will require compromise from both concerns.

The citizens Master Plan Committee will initiate meetings with property owners and will invite input from interested groups.

Madera County does not intend to maintain the perpetual holding pattern. It is an issue that will require both initiative and creativity and we do not view a lack of action a feasible course of action.

Madera County fully intends to take the initiative to see that proper planning is done and haphazard decision making is avoided.

In summary, we view the San Joaquin River bottom, Madera bluff area and the southeastern area of Madera County as a valuable resource for both Madera and Fresno counties.
The Madera Board reserves and will maintain its right to be the final decision maker in regard to any proposals on the Madera County side. We do support a "joint plan" which would include input from both Fresno City and Fresno County government. We would be hesitant at establishing another form of government or an agency designated for the purpose of developing and implementing a plan.

Without a doubt, the issue of land ownership of the riverbottom property must be resolved. I would hope that this committee would formally request the respective state offices involved to resolve this issue as soon as possible. Madera County supports the position of individuals who claim ownership on the riverbottom property.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the state strips these landowners of this property lengthy legal battles will occur.

Madera County is not now or in the foreseeable future in a position to monetarily support establishing the parkway.

In conclusion, we fully intend to play an aggressive role in molding the future of the area.

Again, thank you for the honor and opportunity to address you.
RESOLUTION NO. 88-303

WHEREAS, San Joaquin River bottomlands are a unique environmental and scenic resource for Madera County and the region's development is a major concern for Madera County residents and the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the Madera County Supervisors desire to reaffirm their commitment to protect San Joaquin River bottom open space, scenic resources, wildlife habitat, agricultural land, floodplain, water quality, mineral resources, and permit public and private recreational uses; and

WHEREAS, a greenway system of trails, parks, nature preserves, and open space along the San Joaquin River could be a major educational and recreational asset for Madera County residents, as well as protecting valuable fish and wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, the San Joaquin River Parkway will make the river accessible to the public, secure valuable resources for use by future generations, improve the quality of life for Madera County residents, and provide economic benefits to local businesses; and

WHEREAS, the realization of the San Joaquin River Parkway will take the maximum cooperation between local entities, citizen groups, and the state and federal governments.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Madera County supports creation of a San Joaquin River Parkway and will join with the State of California, Fresno County, City of Fresno, San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust, affected local, state, and federal agencies, and the public to develop a plan for its creation.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Madera County will join the above entities in exploring and identifying sources of funding for developing, operating and maintaining the San Joaquin River Parkway including state park and recreation bond funds, local park and recreation grants, state wildlife conservation funds, other state and federal funds, and will encourage donations of land and monies from private citizens.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted this 11th day of October, 1988, by the following vote:

Supervisors Jensen voted: Yes
Supervisor Ginsburg voted: Yes
Supervisor Hanhart McIntyre voted: Yes
Supervisor Lopez voted: Yes
Supervisor Baker voted: Yes

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
Claudia Bradley
Clerk, Board of Supervisors
September 22, 1988

Assemblyman Jim Costa, Chairman
California Legislature
Assembly Committee on Water,
   Parks & Wildlife

Dear Assemblyman Costa:

Thank you for the invitation to testify at the Committee's follow-up hearing on the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway on Friday, October 14, 1988. Unfortunately, due to another commitment I will be unable to attend. However, the following should clarify Fresno County's position relative to the proposed Parkway.

Madera and Fresno Counties and the City of Fresno all share the San Joaquin Riverbottom; however, within the 25-mile long area between freeway 99 and Friant Dam, the County of Fresno has jurisdiction over 61 percent of Riverbottom lands while the City of Fresno has 10 percent and Madera 29 percent. Therefore, Fresno County has the most at stake in considering flood hazards and beneficial use of the River's resources within the urbanizing area. In addition, Fresno and Madera Counties share frontage on 45 additional miles downstream and 85 miles upstream from the proposed Parkway area. The County has taken positive steps to utilize the River for the benefit of the public by developing and maintaining 410 acres of park and recreation facilities, including Lost Lake Park (311 acres), Skaggs Bridge Park (86 acres), and Mendota Pool Park (13 acres).

In the fall of 1985, increased interest in development projects in and overlooking the San Joaquin River resulted in joint meetings on November 18, 1985 and January 13, 1986 of the Fresno and Madera County Boards of Supervisors and the Fresno City Council. From these meetings, it was decided that a Reconnaissance Study to describe the River environment would be prepared in six months and the three jurisdictions would not consider any project during that period.

On July 21, 1986 at a Joint Hearing, the three jurisdictions discussed the completed Reconnaissance Study and received testimony on its findings. A number of area residents, interest groups, and public officials responded to information in the Study generally attesting to the fragile nature of the Riverbottom, opposing any urban encroachment, and supporting retention of the area in an open space designation. At
the conclusion of the testimony, the Fresno City Council decided to reaffirm the Joaquin Bluffs Environ Specific Plan which calls for the possibility of providing public access to the Riverbottom by building a multi-purpose regional park in the City; and to encourage Fresno and Madera Counties to enter into a joint planning process with the City so that the River area could be comprehensively planned to remain as protected open space with the provision for public use and enjoyment. The Council also reiterated its opposition to several development proposals pending in the Riverbottom.

The Madera and Fresno County Boards of Supervisors declined to endorse the Council's position at the joint session and directed their respective staffs to place the matter on a future agenda for discussion.

On August 5, 1986, the Madera Board of Supervisors met to discuss the Riverbottom Area and determined to reaffirm their existing agriculture and open space policy currently in effect in the San Joaquin Riverbottom and to further endorse the concept of a joint plan for the Riverbottom area to be completed in conjunction with the City and County of Fresno; to be limited to specific issues of mutual concern such as environmental standards and policies for open space, wildlife and habitat preservation, water and flooding issues, scenic resources, mineral resource policies, and transportation issues.

On August 12, 1986 the Fresno County Board of Supervisors reaffirmed adopted plans which call for the Riverbottom to remain in multiple use open space and agricultural uses. The discussion preceding the action reaffirming the adopted plans focused on the following:

1. The City and County of Fresno operate under a 1983 joint planning resolution, whereby City and County staffs cooperate in reviewing plans and projects that may affect both jurisdictions. This process has led to the open transfer of information, and resolution of differences when they arise. When significant issues are identified, these are taken to the respective legislative bodies for final resolution. For the Riverbottom area within the City's Sphere of Influence, the County policies protect open space uses.

2. The City of Fresno proposal for a park within the City's part of the Riverbottom would add to the recreational opportunities available to the public. This park or broader park planning within the City's Sphere of Influence would need coordinated planning in accordance with the Joint Resolution.

3. County land use policies have protected open space uses in the San Joaquin Riverbottom since the plan's inception in 1958 and continue to do so. There is no need for additional joint planning at this time beyond that specified in the Joint Resolution.
4. The protection of the natural environment and wise use of Riverbottom resources is of concern to the three jurisdictions and to the public as well. The existing policies of the three jurisdictions will maintain the predominant open space character of the Riverbottom. With the preparation of the Reconnaissance Study, more detailed information is now available to guide land use decisions within the existing policy framework. As issues arise, coordinated action, as directed by the Board of Supervisors, will be undertaken to respond to specific Riverbottom needs.

Due to severe budgetary constraints Fresno County is not financially in a position to allocate resources to the planning, acquisition, or development of the proposed Parkway. However, the Board discussed the matter again on September 15, 1986, and adopted a resolution in support of the Parkway, and the establishment of a single agency to plan, develop, and operate the Parkway, and to obtain the funds necessary to carry out these activities. This resolution was presented to the Assembly Committee during your September 17, 1987 hearing. Since then Fresno County has taken no further actions on the matter.

If I can be of any further assistance please call me.

Sincerely,

Judy Andreen, Chairman
Fresno County Board of Supervisors

JA:JDT:mc
7402C-58
THE HONORABLE JIM COSTA, CHAIRMAN
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, California 94249-0001

Dear Mr. Chairman

HEARING ON PROPOSED SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY; OCTOBER 14, 1988

The Board of Directors and staff of the District are honored by your invitation to submit testimony concerning this most important project. It is our desire to support your efforts and to be of assistance in any way you determine appropriate and necessary.

The issue before the Committee is the designation and development of a twenty-two mile stretch of the San Joaquin River as a parkway. The concepts embodied in such a parkway span a spectrum from active, urban type parks to passive natural riverine settings. Certainly all concepts require preservation of the natural river system.

Because of its legislatively mandated responsibilities, our District has an active interest in the preservation of the San Joaquin River through this community. The river, first and foremost, is a major part of our natural system of drainage, flood water transport, water conservation and ecology. The river environment needs to be preserved so as to continue the performance of these vital functions.

The Flood Control District has taken significant measures to protect the environment and water quality of the river. Urban drainage uses of the river have been limited and controlled. Only areas which naturally drain to the river are permitted to continue to do so following development. Commercial and industrial land uses are prohibited from draining to the San Joaquin River and runoff from residential areas is subject to specific mitigation prior to discharge.

Relatedly, the District has taken positions protecting the flood carrying capacities of the river from encroachment. The placement of incompatible uses within the river channel exposes future occupants to a flood damage risk wholly unique to riverine situations.
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In addition to the District's interest in the hydrologic character of the river, it has taken an active interest in open-space and recreational programs related to the river. This has included the active support of Proposition 70 and the parkway project itself. This interest greatly influenced the design of a recently constructed storm water facility in which $800,000 of District funds were expended to maintain the open-space and ecological character of the river environs.

In specific response to the questions outlined in your letter of September 13, 1988, we provide the following information:

1a. District's authority to undertake park and recreational activity.

The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District is a special act agency mandated to provide local drainage, flood control and water conservation services. Section 73-8 of the enabling legislation provides park and recreation authorities relative to the District's other functions.

Section 73-8:
"11. To develop property for recreational uses and purposes in connection with the use thereof for control or conservation of waters or to lease to or contract with individuals or public or private agencies for use or for development and use thereof for recreational purposes."

1b. What is the District's experience in park and recreation projects?

The District currently owns or operates some 100 storm water basin or reservoir facilities totaling in excess of 5,000 acres. Many of these sites are or will be retained in a natural condition, conducive to and often enhancing wildlife habitats.

Other sites have been developed as passive parks with grass, trees, and automatic irrigation systems. Such sites are operated and maintained by the District. Other sites have been developed by the District in coordination with other agencies as active urban parks. To date, fifteen sites have been completed and are in service as passive or active parks.

Frequently, the District has been successful in securing both Roberti-Z'berg and Land and Water Conservation grants in support of such park development. In most cases, however, funding has come from the District.
2. What role could the District play in the Parkway?

Pursuant to the District's act, it appears to have the authority to do the following: (1) acquire land and rights-of-way, including actions in eminent domain, if necessary; (2) develop park and recreational improvements, using District funds or other available funding sources; (3) operate and maintain the river channel and related parkway improvements; and (4) ensure maintenance of public access.

3. What statutory changes might be needed to fully participate in Parkway?

It appears no changes in District authorities would be required. However, because the full area of the proposed parkway is not within the District's existing boundary, an annexation would be required. Such an annexation would require approval of the Local Agency Formation Commission and of the majority of the affected landowners. (About 40% of the parkway area is currently within the District boundary.)

4. Is the District eligible for Proposition 70 funds?

The District is eligible for Proposition 70 funds. While there have been preliminary discussions concerning potential projects, specific discussion would be premature at this time. A concept master plan for the parkway is being developed and should be completed before specific projects are initiated.

5. Possible recreation facilities at existing District project sites which would provide river access.

The District has existing projects or interests at five locations on the river extending from Little Dry Creek on the north to Valentine Avenue on the south. An additional four project locations are currently planned, these located between Highway 99 and Highway 41. The methods by which these sites might be incorporated into the proposed parkway should be determined through the master planning process and we will cooperate fully with that effort.

It is our hope this information is helpful to the Committee as it pursues this most important project. If we can provide additional information, please contact us.

Very truly yours,

DOUG HARRISON
GENERAL MANAGER-SECRETARY
Good morning ladies and gentlemen, members of the Committee. My name is Skip Mills. I represent the U.S. Corps of Engineers and am the Project Manager for their Clearing and Snagging Project on the Lower San Joaquin River. I have been asked here today to provide you a status report on our planned clearing work within the Parkway area. Accompanying me today is Mr. Fred Walasavage of our Environmental Resources Branch. I will be discussing with you the engineering aspects of the planned work after which Mr. Walasavage will address the environmental aspects.

The Corps of Engineers was given specific authority and direction to perform clearing on this section of river by the Federal 1983 Supplemental Appropriations Act and the recent 1988 Energy and Water Development Act. The legislation was enacted in response to requests from local interests to arrest the channel capacity degradation and resulting flood damages attributable to the regrowth of vegetation. The reduction of the channel capacity by vegetation not historically present in the channel and the resulting increasing flood damages is documented in several past studies.

I will now describe the nature and extent of the proposed clearing and maintenance, the mitigation measures to offset the vegetation lost, the anticipated benefit of the clearing and the schedule of when the clearing will occur.

The work will consist of removing shrub type vegetation from eight sites totaling approximately 20 acres. The sites are generally located in low lying areas of the river within areas previously cleared of vegetation by the Corps of Engineers in 1968-1970 but never subsequently maintained by the local sponsor. Five of the sites are located in the channel near the Fig Garden Golf Course and three sites just downstream from...
Highway 41. The sites were chosen from many potential sites because of the constricted channel cross section at these locations. The vegetation to be removed consists mainly of shrub willow and alder that have recolonized the sites. Trees encountered within the sites that have a diameter of six inches or greater would be saved and trimmed up to a height of approximately eight feet to allow flood waters and debris to pass under. Additionally, no vegetation, trees or shrubs, will be disturbed in a strip approximately ten feet wide from the edge of the river. This will allow the fish and wildlife value of the streamedge vegetation to continue while providing a visual barrier of the clearing to boaters on the river. The 20 acres of vegetation to be removed represents slightly less than 3.5% of the total riparian vegetation in this reach of the river between Highways 41 and 99. The sites cleared by the Corps are to be maintained free of the flow restrictive vegetation in perpetuity by the local sponsor, the State Reclamation Board, as required by Section 12668 of the State Water Code. This maintenance will consist simply of periodic inspection and removal of any regeneration of tree and large shrub type species.

The 20 acres of vegetation lost less the trees within each site retained will be completely mitigated for. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is currently under contract to the Corps to develop recommendations for the acreage of mitigation needed, the locations of the mitigation areas and any improvement programs, such as tree planting, that is required to provide replacement habitat. This report is to be completed by the end of November. No clearing would take place until the needed mitigation lands are obtained and improvement programs are implemented.

What will the benefits of this clearing? The immediate effect of the clearing will be a reduction of the flood stage by several inches, thereby reducing the severity of the associated flood damages. While this may not sound significant, the clearing, in combination with the regular maintenance by the Reclamation Board, will have a significant effect by arresting the continued choking of the channel at these locations. Without the work, flood waters blocked by the mass of limbs and debris will have no place to go but out of the floodway.

As to the schedule, we anticipate releasing our draft design document with accompanying environmental documentation explaining our proposed work on the Lower San Joaquin, including this work just described, to the public for comment in the next few months. Assemblyman Costa's Office will receive a
copy for review and comment. A final design document will then be prepared probably early next Spring for approval by our higher headquarters. Preparation of plans will follow, followed by actual construction or clearing. However, since we intend to construct at other locations on the San Joaquin before this reach, we do not anticipate doing any actual clearing here until at least the summer of 1990.

As you develop your Parkway plans further, we remain at your service to insure a clearing project uncompromising to your goals.

Thank you.

Fred Walasavage will now further discuss the environmental aspects of our proposed clearing.
Assemblyman Costa, Members of the Committee, my name is Fred Walasavage. I am an Environmental Resources Planner for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Sacramento District.

The Corps is coordinating inputs to and preparing an Environmental Impact Statement/Report for the Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries Clearing and Snagging Project. Your invitation to appear here today invited us to identify what steps must be undertaken pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, herein referred to as CEQA, and the National Environmental Policy Act, herein referred to as NEPA, to complete the project.

The Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/R) is being prepared as a joint Federal and State document. Since the Corps represents the Federal interest of the project, it is our duty to comply with the NEPA requirements throughout the planning process. The State Reclamation Board has appointed a member of its staff to assist us in insuring full compliance with CEQA requirements. So for the purpose of this testimony, I will be discussing steps the Corps is taking to comply with NEPA requirements for the project.

NEPA is the basic national charter for protection of the environment. It establishes policy, sets goals, and provides measures for carrying out these goals. Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA are contained in Section 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1500-1508. These regulations inform Federal agencies what they must do to comply with the procedures and achieve the goals of the act. As a Federal project, the Corps is mandated by law to follow those procedures identified in Section 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations in order to comply with the spirit and the letter of the law.

Pursuant to NEPA, the Corps is currently taking the following steps throughout the planning process to insure full compliance with the act:

a. Using a systematic, interdisciplinary approach to insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and decision making which may have an impact on the project.
b. Identifying and developing methods and procedures to insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making.

c. Preparing a detailed environmental impact statement that includes, but is not limited to:

1. The environmental impact of the proposed action.
2. Alternatives to the proposed action.
3. Mitigation for the environmental impacts caused by the proposed action.
4. The relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.
5. Any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

d. Prior to and throughout the development of the EIS/R, the Corps has been consulting with and maintaining close coordination with Federal, State, and local agencies; environmental organizations; and concerned individuals. This is being accomplished through public meetings, public notices, and inter-agency coordination. Through a Notice of Intent, all segments of the affected public and agencies were invited to participate in the planning process.

e. Upon completion of the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (RDEIS/R), a 45-day review period will be provided for all interested agencies and individuals to comment on the document. These comments will be incorporated and documented in the Final Environmental Statement/Report (FEIS/R).

f. The final document will also be circulated for a 30-day public review. Any comments received will be considered in completing the Record of Decision before proceeding with the project.

That summarizes the steps the Corps has been taking to comply with NEPA requirements. Now I will briefly discuss the most serious potential environmental impacts that may result from project activities and what steps are being considered to offset those impacts.

The flood plain located throughout the proposed parkway is considered to be, in environmental terms, a riparian zone. Within this riparian zone, there are two distinct habitat types: terrestrial and aquatic. The terrestrial habitat is composed of
remnant valley oaks: dense stands of young trees and shrubs, mostly willows; herbaceous vegetation; sand and gravel bars; and agricultural lands.

Under the proposed project, work in the proposed parkway would include the clearing of about 20 acres of vegetation at eight worksites. Consequently, approximately 20 acres of terrestrial habitat will be lost in the proposed parkway. Mitigation will be provided to offset those losses. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service (preliminary habitat evaluation results), that would require the acquisition of about 23 acres of land to be used as mitigation.

The Corps would provide all construction activities required for mitigation development. The State Reclamation Board would provide all lands needed for mitigation and would insure that the mitigation lands are adequately maintained for the life of the project. Specific mitigation management plans for the project will be included in the RDEIS/R and subsequently in the FEIS/R.

A specific mitigation factor that would be incorporated into the project would be to leave trees with a diameter greater than 6 inches standing whenever possible. During preparation of the plans and specifications, these trees would be tagged to insure their preservation. This mitigation technique would provide definite benefits to the wildlife by providing cover, shade, nesting sites, and food sources. Additionally, the esthetic impacts would be reduced.

Impacts to the aquatic environment have been virtually eliminated because of project modifications. Specifically, a 10-foot-wide band of riparian vegetation would be left along the entire length of the river channel. This would provide the shade and food sources that are vital for fisheries and other aquatic organisms. This mitigation technique would also minimize the esthetic impacts caused by the project.

Other impacts and necessary mitigation will also be described in the RDEIS/R. We are assembling the RDEIS/R at the present time, and would circulate it for public comment within the next few months.

If the Committee has other information or suggestions for use in the EIS/R process, they will be welcomed.

This concludes my testimony on behalf of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
We are pleased to have this opportunity to testify in support of the San Joaquin River Parkway. We recognize the unique opportunity to provide hiking, riding, biking, and boating opportunities and greenway spaces for the people in Fresno, the counties of Madera and Fresno, and beyond. The proximity to Sierra Nevada hiking trails and attractions would allow future trail connections to such areas. The Parkway will have a national as well as local and regional significance. We believe the Parkway, as a recreational resource, will ultimately be of economic benefit to the region as well.

The National Park Service Western Regional Office of Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance has been active since August, 1987 and serves the Western Region states of California, Nevada, Arizona, and Hawaii.

The Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program is a reflection of the needs identified in the 1986 report of the President’s Commission on Americans Outdoors which recommended
protection of our river and trail resources and the creation of a network of "greenways" linking our communities. One of their findings from public meetings around the United States was that these greenways lend identity, an enhanced sense of place, a sense of community pride, and economic benefits. In an era of increasing public interest in close-to-home recreation and fitness opportunities, the Commission report called upon the American tradition of grassroots citizen participation at the state and local level to spearhead the protection of river and trail corridors.

Our Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance Program operates in the spirit of the Commission's report and provides aid to local, regional, and state jurisdictions in their rivers and trails conservation efforts. The program is new, growing, and receiving wide interest. We are currently working with a variety of projects which include the 70-mile Santa Ana River Corridor in southern California and the 500-mile San Francisco Bay Area Ridge Trail. These greenway projects cross multiple jurisdictions and require facilitation and coordination at all levels to evolve from ideas to supportable plans to established greenways.

For major protection efforts such as the San Joaquin River Parkway, we advocate a comprehensive planning approach which stresses a public involvement process. Our Conservation Assistance program can function as a catalyst to assist local jurisdictions and citizen organizations with the following aspects of the planning process:
a. Resource Assessment: This includes inventory and assessment of land ownership patterns, and cultural, historical, recreational, and natural resources of the corridor.

b. Issue Identification: Landowner rights and concerns, critical habitats or resources, public access, sources of funding, operation and maintenance.

c. Public Involvement: A public involvement plan will identify task groups to represent community and regional needs during the planning process. The people who live near or use the resource are a tremendous source of insights and solutions. Involvement leads to personal commitment to protection.

d. Goal Setting: Developing a common vision for the corridor will include assessing public and private regulatory, administrative, and assistance alternatives.

e. Alternative Actions: Identifying, developing, and assessing alternative approaches includes options for design, for local land use, for education, and for state and local government cooperative programs.

f. An Action Framework: Includes selected protection measures, identification of responsible agencies, and development of timetables, and costs.

g. Implementation. In working together with corridor interests to develop implementation strategies, we can assist with:
(1). Master plans and typical construction details.
(2). Financing plan
(3). Design standards
(4). Interpretive plan
(5). Signage
(6). User guide
(7). Economic benefits
(8). Answers to landowner concerns
(9). Marketing plan

Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance seeks to arrive at successful strategies that are responsive to local landowners, private organizations, user groups, and city, county, and state planning agencies. We seek to develop a common vision of a project which can be leveraged to gain public and agency support, financing, and recognition.

As a clearing house for the exchange of technical information concerning river and trail protection throughout the nation, we have gathered together case studies which we can share. These offer examples of protection and enhancement of a community’s natural resources, innovative marketing techniques, sources of funding, the economic benefits which accrue to a local community, and solutions to landowner concerns.
These River and Trail Corridors can demonstrate that communities have a "pride in place", a unique value, and an interest in their past, present, and future.

Although we are not a grants program and are not a design firm, we work together with landowners, non-profit organizations, local governments, and private interests to realize these important open space visions.

We would like to see the San Joaquin River Parkway become a model protection effort for others to emulate. We encourage your continuing effort.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee about the San Joaquin River and the proposed greenbelt-parkway.

I am executive director for the San Joaquin River Committee, a nonprofit organization formed in 1985. The River Committee has grown in membership over the last year from 150 to 1,000 individuals from Fresno and Madera Counties.

We formed an organization that focuses exclusively on the San Joaquin River because the general public's awareness of the riverbottom was pretty much limited to what they could see from their car windows.

We also knew that if more people were aware of the value of the San Joaquin, we would have a chance at creating a wonderful greenbelt corridor of parks, trails, and wildlife preserves along the San Joaquin surrounded by open space from Highway 99 to Millerton State Park.

Since we cannot be on the river today, I would like to bring the river to the Committee through slides.

The San Joaquin River by the time it reaches Friant Dam is the 5th largest river in California, draining approximately 1,600 square miles. It originates high in the Sierra Nevada, fed by glaciers below peaks that are over 13,000 feet in elevation.

Hydroelectricity generated by Pacific Gas and Electric and Southern California Edison facilities on the San Joaquin serves close to one-million homes from Los Angeles to San Francisco. The river is stored behind 29 diversion dams and routed through 16 powerhouses before it reaches Friant Dam. Southern California Edison describes the San Joaquin River as "the hardest working water in the world".

At Friant Dam, 95 percent of the river's flows are diverted from the channel. Some of the water is sent north through the
Madera Canal which terminates at Ash Slough near Chowchilla. Most of the water goes south via the Friant-Kern Canal, delivering irrigation water from Fresno to Arvin in southern Kern County.

Over one-million acres are irrigated with San Joaquin River water.

The San Joaquin River and bottomlands between Highway 99 and Friant Dam encompass 12,000 acres in Fresno and Madera County.

The riverbottom falls within three jurisdictions: Fresno County has jurisdiction over 7,300 acres of riverbottom south of the river and north of the City of Fresno; Madera County has jurisdiction over all the riverbottom north of the San Joaquin River, approximately 3,500 acres; the City of Fresno has jurisdiction over riverbottom land south of the river between Highway 99 and Lanes Road, about 1,200 acres.

In addition, over 20 federal, state, and local agencies exercises authority in the riverbottom. A partial listing includes the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, California State Lands Commission, Department of Fish and Game, CalTrans, and the State Water Quality Control Board.

Since the early 60s the General Plans for Fresno and Madera Counties, and the City of Fresno have called for open space land uses in the riverbottom. Open space land uses that have been permitted include grazing, farming, sand and gravel extraction, one public recreation area at Lost Lake Park, three golf courses, Riverside, a municipal course, the San Joaquin Country Club, and Fig Garden golf course, and compatible commercial, like the worm, catfish, goldfish, and crayfish farms in the riverbottom.

Other more intensive land uses have also been permitted. Two mobile home parks flank the river in Fresno and Madera Counties at Highway 41. They were permitted in the early 60s when the Bureau of Reclamation proposed to dam the river creating the Fig Garden Reservoir. This project would have flooded the San Joaquin from the Sante Fe tracks upstream to three miles below Friant Dam.

This dam proposal was later dropped. The mobile home parks remain.

Why has the San Joaquin River become the focus of so much attention recently? Because the city of Fresno and southern Madera County have become increasingly urban, and decisions regarding its future will soon be made.

There are many good reasons to preserve natural lands surrounding the San Joaquin River. Riverbottom land differs markedly from other valley land in Fresno and Madera Counties.
First, preserving natural lands surrounding the river protects the public from flooding due to rain and snowmelt runoff.

The maximum recorded peak flow occurred on December 23, 1985 when the river flowed into Millerton Reservoir at 97,000 cubic-feet-per-second. At peak inflow, Millerton Reservoir was filling at about two feet per hour. Fortunately, the reservoir had been pulled down prior the storm.

While the inflow above Friant was 97,000 cubic feet per second, the outflow was 14,000 cubic feet per second. A flow 7 times as large below Friant Dam would have inundated much of the riverbottom.

Second, preserving natural lands surrounding the river also helps to maintain high water quality in the San Joaquin. The San Joaquin River provides important groundwater recharge for the surrounding communities.

Storm runoff from streets, roofs, agriculture, and landscaping--non-point source pollution--can be a major problem for river quality. People swim and fish in the waters of the San Joaquin.

Third, San Joaquin riverbottom oak and riparian woodlands are critical for migrating and resident wildlife species. Rivers and their associated woodlands are the most biologically rich environments in the Valley.

Riparian habitat is a fancy name for the trees and bushes that grow along the river. California has less than 2.0 percent remaining of its historic river woodland acreage.

San Joaquin Riverbottom woodlands support over 230 species of reptiles, amphibians, birds, and mammals--many of which depend entirely on this habitat to survive.

Wildlife like redtail hawks, bobcats, and gray fox that do not reside in riparian habitat feed on animals that do. There is a direct relationship between habitat and wildlife; when the plants and trees along the river go, the wildlife goes with them.

Fourth, the San Joaquin riverbottom and bluffs are the finest natural scenic resource on the Valley floor in Fresno and Madera Counties. There is no replacement for this scenic resource.

Finally, open space conserves resources important to our local communities. Most the soils in the riverbottom are rated as Class I and Class II, the two highest ratings for soils.

Another important resource in the riverbottom is its mineral deposits. 85% of the sand and gravel used for construction in Fresno and Madera Counties comes from the San Joaquin.
In summary, the San Joaquin Riverbottom is a fragile natural resource best protected by surrounding open space. Open space prevents urban encroachment into the floodplain, protects water quality, preserves important wildlife habitat, retains the value of this scenic resource, and conserves important agricultural and mineral resources.

But, we have not begun to actualize the San Joaquin's potential for recreation and education for the half-million residents of Fresno and Madera Counties.

This point was driven home for me about two months ago as I spent two days canoeing from Lost Lake Park to Highway 99. The temperature in the Valley on both days was well over 100 degrees, yet I was cool and refreshed by the river. I was within one-half hour of 450,000 people, yet we saw only ten people along the river during those two days.

We believe the time has come to develop a greenbelt-parkway along the 25-miles between Millerton State Park and Highway 99.

It's not a new idea. It was first proposed in 1918 by a Fresno City planner named Charles Cheney. The Fresno City and County Chamber of Commerce proposed developing a parkway in the early 1960s.

Parks and natural areas are as important as roads and water to the health of our cities. They are green infrastructure—release valves from the tension of urban living. And it is no coincidence that many of our healthiest cities boast river greenway systems. Such cities include Sacramento, San Antonio, Denver, Kansas City, and Washington D.C.

We need look no farther than the American River Parkway in Sacramento for a model for a greenbelt-parkway.

The American River Parkway includes a 22.5-mile long bicycle, hiking, and equestrian trail system from Discovery Park near downtown Sacramento to Nimbus Dam along the American River. Side trails go through natural areas or link up to picnic areas along the river.

There are 23 access points vertical to the river. The Parkway includes a nature study center where kids learn about natural environments. There are three golf courses, and several wildlife preserves.

A San Joaquin River Parkway could be very similar. We could link regional parks with a hiking, cycling and equestrian trail from Highway 99 to Millerton State Park. Some components of such a greenbelt-parkway already exist.

Millerton State Park encompasses 6,500 acres including the surface of the lake. Terminating the parkway at Millerton will
link the trail system to a 79-mile long trail being built along the San Joaquin River to Mono Lake.

305-acre Lost Lake Park is administered by Fresno County, 70 acres of which are owned by the Wildlife Conservation Board. Lost Lake flanks the river for two miles and is popular for trout fishing. Aggregate used to construct Friant Dam was mined from the site.

Woodward Park is a 275-acre City of Fresno park acquired and developed largely through a donation from Ralph Woodward. The City of Fresno owns undeveloped land connecting Woodward Park with the San Joaquin River. Future expansion of Woodward Park to the river would greatly enhance this already popular park.

Another regional park within our proposed parkway would be the 286-acre Underdown property between Highway 41 and Freeway 99. Just this week the Wildlife Conservation Board announced that it would purchase the property and that the Underdown family had made a substantial donation. This site was mined for sand and gravel and features several beautiful ponds. This is the first property purchased with bond funds allocated to the San Joaquin by Proposition 70.

Finally, we could anchor the Millerton to Highway 99 portion of the proposed San Joaquin River parkway near the Highway 99.

Parkway wildlife preserves would protect areas that are critical to plant and animal species. Several of the most sensitive areas for wildlife are upstream from Highway 41, including a large heron rookery where over 100 of these large birds roost in the Spring. There is even a herd of 50 deer that inhabits the riverbottom yearround.

The parkway could also serve as an outdoor environmental classroom for Clovis, Fresno, and Madera elementary and high schools. The San Joaquin is a wonderful place for kids to learn about natural resources and historical use.

The parkway could be compatible with agriculture and sand and gravel mining. Areas mined for gravel when reclaimed and replanted can become new wildlife preserves and parks.

Most important, the parkway will preserve sensitive natural lands along the San Joaquin while providing much-needed public access to this beautiful resource for birdwatching, canoeing, hiking, or the pure enjoyment of the solitude and scenery.

Of course, we could always do with the San Joaquin River what Los Angeles did with the Los Angeles River--shunt it through the city via a giant concrete-lined canal.

But I believe we won't. The San Joaquin is our heritage from the past. The river has played and continues to play a prominent role in the development of the San Joaquin Valley. It
serves the needs of people for electricity from San Francisco to Los Angeles. It provides irrigation for a million acres from Chowchilla to Bakersfield. It is time to create a legacy for our children, time to preserve a bit of the Valley as it once was for them to see, a parkway of quiet natural beauty close to home.
Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Coke Hallowell and I am President of the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee about the activities of the Trust in support of the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway.

Local citizens concerned about preserving the San Joaquin River realized that long term protection of river resources would mean purchasing critical riparian and natural lands, acquiring conservation easements to preserve open space, and promoting stewardship.

We formed the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust in March to allow private citizens of Fresno and Madera County to be involved directly in the protection of the San Joaquin River. The San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust is a land trust.

Land trusts are local, private nonprofit conservation organizations directed by boards of local trustees working within their communities for direct protection of lands of open space, recreation, or resource importance. Land trusts are committed to long-term management of land and to education about natural resources and the need for stewardship.

Over 700 land trusts across the United States act quickly and independently to acquire land when it becomes available, a process that can take months for government agencies. Two well-known land trusts are the Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Land.

The mission of the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust is to work with landowners to protect ecological diversity, scenic integrity, pristine riverfront habitat, and the rural character of the San Joaquin Riverbottom from Millerton State Park to Highway 145.
The Trust will use a wide range of land preservation techniques to achieve specific objectives while making the San Joaquin more enjoyable for the general public. Those preservation techniques will include purchasing lands with donated funds, seeking conservation easements, encouraging donations of land, and supporting public acquisition. Through ongoing programs the Trust will manage land to protect natural features and provide resource education for the public and agencies.

Local community leaders who have agreed to serve as initial directors for the Trust reside in both Fresno and Madera Counties and represent a wide range of interests, experience, and backgrounds. They are educators, environmentalists, managers, business people, developers, lawyers, farmers, ranchers, landowners, bankers, and community activists. They share the belief that the San Joaquin carries a responsibility of stewardship, for its wildlife habitat and natural beauty is not ours alone, but a birthright for future generations.

San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust has formed advisory committees of local citizens to plan the parkway, make recommendations on land acquisitions, research, develop, and conduct educational programs, and fundraise for ongoing activities and specific projects.

I would now like to introduce Mr. John Wissler, Vice-President of San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust, who will speak to the Committee about the San Joaquin River Parkway and Environments Conceptual Plan.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is John Wissler and I am Vice-President of the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust.

The San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust has formed a committee to oversee development of a San Joaquin River Parkway and Environments Conceptual Plan. This committee is composed of six board members and the executive director.

We will develop a written document and appropriate graphics and display materials for a San Joaquin River Parkway and Environments Conceptual Plan to promote public and agency support. Area of study is San Joaquin River environs in both Fresno and Madera Counties from Millerton State Park to Skagg's Bridge Park at State Highway 145.

We intend to hire a landscape architect to develop the parkway plan within the next two months. The architect will coordinate the planning effort with the Trust, local, state and federal agencies, landowners, and the public. Over 20 local planning and landscape architectural firms have received invitations to bid on the project.

The Trust has established an ambitious timetable. The Contract for the plan will be awarded on November 24. We intend that the
final document will be available for public review by March 24, 1989.

Conceptual plans do not come cheap. Funding for this planning effort will come from the Trust and the State Department of Parks and Recreation. The Trust's portion will be raised from local individuals, organizations, and corporations.

We will depend heavily on volunteered services from experts in various fields to develop the plan. Another important factor will be participation by landowners and the general public.

This will truly be a community plan in the finest sense. Upon completion of the plan we can begin the work of putting the pieces of the San Joaquin River Parkway together.

This concludes my testimony, and on behalf of Coke Hallowell and myself, I again thank you.
Chairman Jim Costa and members of the Committee. I am Richard Trudeau of Lafayette, California. For seventeen years, from 1969 to 1985, I served as General Manager of the East Bay Regional Park District, which covers the two county area of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Since my retirement I have been doing park and recreation consulting in various parts of the country. I was also one of the Senior Advisors to the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors.

It has been thirteen months since the first interim hearing on the San Joaquin River Parkway was held here in Fresno. It is also twenty-two months since the report and recommendations of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors was distributed. A lot has taken place since these two events.

The President's Commission wanted to build a prairie fire of action and it has gotten this in its Greenways concept. There are some 500 new greenway, trail, and parkway projects underway across the country. Many of these new initiatives are along rivers, such as the Hudson River Greenway which goes through ten counties and will form a 600-mile loop through New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut and the Mississippi River National Heritage Corridor, which provides federal incentives for river conservation through cooperative efforts between Federal, state, and local governments, the private sector, and citizens of the Twin Cities area in Minnesota. Ultimately these River Greenway projects will join others which are successfully launched such as the River Greenway along the Potomac River, the American River which you know about, and the Yakima River in Washington State, which may serve as a model for the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway.

This is an idea whose time has come for you in Fresno and Madera counties. There will be problems, of course. But nothing worthwhile comes easy and the development of a Parkway along the San Joaquin River will be of tremendous value, aesthetically and recreationally for the citizens of this area.
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Let me tell you just a bit about the Yakima River Greenway, which may well serve as your model. That Greenway runs for twenty-five miles along both shores of the Yakima River from the little town of Selah through Yakima to the little town of Union Gap. When completed it will total 3600 acres of protected natural greenbelt through the three communities and will have both land and water recreation for citizens of the southeastern part of Washington State. As with all exciting and forward looking projects, this one took some time. The idea had its inception in the late 1950's but nothing happened until the Greater Yakima Chamber of Commerce took a firm hand in 1969, soliciting endorsements for the creation of a Regional Freeway Park from some 82 civic, religious, and fraternal organizations. With public opinion behind the concept after the Chamber mobilized the various groups, the Washington State Legislature appropriated the $35,000 necessary to develop a master plan. A Yakima River Greenway Foundation was begun, which has solicited the private funds to buy the land along the river, develop the linear parks, and ultimately plans to maintain and operate the greenway through the creation of an Endowment Fund. Right now, the Foundation works with the Yakima Park and Recreation Department in this regard. This is a splendid example of community involvement, which has been successful.

It is interesting to note that the first proposal for a San Joaquin River regional parkway was made in 1918, about the same time that the first proposal was made for the creation of a regional park system in the hill areas between Alameda and Contra Costa County. The latter finally became the East Bay Regional Park District when it was created by voters of seven communities by a 3-1 margin in 1934 during the height of the great depression.

The East Bay Regional Park District may provide you with another model, this of a structure you may ultimately choose to acquire, develop, and maintain and operate the San Joaquin River Parkway. It is, however, only one of several possible models of structure. The District covers most of two counties, has its own tax base and staff, and is governed by a seven member elected Board, operating under the Public Resources Code of the State of California, Sections 5500 series.
There are two District publications I will leave to you, Chairman Costa for the guidance of your committee. One is an annual report from 1964-65 called "The Story of a Nickel," which shows what can be done with limited funds. The other is called "A Vision Achieved," and it tells the story of the District's first fifty years. The Park District doesn't have any rivers but it does have several creeks and we have worked with cities, flood control districts, both counties, agricultural groups, environmental organizations, the private sector, the state, and citizens of the areas in creating trails along the Alameda Creek, Redwood Creek, and Wildcat Creek in our two counties. We have a private foundation which for nearly twenty years has helped in the solicitation of land and money for the District and we have had extensive assistance from the corporate sector in our "Adopt-a-Park" program.

But there are other regional park models to consider. Marin County formed a Regional Park and Open Space District under our same code but its Board of Governors is the Marin County Board of Supervisors. The Maryland-National Capital Regional Park and Planning Commission is also composed of two counties -- Montgomery and Prince George's counties. Each county has its own five member elected commission and the two commissions meet together as a ten member Board to develop policies and guidelines for the park and recreation programs, ensuring that there will be no duplication of effort. The latter might serve as a good model if Madera County had a park department and consequently a park commission. It is also possible that you could govern the San Joaquin River Parkway through a community services district or even a joint powers agreement. But in the latter case the heavier burden would fall on Fresno County, and it is well known that California's counties are not as well funded as they might be. Hence your own district, whether it be a regional park district or a community services district may prove the best bet -- with its own tax base.

Are you forgetting Proposition 13 with its two-thirds vote requirement on taxes, you might rightly ask? Not at all! The pendulum seems to be swinging back. Every survey conducted nationally or in California
in very recent years has found that voters are willing to tax
themselves for parks, open space, and wildlife. Consider this
record: forty-nine cities and counties around the United States
offered bond issues to voters from 1982 to 1986, with forty-two
being passed for an 85.7 margin. Thirty-two bond measures went
before voters in six states during that same period, with twenty-four
being passed. In California Proposition 43, a $100 million local
park bond measure, received a 67.8 percent "yes" vote in 1986 and
Proposition 70, the $776 million state and local park, open space,
and wildlife measure passed overwhelmingly last June with better
than a 65 percent "yes" vote. With a 70 percent "yes" vote on
Proposition 70 in their two counties, the East Bay Regional Park
District has placed a $225 million local bond measure before voters
in November, sharing the funds with 25 percent going to local park
and recreation agencies. A voter survey done prior to the determination
to float such a bond measure showed that 71 percent of the voters in
the two counties would support such a bond measure today if the average
added tax per property owner remained under $10 per year of property
assessed at $100,000.

I believe the time is right for the creation of a San Joaquin River
Parkway in this area. I also believe that if the public is taken into
the planning of that Parkway, as well as realizing the benefit to
this area, that this can be achieved. You already have $5 million to
start with, I am told, from the success of Proposition 70. If the
right steps are taken to involve the community, you can pass a tax
override to fund the maintenance and operation of the Parkway.

Let me leave you with a Nature lesson taken from the Indian Center
in Yakima, Washington. It says:

    _The cloud may bring needed rain or damaging torrents._
    _The Lesson is: People are neither all good or all evil._
    _The Willows bend and do not break._
    _The Lesson is: Rigidity will bring defeat._
The stream makes its way in spite of obstacles of every kind. The lesson is: Determination combined with sustained effort will reach the goal.

The crane stands immobile, but when he strikes he always comes up with fish in his bill. The lesson is: Patience should be followed by decisive action.

Thank you for asking me to testify before this committee today. I would be pleased to answer any questions — or to provide further assistance when it may be needed.

#    #    #
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Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Linda Falasco and I am President of the Central Valley Rock, Sand and Gravel Association. Our membership spans the geographic area from Bakersfield through Sacramento. We represent 40 sand and gravel, ready mixed concrete and asphaltic concrete producers.

Today, I am speaking on behalf of the aggregate producers on the San Joaquin River which include RMC Lone Star, River Rock Products, CalMat, Stewart and Nuss, and San Joaquin Sand and Gravel; as well as the several concrete and asphaltic concrete operations who rely upon the construction materials these operations provide. More importantly, we are speaking on behalf of the statewide and regionally significant aggregate resources found within the flood plain of the river.

The development of a Parkway on the San Joaquin River is being modeled after the American River Parkway. Let me explain to the Committee why we are concerned about this model. While the American River Parkway may have protected and developed many of the land resource values, it did not consider the important aggregate deposits found within its flood plain. The planning 27 years ago, and in its evolution, allowed the existing sand and gravel operations to continue until such time that the deposits were exhausted. It prohibited the recovery of any new deposits.

In 1985, the Department of Conservation published a report regarding aggregate resources for the Sacramento Region. Special Report 150 found that there was an anticipated 800 million ton shortfall of construction aggregates. It determined that the permitted sites would be exhausted by the mid 1990's. Since that time, the estimates indicate that depletion will occur in 4-5 years.

The report further identifies that a 19 mile stretch of the American River within the Parkway contains over 136 million tons suitable for construction aggregates.
If this stretch of the river was allowed to be developed for the aggregate resources, it could supply the region for an additional 25 years. Because the American River Parkway precludes the recovery of the non-renewable resources, the bulk of the construction aggregates utilized in Sacramento are imported from Marysville and Yuba City at significant costs.

This scenario does not have to be repeated in the development of a parkway on the San Joaquin River. The Department of Conservation has identified the mineral resources for Fresno in Special Report 158, published in 1986. The State Mining and Geology Board is in the last phases of designating portions of the San Joaquin River as containing aggregates of statewide and regional significance which must be considered in local planning.

We must emphasize that the aggregates on the San Joaquin River are a non-renewable resource. The sand and gravel used in construction are the result of 60 million years of geologic activity. The youngest components of the deposits are 3 million years old. To put this in perspective, life on earth during the creation of these aggregates is characterized by the appearance of the first apes and the evolution of oldest man.

The San Joaquin River is the source of over 85% of the construction aggregates for the Fresno Region. The community is consuming these deposits at a rate of over 4 million tons per year. The presently permitted sites have sufficient reserves available to provide materials for the next 15-1/2 years. The identified and unpermitted land on the San Joaquin River can provide the community with 102 million tons of aggregates or an additional 18 years. Lost Lake Park contains another 10.3 million tons of aggregate resource which due to present policies cannot be developed. The mining activities can be expected to be productive on the San Joaquin River for the next 30 to 40 years and must be provided for in any long term planning for the River.

If these resources on the San Joaquin are precluded from development, alternative locations will have to be utilized. The community will have to be willing to accept the
results. These include increased costs for the products, increased truck traffic, increased road congestion, and increased air pollution.

In conclusion, I would like to quote John F. Kennedy from a February 23, 1961 speech.

"Our entire society rests upon - and is dependent upon - our water, our land, our forests and our minerals. How we use these resources influences our health, security, economy and well being."

In keeping with this sentiment, we would add that we are optimistic and confident that any Parkway Plan for the San Joaquin River will provide for the maximum utilization of all the land resource values, including sand and gravel recovery.

Respectfully submitted,
CENTRAL VALLEY ROCK, SAND & GRAVEL ASSN.

Linda A. Falasco, President
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AGGREGATE MATERIALS IN THE FRESNO P-C REGION

QUATERNARY: 3 Million Years Old
Appearance of Great Land Mammals; and Oldest Man

TERTIARY: 60 Million Years Old
Appearance of the First Placental Mammals through the First Apes

Qp: Basin, river channel and alluvial deposits
alluvial sand, silt and gravel deposited in terraces, fans and basins. Deposition is hypothesized to have occurred during, and was controlled by, glaciation in the Sierra Nevada Mountains (1) and (2).

Qm: Modesto Formation
e: eolian deposits
Qr: Riverbank Formation
Qt: Turlock Lake Formation
fp: Friant Pumice Member
QTm: North Merced pediment gravels
Tv: variously described as olivine basalt (3) or trachyandesite (4)
Tg: pre-volcanic gravels deposited by San Joaquin River
Tl: Lone Formation - strongly indurated and cemented sandstone and conglomerate with clay interbeds. Primarily fluvial
Mzb: Basement rocks within the Fresno P-C Region consist of pre-Cretaceous meta-sedimentary rocks, granodiorite and granite. (5)

1) Janda, 1965
2) Marchand, 1977
3) Marchand and Allwardt, 1978
4) Marchand and Allwardt, 1981
5) Matthews and Burnett, 1965

[Diagram of stratigraphy with columnar section]

Figure 4. Generalized Columnar Section of the stratigraphy in the San Joaquin River area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERA</th>
<th>PERIODS, EPOCHS</th>
<th>TIME, IN MILLION YEARS</th>
<th>SOME GREAT EVENTS IN CALIFORNIA</th>
<th>LIFE ON THE EARTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cenozoic</td>
<td>Quaternary Recent or Holocene</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Continued faulting and mountain building</td>
<td>Great land mammals; oldest man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal building of Coast and Transverse Ranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary Pliocene</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Local movements in Coast and Transverse Ranges; first movements on San Andreas fault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miocene</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oligocene</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Widespread coastal seas</td>
<td>First placental mammals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eocene</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paleocene</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesozoic</td>
<td>Cretaceous</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Building of the Sierra Nevada, Klamath, and Peninsular Ranges</td>
<td>Extinction of dinosaurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Shallow seas</td>
<td>Age of dinosaurs First dinosaurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triassic</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleozoic</td>
<td>Permian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Volcanism and mountain building (extent unknown)</td>
<td>Rise of reptiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvanian</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Probably shallow seas over much of California, Cambrian to Permian</td>
<td>First reptiles First land vertebrates Fishes abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippian</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trilobites dominant First abundant fossils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devonian</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silurian</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordovician</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambrian</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precambrian</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Uplift Mountain building in southern California</td>
<td>Organic tubes in marine limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>Oldest rocks and mountains on earth</td>
<td>Oldest fossils (algae?) First life (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crust of the earth solidified about 4,000 million years ago</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>Origin of the earth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Mr. Jim Costa, Chairman
Assembly Committee on
Water, Parks and Wildlife

RE: Proposed San Joaquin River Parkway - Follow-up Hearing, Fresno

Dear Mr. Chairman and Committee Members:

I am John Buada, land use and environmental planning consultant. For approximately the last 10 years I have provided services to the sand and gravel industry in Fresno and Madera Counties which extracts aggregate material from the San Joaquin River. I am the Natural Resource Coordinator for the Central Valley Sand and Gravel Industry, I am a member of the local Fresno Producers Committee, and I serve on the Advisory Committee on Education for the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust.

The San Joaquin Riverbottom from Friant to Highway 99 has historically been the primary source, supplying more than 80% of aggregate materials to the Fresno Region since the late 1800's. In the past, material was extracted from both the riverbed and the adjacent floodplain. Current extractions are confined to the floodplain deposits.

Sand and gravel sites have been the key component in the physical beginning of the parkway with Lost Lake Park, which was the source of aggregate materials for the construction of Friant Dam, and the recent agreement by the Wildlife Conservation Board for the gift and sale of the old River Rock Products site from the Underdown family for a new regional park. The prime attractions of these properties as park sites were the lakes, wetlands and accompanying riparian habitat created by the extraction of sand and gravel.

The Association is currently sponsoring in part a study by Susan Ballinger, a graduate student in the Biology Department at Fresno State University, of the waterfowl use of six sand and gravel ponds. Preliminary observations show even unreclaimed sites provide important waterfowl habitat. Today, all the operators have reclamation plans in place. In most cases, the property owners have chosen to have the sites reclaimed as lakes and wetlands. These reclamation plans are already incorporating the early observations of the Ballinger Study to further enhance not only waterfowl habitat, but also habitat for other wildlife that inhabit these sites, such as abundant fish species, raptors, small mammals, and numerous songbirds.
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As a further illustration of the local producers increasing awareness and sensitivity to the existing environment and the environment that they are creating, I am working on a reclamation plan for a potential new site, where it is the property owner's desire to establish a water-related wildlife sanctuary. We are working closely with the State Department of Fish and Game to design a reclamation plan for that sole purpose. A wildlife conservation easement will likely be part of the agreement to insure that the site will be maintained as a private wildlife sanctuary.

This type of project will be an integral part of any parkway, even if it remains in private ownership. At a statewide conference on Riparian Systems that I attended with 800 others at U.C. Davis last month, the many speakers illuminated the salient point that, "Wildlife does not know the difference between public and private property." They are attracted to the riparian system. This project and other sand and gravel reclaimed sites which will likely remain private are an integral part of the riparian system which is the main attraction of the parkway experience.

The concept of the San Joaquin River Parkway was born in great part by the results of the 1986 San Joaquin River Reconnaissance Study prepared by Fresno and Madera Counties and the City of Fresno. That study clearly illustrates that the essence of river parkway experience is the corridor of water, riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat encompassing both the river itself and adjacent wetlands and forming a riparian system.

The Reconnaissance Study identified a riparian/wildlife corridor consisting of 7,900 acres, 1,088 acres of which is water. Of that water acreage, at least 900 acres or 80% are sand and gravel created ponds and lakes. Another 1844 acres, identified as other riparian, are wetlands and riparian habitat associated with sand and gravel mining. Of the total acreage in the corridor, 2,744 acres or 35% exist today solely as the result of sand and gravel mining.

My firm, Buada Associates, is presently completing the San Joaquin River Rock, Sand and Gravel Sources study for several members of the Association. As you know, it is the goal of the State Fish and Game Commission to increase wetlands in California by 50% by the year 2000. In the next 15 years, reclamation from existing sand and gravel permits will alone create an additional 1,500 acres of lakes and wetlands in the San Joaquin River bottom, increasing existing wetlands in the area by 50%. Additional non-permitted sand and
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Gravel resources could create an additional 1,950 acres of wetland habitat over the next 33 years. Together, the existing and future permits could increase wetlands by 3,450 acres or 135% from the existing 2,744 acres to 6,194 acres. Portions of this additional acreage would be outside the original corridor boundaries and could expand it by an additional 1,000 acres.

Without the sand and gravel industry in the San Joaquin Riverbottom, the existing riparian/wildlife corridor would be considerably smaller than it is today. The future of expanding the riparian/wildlife system is integrally tied to the continuance of existing and future sand and gravel permits. Together, they can assure the region of a healthy, growing riparian/wildlife corridor so essential to the proposed parkway.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this information and we appreciate the continued inclusion of the sand and gravel industry in planning for the parkway.

Sincerely,

John C. Buada
October 17, 1988

To: Assemblyman Jim Costa, Chairman
   Water, Parks, and Wildlife State Assembly Committee
   Room 2003
   State Capital
   Sacramento, California 95814
   Attention: Peggy

Dear Chairman Costa:

My name is Michael Bautista, we own 440 acres on The San Joaquin River in Madera County, known as the Coombs River Bend Ranch. Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments with your committee.

The subject of today's hearing is "Proposed San Joaquin River Parkway...". We want to go on record stating our support for parks along the San Joaquin River. We must also state for the record, our serious concern regarding the manner in which the active proponents are proceeding to achieve the parkway objective.

As businessmen, to begin purchasing property or assets without complete budget and operating plans is somewhat remiss from our standpoint. Needless to say, the plan must address all the issues to the extent they can be identified. There are major issues which need to be resolved before proceeding with random acquisitions of properties.

All issues of ownership, as disputed between The State Lands Commission and property owners, should be resolved.

The issue of channel clearing and maintenance should be resolved. This is a contractual obligation.

The matters of ownership, easements, channel maintenance, channel clearing, parkway operations, and parkway maintenance must become part of the whole plan and effort. This will then become a comprehensive plan which then can be presented to all parties. To begin purchasing properties without addressing all the issues is not in the best public interest.

Because of the river's proximity to already established metropolitan areas, we believe that mixed uses along the San Joaquin River are desirable and compatible. There are examples throughout the nation and world, too numerous to
mention, where development coexists with river and waterway environments, and the inherent and developed amenities. Why take public monies which have better uses, when masterplanning with landowners, development interest, and park proponents can achieve the same objective. The "comprehensive plan" will result in substantially less cost to the public. There are a number of creative funding mechanisms and incentive plans that become available when development is included in the plan.

We strongly believe the legal claims of title and easement, and the plans for operating and maintaining the park and river directly concern the proposed parkway. Please do not ignore them or discount their importance. We believe to do so jeopardizes the ultimate objective.

The property owners want to be part of the process, but surely you understand we must first consider our property rights.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Bautista
President
Coombs, Inc. and River Bend Ranch
DATE: October 14, 1988

TO: Assembly Committee on Water, Parks, and Wildlife

SUBJECT: Proposed San Joaquin River Parkway

Assemblyman Costa:

Fresno County Farm Bureau appreciates the opportunity to convey to this Committee its thoughts and concerns regarding the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway.

If the Parkway, as envisaged, becomes a reality there will be costs associated with operation, maintenance, and security. Operation, maintenance, and security of the American River Parkway in Sacramento costs approximately $2 million per year. By what mechanism is it proposed that these costs for the San Joaquin River Parkway be funded. Is the financially strapped County of Fresno to be responsible? If so, will the money be pulled from the County General Fund leaving law enforcement or other departments with smaller budgets. Ideally, the State would provide funding for some of the mandated State programs for which the counties are not reimbursed. We are concerned that the only way the County would be able to pay for the operation, maintenance, and security is by a property tax override.

If this were to be the case would all County taxpayers have to pay for a Parkway in North Fresno? What about property owners in Coalinga? How would the lines of demarcation be drawn? Is there an equitable method for providing the revenue necessary to maintain this proposed Parkway?

Furthermore, we have concerns about personal property rights and the potential infringement of those rights by a proposed Fresno City "O" Zone of the River bottom area. Restrictive zoning by definition limits the beneficial uses of a piece of property and thereby limits or reduces its value.

We also have concerns about the possibility of the State redesignating the definition of a navigable stream and the impact that might have on land acquisition for the proposed Parkway. California Farm Bureau Federation Policy No. 51 states the following:

"We oppose any redesignation of navigability of rivers and lake shores above the existing lines of record as of January
1, 1970 and the subsequent acquisition of lands by the State of California under private ownership along the rivers of California."

Once again, we thank you for the opportunity to present our concerns about the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway.
Assemblyman Jim Costa  
Water Parks and Wildlife Committee  
Room 2003  
State Capitol  
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Subject: Hearing at Fresno, Ca, on proposed parks/San Joaquin River

My concern is the trailways connecting the proposed parks. While we hear and read that there will be no condemnation used in acquiring land for the parks, the testimony on acquisition of the connecting trailways has very quietly and nearly avoided. I do not believe that property owners whom do not wish to sell their land now would be willing to see trails through their properties, and would reject a sale for this purpose. Do you propose condemnation for these trails in such an event, and if not, what are your plans on this subject? I would like to have this addressed publicly now.

I would remind this committee that the flood plains are in all cases that I know of, private property and a part of the entire private parcel. Much of these lands are under cultivation and have never been claimed by the State or others as public lands, to my knowledge. I mention these lands in response to a statement made by Mr. Costa that these flood plains were under consideration for the trails.

In closing, I want to state that the claims made by the State Lands Commission, which could have a bearing upon this, as well as many more concerns, is at this point in time, no more than a claim. Most of you have only heard one side of this story through the media, but I can assure you that there are contrary opinions as to the validity of these claims.

It amuses me to hear the comments about funding these projects. The advocates speak of grants, State and Federal. These are not "free lunches". They are still collected and charged to all taxpayers.

On the Federal level, we all know that they are a part of our obscene debt. Some one, some day, must repay these borrowed funds. Those who only see the beauty in today's excesses, could well bear the scars and scorn of an economically devastated nation in the future.
October 11, 1988

Jim Costa, Chairman
Assembly Committee on Water, Parks and Wildlife
State Capitol
Post Office Box 942849
Sacramento, California 94249-0001

Subject: Proposed San Joaquin River Parkway

Dear Mr. Costa:

Due to time and budget constraints, the Service will be unable to participate in the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee follow-up hearing on the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway.

Our endangered species staff have indicated the only Federal endangered or threatened species that may occur within the area of the proposed parkway is the threatened valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*).

Regarding the availability of Federal funds or other assistance for protection of lands supporting threatened or endangered species, Land and Water and Conservation Fund monies have been used to acquire habitat for endangered and threatened species. This money is established from revenues and collections from surplus property sales, motorboat fuel tax, and other sources such as receipts under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

The Service continues to support the concept of a San Joaquin River Parkway. If you have any further questions regarding endangered species, please contact our Endangered Species Field Supervisor, Gail Kobetich, at (916) 978-4866.

Sincerely,

James D. Carson
Acting Field Supervisor

cc: ARD, (AFWE), FWS, Portland, OR
November 2, 1988

The Honorable Jim Costa  
Member of the Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 2111  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Costa:

At the interim hearing of the Assembly Committee on Water, Parks and Wildlife you asked if the Department had any plans for park-and-ride lots on Route 41 north of San Joaquin River in order to alleviate congestion at the river crossing.

There is an existing park-and-ride lot 10 miles north of the river at the intersection of Route 145 and Route 45. The Department's district office staff have developed, in cooperation with Madera County planners, a list of potential park-and-ride lot candidates for sites in Oakhurst, Coarsegold and other locations north of Route 145. Also, there is a potential location south of the San Joaquin River in Fresno County at Audubon Drive. None of these potential locations are funded for acquisition or construction. No park-and-ride lots are currently planned for the area north of the San Joaquin River and south of Route 145 since there is no Department owned right-of-way available for one. However, when an alignment is adopted for Route 41 in this area, the future right of way for the new route could temporarily be used for park-and-ride lots as it is acquired.

If you have any further questions in this regard, please contact Mr. Dick Weaver, District Director of our Fresno Office, at (209) 488-4057.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

WARREN D. WEBER  
Assistant Director  
Legislative Affairs
September 27, 1988

Assemblyman Jim Costa, Chairman
Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Jim:

Thank you for inviting us to testify again on Friday, October 14 regarding the San Joaquin River Parkway. Unfortunately, I and our Officers and the Board of Directors will be attending the annual meeting of our state association-- the California Building Industry Association-- that day.

On behalf of the association, however, I would underscore the testimony from your previous hearing and amplify the fact that while we are supportive of the creation of a parkway system in the San Joaquin River, it cannot be accomplished by merely "shutting down" the area to development.

As with the American River Parkway in Sacramento, it must be a carefully planned blending of open space, park area and development, for each of the components cannot survive without the other in creating a successful parkway setting. Thank you for the opportunity to forward our views on the San Joaquin River Parkway and we look forward to working with you and other interested members of the community in making it a reality.

Respectfully,

Paul A. Stewart II
Executive Vice President

PAS/pas