



# REPORT TO COUNCIL

## City of Sacramento

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2671  
www.CityofSacramento.org

STAFF REPORT  
**August 23, 2005**

Honorable Mayor and  
Members of the City Council

**Subject:** Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan Implementation Process

**Location/Council District:** 1 and 4

**Recommendation:**

Adopt a Resolution approving the proposed governance and finance feasibility process for a proposed regional riverfront entity as part of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan implementation effort.

**Contact:**

Robert G. Overstreet, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation, 808-1190  
Annabeth Stem, Program Analyst, Department of Parks and Recreation, 808-8830

**Presenter:** Robert G. Overstreet, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation

**Department:** Parks and Recreation

**Division:** Office of the Director

**Organization No:** 4511

**Summary:**

Since the City Councils of West Sacramento and Sacramento accepted the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan in July of 2003, both cities and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), in conjunction with the Counties of Yolo and Sacramento, have worked together to develop a process to identify and manage riverfront project implementation. A fundamental element of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan implementation program is the establishment and/or redefinition of a regional management and financing entity to support riverfront improvement efforts and to provide a more stable funding source for capital, maintenance, and operational expenses. Staff from the two cities and SAFCA have developed a process for stakeholder review of potential entity models. A cabinet of key stakeholders will be presented with a statement of the challenge and potential approaches. The proposed

stakeholder group will assemble a strategic mission, develop objectives, and refine a critical path for the development of an effective streamlined riverfront organization.

**Committee/Commission Action:**

On Wednesday, June 29, 2005, the Waterfront Advisory Committee, comprised of Sacramento Mayor Fargo, West Sacramento Mayor Cabaldon, Sacramento Councilmember Fong, and West Sacramento Mayor Pro-Tem Pierson, recommended that the two Cities' respective City Councils approve the scope of work for the creation of a riverfront regional entity.

**Background Information:**

Since the City Councils of West Sacramento and Sacramento accepted the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan in July of 2003, both cities and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), in conjunction with the Counties of Yolo and Sacramento, have worked together to develop a process to identify and manage riverfront project implementation.

The Steering Team, formed following acceptance of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan to consider policy options and facilitate communication among the participating agencies, includes representatives from:

- o City of Sacramento Department of Convention, Culture, and Leisure
- o City of Sacramento Department of Parks and Recreation
- o City of Sacramento Economic Development Department
- o City of Sacramento Neighborhood Services Department
- o City of West Sacramento Redevelopment Agency
- o County of Sacramento, Department of Regional Parks, Recreation and Open Space
- o County of Yolo, Planning and Public Works Department
- o Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency

**Riverfront Governance and Financing**

The Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan implementation program includes the establishment and/or redefinition of a regional management and financing entity to support riverfront improvement efforts and to provide a more stable funding source for capital, maintenance, and operational expenses, particularly for public facilities and areas. The process to assess the feasibility of such an entity must encourage private sector participation, achieve a measure of public and private agreement, develop a tightly defined mission, establish a governance structure, and identify a sustainable funding source.

In the fall of 2004, staff from the City of Sacramento and the City of West Sacramento began meeting with key business owners, developers, and public and private

organizations from both sides of the river regarding the development of a regional riverfront entity. The Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) was retained to continue the stakeholder assessment work and report on their findings (see Attachment 1). The purpose of these initial stakeholder meetings was to identify potential conflicts, initial agreements, and goals that stakeholders are willing to explore in building agreement on an appropriate form of management entity and financing sources.

Feedback from the riverfront stakeholders interviewed was very positive. The property owners, business owners, and public and private agencies consulted support engagement in a fact-finding process, although none expressed a preference for any particular organizational model as yet. There seemed to be a consensus around the objective of creating a "championing" entity that would help lead projects through the regulatory process and finance and develop riverfront projects.

Stakeholders interviewed did voice some cautions about creating additional layers of government review and permitting. Private property and business owners wish to closely examine the cost associated with any type of entity, particularly in the context of the total tax and fee burden already imposed on their properties and businesses. All stakeholders interviewed expressed a desire to see close coordination between the public and private sectors throughout the process. Perhaps the most common concern voiced by stakeholders is the desire to avoid a long, drawn-out entity development process. Those interviewed hope that the study process will be accomplished by the end of this year.

In addition to the CCP, two firms will provide technical assistance in connection with the riverfront entity study process. The Resources Law Group (RLG), through an agreement with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), will analyze alternative organizational models for a regional entity to evaluate the relative legal, structural, and other advantages of each alternative. Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC) will provide similar analysis related to potential financing and funding mechanisms that may be suitable for use in creating a riverfront entity. Additionally, individuals from various cities around the U.S. with similar private/public riverfront governance models will be engaged to provide advice and expertise for the proposed stakeholder meeting "kick-off event." Attachment 2 provides a description of the scopes of work for the firms involved in the regional entity feasibility process.

The proposed process is a focused series of workshops to define a work plan for the development of an effective riverfront organization. RLG and PMC will provide organizational and financial data and analysis and CCP will facilitate the vetting of alternative entity models with stakeholders and the public. Several key stakeholders from both sides of the river, such as Lina Fat, Mark Friedman, and Dan Ramos, have expressed willingness to be part of the private sector leadership for this process.

In summary, staff proposes the following process for accomplishing the scope of work for the creation of a regional riverfront entity for the Sacramento River:

Proposed Process:

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Waterfront Advisory Committee meeting              | Presentation and acceptance of process<br><i>* Took place June 29, 2005</i>   |
| 2. | City Council Meeting                               | Approval of process and direction to staff<br><i>* Process approved by City of West Sacramento City Council on July 20, 2005</i>  |
| 3. | Kick-off Event                                     | Formally begin the "brainstorming" process. Mayors and Council members (WAC) invited to deliver opening remarks. Representatives of nationally recognized riverfront entities will present examples of success.<br><i>* Scheduled for September 8, 2005</i> |
| 4. | Workshop 1<br><b><i>Begin the Discussions</i></b>  | Discuss principles and objectives. Review findings from stakeholder interviews and information on governing structures and funding options. Identify key issues.  |
| 5. | Workshop 2<br><b><i>Discuss Options</i></b>        | Review list of principles and objectives, in-depth discussion of governance and funding options. This meeting will focus on delimiting options and identifying information needed to make a final recommendation.   |
| 6. | Workshop 3<br><b><i>Develop Recommendation</i></b> | Review reports from stakeholders, consulting firms, and staff and develop a consensus recommendation.   |
| 7. | Workshop 4   | If needed   |
| 8. | Parks and Recreation Commission                    | Present recommendation  |
| 9. | City Council Meetings                              | Present recommendation to respective Councils.  |

Capital Funding

The City of Sacramento, City of West Sacramento, and SAFCA have been working together to develop funding sources for implementing projects in the Master Plan. The City of Sacramento received over \$2 million from the Proposition 13 and Proposition 40 River Parkways Grant Programs for development of Jibboom Street Park and secured a \$5.3 million loan from the State Department of Boating and Waterways for renovation of

Miller Park. The City of West Sacramento has also received significant funding for Sacramento riverfront projects.

Proposition 50 authorizes the Legislature to appropriate \$100 million for the acquisition, restoration, protection, and development of river parkways via the Proposition 50 River Parkways Grant Program. Guidelines for the first round of the Proposition 50 grant program, which will result in the award of \$40 million statewide, were released by the State Resources Agency in late July. Grant applications are due October 18, 2005. The Steering Committee agencies are collaborating on strategies for grant applications for the River Parkways program and other potential funding sources.

### Status of Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan Projects

Attachment 3 provides a summary of initial projects and their status. Key projects are:

- The Tower Bridge pedestrian widening project is proceeding; construction is to start by August 2006 and should be completed by December 2007.
- Planning for the Docks Area is proceeding; community meetings to discuss land use designations will be complete this Fall and the public space is being more clearly defined along the riverfront.
- Jibboom Street Park development is proceeding; construction to begin late summer 2005 for completion in 2006.
- The Marina renovation is proceeding with design work.
- The City of Sacramento General Plan update will incorporate principles and policies from the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan.
- West Sacramento promenade is proceeding toward construction.
- Bike trail from R Street to Miller Park is under construction.
- Negotiations for land exchanges with the State are ready to begin.

### Environmental Review and the Sacramento River Corridor Planning Forum

As a result of the Sacramento River Corridor Planning Forum, guidelines for development in Reclamation Board regulatory areas have been developed. With SAFCA and the City's Department of Utilities taking the lead, the public projects that are within the Reclamation Board regulatory area will be cumulatively assessed and presented to the Reclamation Board. As projects come forward, this cumulative assessment, based on the Forum Guidelines, will be designed to satisfy concerns of the Board. The cumulative impact analysis can simplify subsequent project-specific environmental analysis. The City of Sacramento's Docks Area Study and West Sacramento's promenade project will be presented as the initial projects on which to apply the Forum guidelines.

### Management Oversight

Implementation of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan is entering an important phase. Additionally, great changes to the American River waterfront area are on the horizon. Staff believes that the time is right to establish a centralized strategy for coordination of projects along Sacramento's two rivers, a staff position or office with oversight responsibility for riverfront projects to ensure that effective coordination and communication exists to proceed with important current and future Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan and American River Parkway Plan implementation activities.

The City's commitment to and investment in the riverfront areas will provide a foundation for private sector involvement and encourage participation from other public agencies—both elements required to make Sacramento's riverfronts excellent. Establishing a clearinghouse for management and oversight of the City's role in implementation of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan, as well as the American River Parkway Plan, will guarantee that projects related to the riverfronts proceed in a timely and well-planned manner and that the City's goals are achieved. Staff will return to Council later this year with a recommendation for coordinating projects along our rivers.

### **Financial Considerations:**

The proposed cost of the feasibility process for the regional riverfront entity is approximately \$83,000. The City of Sacramento will contract with CCP and PMC at a total cost of \$52,900. The City of West Sacramento will, by agreement, reimburse the City of Sacramento for 40% of the costs for the CCP and PMC contracts to achieve an equitable split of costs between the cities. The City of West Sacramento will pay for the travel expenses of speakers from other riverfront organizations participating in the "kick-off event" for the Regional Riverfront Entity, estimated to cost \$10,000. The City of Sacramento's share of the cost will be covered by the Department of Parks and Recreation operating budget. Attachment 4 details the cost share plan between the City of Sacramento, the City of West Sacramento, and SAFCA for the riverfront entity project. Following completion of the feasibility process for the regional riverfront entity, staff will prepare recommendations for a startup budget for the proposed organization.

### **Environmental Considerations:**

This action is not subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the general rule (Section 15061(b)(3)) that CEQA applies only to projects that have significant effect on the environment.

### **Policy Considerations:**

The action requested herein is consistent with the City's Strategic Plan goal to achieve sustainability and livability and expand economic development throughout the city. It is

also consistent with the goals of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan, accepted by the Sacramento City Council on July 31, 2003.

**Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD):**

No goods or services are being purchased.

Submitted by:   
Robert G. Overstreet II  
Director

Recommendation Approved:

  
ROBERT P. THOMAS  
City Manager

Table of Contents:

Pg	1	Report
Pg	8	Attachment 1 – Center for Collaborative Policy Report
Pg	22	Attachment 2 – Sacramento Riverfront Entity Scope of Work Summary
Pg	24	Attachment 3 – Status of Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan Projects
Pg	28	Attachment 4 – Riverfront Entity Feasibility Project Cost Share Plan
Pg	29	Resolution – Approve Proposed Entity Process
Pg	30	Resolution Exhibit A – Governance and finance feasibility process for a proposed regional riverfront entity

# Sacramento Riverfront Management Project

## Initial Interviews Report

John Folk-Williams  
Jeff Loux

Center for Collaborative Policy  
California State University  
Sacramento

June 21, 2005

## **Sacramento Riverfront Management Project**

### **Introduction**

The Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) of Sacramento State University is pleased to present this Final Report summarizing stakeholder interviews and offering recommendations for a collaborative process relating to formation of a management and financial support entity for implementation of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan. This assessment is intended to help the Steering Committee and the Waterfront Advisory Committee understand the stakeholder issues and concerns and how they can be responded to by means of a brief series of workshop events. Ultimately, the goal of a stakeholder assessment is to identify the conditions necessary to sustain collaboration and achieve the Steering Committee's goals for building consensus on a management vehicle.

The Center's method for a stakeholder assessment is to conduct individual and small group interviews with a cross-section of decision makers and leaders. The Center began with a substantial list provided by the Steering Committee, whose leading members had already interviewed some of the major players relating to riverfront development. During the interviews, we identified additional names of people who could influence the choice of a riverfront management mechanism because of their information or insights, or because of their ability to challenge the outcome of a collaborative process. Some of these needed to be interviewed during the assessment; others simply needed to be identified for future communication.

The first part of this report summarizes information gained from the stakeholder interviews and integrates this into a series of criteria that capture the major themes.

The second part of the report offers specific recommendations for the collaborative process to be held over the next few months with the aim of building broad support for a particular management and financing strategy and mechanism.

### **Part I: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews**

During the spring of 2005, facilitators from the Center for Collaborative Policy interviewed a variety of stakeholders with views and interests in the riverfront to identify their issues, listen to their ideas and solutions and gauge their interest in being part of the subsequent workshops and discussions. The stakeholders in the following organizational roles were interviewed:

Property owners, land developers, art museum director, state property manager, state parks director, bicycle advocates, public access advocates, state land leasing and

environmental managers, flood control agency directors, city utilities department, state flood management official, county parks director, land planning NGO, professional association leader, business district manager, reclamation district managers and business owners.

### **Range of views about the Master Plan and experience in its preparation:**

Most respondents had favorable reactions to the Master Plan, and believed the suite of projects generally meets their needs. Several respondents including the property owners were appreciative of the participatory nature of the master plan process and full involvement of stakeholders. Several people noted that the plan is visionary and long-term, and were concerned that the Plan not be “watered down” to eliminate or postpone some of the more intensive and exciting improvements that can really attract people to the river. Several respondents noted that certain aspects of the plan should be high priority such as riverfront trail systems, and trail and bikeway connections to surrounding projects and high use areas. The environmental community and flood control representatives wanted to make sure that any new projects did not undermine the integrity of the levees or affect flood management solutions already in place. Additionally, several developers noted that there may be a hesitancy to aggressively pursue the more costly and complex projects along the river itself (often needing major regulatory permits); and that these should not be ignored. State transportation officials expressed concern that the plan did not account for impacts on regional highways of the high number of new residents and jobs projected for the downtown area.

One respondent noted that “we should not settle for anything less than exceptional (on the riverfront)”, and that the landscape and design treatment should be “iconic” and unique to this region and this river. “We don’t want boring.”

Another person emphasized that development on and near the river was imminent on a “level of quality never before seen in this area.” He felt that this required giving up the narrow scope of vision of the past and seeing the riverfront as a large regional attraction. Elk Grove and Roseville should be thought of as part of that region and efforts made to keep them informed. This Master Plan should be thought of in the context of the Blueprint, as affecting the entire metropolitan region.

Advocates for public access emphasize integrating opportunities for the public in private development as well as public spaces and taking advantage of each project to combine as many purposes as possible to harmonize economic, flood control, public access and habitat purposes. Some state officials wanted to ensure that the needs of the thousands of state employees in the area were carefully considered and met during the implementation process.

### **What is the most important project in the Master Plan to be completed first:**

This question elicited some fairly strong responses. Developing a looped trail/bikeway network along the river (on both sides) and connecting across the river at the key

bridges (especially the Tower Bridge) was the most commonly echoed "first priority." Several people noted that some early promenade improvements need not be the full or final projects, but could allow people immediate comfortable access to the river. Levee and bank stability projects were also seen as high priority. Some noted that the ultimate pathway system should allow people direct water access not just at the top of the levees, but to "touch" the water. Other very high priorities include public access and amenities at the Railyards edge to connect to Discovery Park, connection from R Street to Miller Park, the Wagon Bridge at I Street, and public amenities on the West Sacramento side such as the Amphitheater and outdoor seating areas. In general, the sense was to keep the exciting, innovative aspects in the Plan even if they are costly or engender some controversy. Some business owners on the Sacramento side emphasized the need for more boat docking facilities and terracing of levees as ways of benefiting Old Sacramento.

For the many flood control agencies, the priorities are different. Typically, they are concerned about keeping open access for their equipment under all circumstances and sustaining levee integrity. Particular projects are not the issue.

For at least one flood control agency, though, the tie-in between the Sacramento and American rivers at a stabilizing point of land in Tiscornia Park and the American River Parkway is critical, as is formalization of the Sacramento River Corridor Planning Forum Guidelines through implementation of the initial projects of the Riverfront Master Plan.

Predictably, respondents with interests on one side of the river or the other tended to favor projects on "their" side as the highest priority. Others, though, emphasized that the river would not truly become central to the cities until there were many new residents as well as park users who could see the river from the places where they lived, worked or shopped. The sense of immediate and personal connection would be essential, and projects bringing that to reality should have priority.

### **Key Challenges in a Management and Financing Plan:**

A number of different suggestions were made:

(1) Keeping the two cities together and focused on solutions was a concern based on past interactions where there was antagonism or competition.

(2) Coming up with a fair and agreed upon manner for assessment will be difficult especially as it relates to public agencies paying "their share" when it is not required. Several landowners noted that the cities, county and state governments needed to be part of any assessment.

(3) It will be challenging to establish the level of improvement generated by the plan and what a fair rationale for a new assessment would be. E.G. How far away from the riverfront would the area of benefit extend?

(3) Getting through the many flood control requirements and environmental regulatory hurdles (for actual projects).

(4) Access to adequate funding; Proposition 40 and 50 parkway funds are limited and all headed for the LA River. Some felt the full cost of the plan was in the billions and not feasible.

(5) Already pay high park fees and other municipal fees; it will be difficult to assess even more fees on businesses. This is especially true of the established businesses of Old Sacramento most of which will not have new direct features added to benefit their properties. It will be necessary to demonstrate all the ways in which their clientele could increase as a result of the changes. Since they already pay substantial assessments, there is concern that they could rebel at further increases.

(6) Concern that the two sides of the river may not be treated "fairly" since significantly more funds need to be expended on the West Sac side to attract people, and there is much more established business and activities on the Sacramento side.

(7) A single experienced manager is needed to streamline the permitting and reduce the regulatory burden.

#### **Key Criteria in Evaluating Success of Management and Financing Plan and Structure of the Organization:**

- Fairness, openness, and equitable representation, which includes significant, direct participation by the private sector/land owners.
- Dynamic and flexible; able to be "nimble" and respond to changing conditions, market forces, etc.
- Do not create another layer of government or bureaucracy only because you can; there are already too many permits and regulations to riverfront development.
- Be clear about the need for a new entity.
- Make it a "seamless" organization so it is not seen as another government or layer.
- Respect the entities already in place; coordinate them as effectively as possible; only add on for purposes they cannot readily fulfill.
- Able to quickly and ably seek outside funding with adequate political representation for "clout."
- Effective, action and project-oriented, an energizer; not planning, regulatory or analytical, not a force for slowing things down or a project killer.
- Focused solely on developing the riverfront; not distracted by other issues.
- Able to create the infrastructure no single agency can build.
- Financing should not be based on user fees on pedestrians and bicyclists.
- New entity should be able to bring in broader base for funding source; it's hard to see savings on the management side.

- Public role essential since all the levee facilities are publicly owned; private role has to be carefully defined as an advisory one. (Private interests will change over time as properties are sold.)
- Core features of new entity are delivery of capital projects and delivery of maintenance services; the planning is already done.
- Copy good models out there; do not reinvent the wheel in terms of organizational structure or funding.
- Keep clear access for current flood control maintenance, inspection and emergency equipment.
- Adjust new assessment in proportion to increment of benefit from new improvements.
- Important to hold development to high standards. Extracting impact fees is a way to do that and sustain an ongoing organization.

### **Range of Ideas for Management Structure:**

1) Some form of Joint Powers Authority was the most frequently mentioned organizational model. Some expressed the interest that the private sector have a strong role in any JPA or other entity. A Riverfront JPA would be focused on the river, tailored to do the job efficiently, involve representatives from all sectors, and create assessment district financing. A JPA could contract with a private or non-profit entity to manage the riverfront.

2) Another option listed was a Riverfront Conservancy of some type, although there was concern expressed that a conservancy would place too much emphasis and authority with the state and Resources Agency; and may not be as development minded as the entity needed to be. Loss of local control was a serious flaw in that model for some. Others felt the conservancy vehicle should only be used for a more extensive region.

3) Another option raised was to use the existing departments of parks and recreation in the two cities to manage the riverfront improvements. The advantages of this are that it is simple, in place, and does not create any extra costs or layers of government. The disadvantages are that the parks departments are not focused on the river and may not have all required forms of expertise.

4) A fourth option is to create a private-public partnership in the form of a Riverfront Development Corporation, as has been done in other major cities. Such an entity generally contracts for maintenance services and focuses its efforts on fund-raising, publicity and the planning and carrying out of public events designed to draw people from the region to the venues of the riverfront.

5) One other option mentioned was to have the two cities continue on the present course of pursuing independent implementation of individual projects but in a context of shared plans, goals, fund-raising and cooperative staffing. When it came time to

implement a project that neither could do on its own, a more limited joint powers authority could be created to deal with that.

**Range of Ideas for Financing:**

Many ideas were discussed. Most agreed that all forms of potential capital and operations funding need to be pursued and that for any given project or improvement, multiple sources may be needed. Among the options:

- Mello Roos financing
- Propositions 40 and 50
- Lighting and Landscape districts
- Cities park and recreation fees
- Caltrans and other state money sources as part of other transportation projects
- Public-private development partnerships
- Redevelopment funds
- Parking fees from a new paid parking area or downtown or Old Sac
- Need endowments from developers up front to help with O and M costs
- Property assessments for public and private lands
- Development impact fees
- As one person put it, new development and government are the sources

**Degree of Participation Desired:**

We found a range of opinions on this question. Most of the land owners, public agencies, and non-profits wanted to stay involved in all interactions, although most expressed the need to move quickly and not have too many meetings. The environmental and public interest groups were not as interested in being close to the meetings (given other time constraints), but wanted to be kept informed. There was a strong sense that local elected officials needed to be contacted and informed.

There was also a consistent response that we do not need a lengthy process and a lot of meetings. The feeling is that there is a unique consensus at this time and we need to "get on with it" in terms of deciding on a structure and funding choices.

**Other/miscellaneous:**

In discussing the issues with stakeholders, a number of people in addition to those on the Steering Committee list were mentioned, including: the mayor and councils of both cities, leaders in other cities of the region, SACOG leadership and staff, county board members, local elected officials from each county in State government, environmental regulatory agencies, Caltrans and other environmentalists. Efforts were made to contact only Caltrans and other environmentalists with immediate interests in the SRMP area. The Steering Committee may want to consider appropriate methods for informing and staying in touch with the leaders of the region as a whole.

**List of Interviewees:**

Mark Friedman	Fulcrum
Lynn Yackzan	Unger Family
Dan Ramos	RAMCO
Laverne Ireland	Sierra Club
Ruth Coleman	State Parks
Cathy Taylor	State Parks
Lyle Jones	Crocker Art Museum
Steve Huffman	Old Sacramento Foundation
Lina Fat	Fat Family/Old Sacramento Foundation
Nick Docus	American Association of Architects
John Brooks	Department of General Services
Dwight Sanders	State Lands Commission
Lorna Burks	State Lands
Diane Jones	State Lands
Randell Iwasaki	CalTrans
Jody Jones	CalTrans
Keith Swanson	Department of Water Resources
Paul Devereux	American River Flood Control Association
Ken Ruzich	Reclamation District 900
Dan Gorfain	Friends of the Sacramento River Greenway
Dave Brent	City of Sacramento Utilities
Ron Suter	County Parks, Recreation and Open Space
Stein Buer	SAFCA
Tim Washburn	SAFCA
Walt Seifert	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
Tim Youmans	Urban Land Institute - Sacramento

## Potential Criteria for Management & Financing Options

### Need:

- There needs to be a clear case for a new entity.
- Show creative use of existing authorities, resources, agency capabilities.
- Relate need for new revenues to improvements and benefits.
- Identify types of projects, programs or infrastructure no single existing agency can create on its own.

### Formation & Governance:

- Private landowner/business involvement
- Public interest groups on board of new entity
- Public agency role uppermost because levees are and many facilities will be publicly owned. Any flood liability would be assumed by permanent public entity.
- Use tested successful models; don't reinvent wheel.
- Equitable and fair representation for key interests.

### Type of Entity:

- Flexibility – open to what works and what is needed
- Want existing successful model
- Use as much coordination as possible before going to new entity
- JPA most frequently mentioned but not as essential
- Also mentioned: Riverfront development corporation; conservancy; public-private partnership; reliance on existing cities' parks departments; continuance of current strategy of coordination with separate city projects.

### Functions:

- Raise funds
- Create buzz, accelerate development
- Deliver capital projects
- Deliver/coordinate/manage maintenance services
- Have and use political clout
- Sole focus on developing riverfront – no distractions
- Flexible and nimble enough to respond to market forces

### Financing:

- Fairness, equity in developing new revenue sources
- New sources locally should be based on clear needs related to specific benefits.
- Use creativity in combining funds from multiple sources to sustain different functions
- Involve property owners in new assessments affecting them.

- Investigate ways that state property owners can contribute to ongoing costs in return for benefits.
- Define a zone of benefit as basis for assessments on property owners.
- Charge development or impact fees as way to maintain high standards and to provide revenue for ongoing organization.
- User fees for parking, parks and recreation.
- State funds for public purposes, such as redevelopment, boating safety and waterway improvements, habitat restoration, transportation, flood safety, watersheds, etc.

**Other Criteria:**

- Sensitivity to needs of State employees in area.
- Maximize attention to public access in all phases of development.
- Provide for free flow of bicycles in this alternate transportation corridor.
- Utilize existing flood control entities to manage and inspect levee modifications while providing additional funding for new burdens.
- Keep flood safety uppermost through all phases of implementing Master Plan and maintaining new Riverfront features.

## Part II: Proposed Public Workshop Process

### Introduction

The following recommendations are based on the Steering Committee meetings that we have been attending, our interviews with over 25 key stakeholders, our assessment of the situation and our own background in developing public processes. With any public policy process, there are likely to be modifications and mid-course corrections that are needed, but we believe this proposed design meets the multiple objectives of involving key stakeholders, being efficient with time and resources and allowing adequate education and information exchange to develop a viable organizational and financial model.

### Suggested Process

We recommend a four meeting sequence.

**Workshop 1 (Kick-Off and Organization):** The first meeting would be the “kick-off” that the Steering Committee has been planning in which experts from across the country will come and present their models and successes from waterfront or riverfront areas. The meeting audience will consist of key stakeholders, but also be open to elected officials, staff members, and members of the public.

We could divide the meeting into two parts: the first and longer part consisting of the presentations and kick-off speeches, with elected officials highlighting the key elements of the mission of the stakeholder group’s work over the summer, and the second shorter part consisting of an organizational meeting of the stakeholder group itself at which we could:

1. Discuss, clarify and confirm the basic one-page mission and charter for the group outlining what we hope to accomplish, the scope of our work, milestones and schedule for future meetings. CCP would come to the meeting with several options drafted.
2. Discuss and agree to a very simple set of working ground rules, again captured on one page, for the next three meetings including a mechanism for making a group “decision” should that be needed. CCP would come to the meeting with some draft ground rules ready for discussion.
3. If available from the technical consultants, the group can go away with a short summary laying out the various options for organizational structure and funding (homework). This summary should include the pros and cons of each option. If this is not available, we would provide it before the next

meeting. If this material is not available, then we may assign people to write down their "interests" and bring that to the second workshop.

**Workshop 2 (Criteria and Options):** The second meeting would focus on our overall objectives and the criteria that the stakeholders believe a successful entity or organization needs to have. We would not immediately talk about the actual options, but instead list out the criteria that each participant wants an entity to have, then discuss those that appear to be in common and those that appear to be in conflict or competition. We may do a priority setting exercise if needed to reduce the total number of criteria to a manageable number. We may need to have a "warm up" discussion of stakeholders' issues and interests prior to generating criteria, but hopefully the criteria discussion will elicit the issues as well.

At the second workshop we should also have a short presentation from the technical consultants about various organizational options and funding options. Stakeholders would then ask questions, but we would not enter into a lot of dialogue. If the technical summary reports are not handed out at the first meeting, they would be at this one.

**Workshop 3 (Narrowing Options):** We would devote this meeting to applying the criteria to the various organizational options and funding sources. We recommend that either the technical consultants or CCP come to the meeting with a matrix or table already filled out noting how well each option performs for each of the criteria.

We will spend the rest of the meeting seeing if we can narrow down the options and focus on one or two that seem the most feasible and desirable. We suspect that a variety of funding sources will be recommended. It is also possible, that several organizational options might be recommended or a hybrid solution. We would conclude workshop 3 knowing what the most likely option(s) appears to be. We would also catalogue any outstanding questions or concerns that may still linger regarding that option.

**Workshop 4 (Final Option Selection):** It is possible that we can conclude after workshop 3, but we believe it is wise at this stage to assume there will need to be one more. The fourth workshop will be spent answering any residual questions, adding detail to the chosen option(s) and discussing next steps, implementation timing, strategies for getting the Waterfront Advisory Committee and decision-makers on board, etc.

After the final workshop, CCP or the technical consultants will write up a summary report of the findings of the group including any technical data and analysis that has been examined.

## Key Stakeholders

The group needs to be large enough to include all of the relevant stakeholders, yet of a manageable size to allow for adequate education, interaction, relationship building and decision-making. We recommend the following people or organizations be invited to participate as members of the stakeholders group. (Please note that several of these individuals were interviewed by project staff rather than by the facilitators, and some questions remain about who the representatives should be in some cases.)

Potential Stakeholder Group Composition:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Person</b>
Business Improvement District	Capitol Station District	Connie Miottel
Business Improvement District	Downtown Partnership	Michael Ault
Business Improvement District	Old Sacramento Mgmt. District	Steve Huffman
Land Owner	Fat Family	Lina Fat
Land Owner/Developer	Fulcrum	Mark Freidman
Land Owner/Developer	Raley's	TBD
Land Owner/Developer	RAMCO	Dan Ramos
Land Owner/Developer	Unger Family	Lynn Yackzan
Land Owner/Developer	Union Pacific/Millennia	TBD
Local/regional Government	American River Flood Control District	Paul Devereux
Local/regional Government	City of Sac – Utilities	Dave Brent
Local/regional Government	City of Sac-Econ Development	Laura Sainz/Wendy Saunders
Local/regional Government	City of Sac-Parks & Recreation	Bob Overstreet
Local/regional Government	City of West Sacramento – Redevelopment Authority	Mike Luken, Les Bowman
Local/regional Government	Reclamation District 900	Ken Ruzich
Local/regional Government	Regional Transit	Beverly Scott
Local/regional Government	SACOG	TBD
Local/regional Government	Sacramento County	Ron Suter
Local/regional Government	SAFCA	Tim Washburn
Local/regional Government	Yolo County	Linda Fiack
NGO	American Institute of Architects	Nick Docus
NGO	Crocker Art Museum	Lyle Jones
NGO	Friends of Sacramento River Greenway	Dan Gorfain/Tom Higgins

<b>Category</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Person</b>
NGO	Sac Convention and Visitors Bureau	Steve Hammond
NGO	Sacramento Metro Chamber	David Butler
NGO	Sierra Club	Barry Wasserman or Paul Menard
NGO	West Sacramento Chamber	Kay Ferrier
State Government	Caltrans	Jody Jones
State Government	General Services	John Brooks/Anne Cavanagh
State Government	State Lands Commission	Dwight Sanders
State Government	State Parks Department	Ruth Coleman
State Government	State Parks in the Capitol area including the Railroad Museum	Cathy Taylor

We further recommend that meeting notes and the final report be circulated to the Waterfront Advisory Committee and all elected officials who must take part in this venture and other relevant stakeholders "outside the table" whose cooperation is required for implementation of the program. Individual briefings may also be necessary over the course of the process.

## ATTACHMENT 2

**Sacramento Riverfront Entity Scope of Work Summary****Scopes of Work**

Four firms have been identified to assist the riverfront stakeholder group in determining the feasibility for creation of a riverfront management/financing entity: (1) the Center for Collaborative Policy; (2) Pacific Municipal Consultants; (3) Resources Law Group; and (4) the Waterfront Center.

<u>Firm</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Budget</u>
Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder assessment and participation</li> <li>• Initial stakeholder interviews</li> <li>• Stakeholder meeting facilitation</li> </ul>	\$ 24,720	City of Sacramento
Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanded list of financial tools; comparative matrix of funding mechanisms</li> <li>• Financial modeling of tools selected by stakeholder group</li> <li>• Programming (future if needed)</li> </ul>	\$ 28,180	City of West Sacramento <i>(via reimbursement agreement with City of Sacramento)</i>
Resources Law Group (RLG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative organizational models</li> <li>• Legal aspects of funding mechanisms</li> <li>• State agency participation and coordination</li> </ul>	\$ 20,000	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)
Waterfront Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of nationally-recognized waterfront entities at Kick-Off event</li> </ul>	\$ 10,000	City of West Sacramento

**Stakeholders**

Riverfront champions invited to participate in this endeavor include:

## Key Property Owners

- Fat Family (Lina Fat)

- JML Enterprises (Embassy Suites Hotel)
- Fulcrum Capital (Mark Friedman)
- Raley's Corporation
- Ramco Enterprises, Inc. (Dan Ramos)
- Unger Family

#### Key Organizations

- Capitol Station District
- Downtown Partnership
- Old Sacramento Foundation
- Sacramento County
- Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
- SAFCA
- State Lands Commission
- West Sacramento Chamber of Commerce
- Yolo County

#### Other Interested Organizations

- American Institute of Architects, Sacramento Valley Chapter
- Crocker Art Museum
- Friends of Sacramento River Greenway
- Gold Rush Park Team
- Indian Museum
- Railroad Museum
- Sacramento Area Bicycle Association
- Sierra Club
- State of California Department of General Services
- State of California Department of Parks and Recreation
- State of California Department of Water Resources
- Urban Land Institute
- Other stakeholders to be determined

### **Guiding Principles for the Creation of a Riverfront Entity**

Although specific goals, objectives and performance milestones will be developed by the stakeholder team, the success of this scoping effort will be dependent upon a few basic principles:

- Agreement on needs and objectives
- Sustained stakeholder support from project initiation through implementation
- Private sector participation and support for riverfront
- Agreement on a feasible funding and governance mechanism

## ATTACHMENT 3

Status of Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan Projects**Capital Projects:**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
Tower Bridge pedestrian widening	Completing EIR, 2006 construction
I street bridge feasibility study	Not started; added to federal priority list
Riparian enhancements	Concept completed, Miller Park tree plantings proceeding
State Central Plant partnership agreement	Monitoring State progress
Bike trail from R Street to Miller Park	Construction started, 2005 completion
R Street pedestrian over crossing	ROW an issue; time extension needed
North of I Street pedestrian bike separation (Design)	Not started
West Sacramento riverfront trails and promenade	RFP issued 3/2005
E Street fishing pier	Joint RFP (both cities) planned for 2005
Tower Bridge Gateway/Garden Street	Env. cert. 4/2005, final 5/2005
Jibboom Street Park	Master Plan completed, moving forward on the old power building
Docks Area initial assessment	Completed
Bridging I-5	Work in progress
Tower Bridge/Raley field interim pedestrian path	Completed
Joe's Crab Sack/Tower Bridge boardwalk connection	Completed

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
Circle of Lights to R Street promenade	Not started
Street plantings in West Sacramento	Completed
East Riverfront property levee relocation	On hold
Railyards Gateway Park concept	Not started, property transfer
South Barge renovation	Project proceeding pending operator negotiations
L Street barge replacement	New barge in 2005
Broderick boat ramp extension	Pending funding from State
Fishing pier/boat dock	Joint RFP (both cities) issued 4/2005
Old Sacramento boardwalk lighting	Construction drawings, but project on hold by Old Sacramento stakeholders

***Planning & Regulatory Projects:***

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
Historic structures and natural resources survey	Included in West Sacramento promenade; pending City of Sacramento General Plan update
Design guidelines for public riverfront improvements	Included in West Sacramento promenade; City of Sacramento on hold
Develop public art and interpretive program	Included in West Sacramento promenade; City of Sacramento on hold
West Sacramento parking Study	Demand analysis started
Downtown Sacramento Strategic Parking Study	Completion 10/05
General Plan and Special Plan Amendments	Part of City GP Update, West Sac not started

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
Specific Pan/EIR/Financing Plan for the Docks Area	Completion by summer 2006
Sacramento River Corridor River Forum Guidelines	Completion by spring 2005
American Heritage River Initiative	Assessing feasibility
Pursue Federal Permit Streaming Area	Not started

***Maintenance Projects:***

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
Identify Current Maintenance Responsibilities	Work underway
Identify maintenance Levels	Assessment nearing completion
Develop Schedule /Cost Estimates 0-5 years	Work Underway
Identify Maintenance responsibilities	Work Underway

***Public Safety Projects:***

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
Determine Area of Consolidation Service	Not started
Public Safety Boat Dock Feasibility	Not started
Joint City Fire Boat Feasibility	Not started
Riverfront Helipad Location Feasibility	Not started

***Marketing Projects:***

<b><u>Project</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
Develop A Marketing Plan	In process
Enhance Joint City Riverfront web Site	Short term website created
Revise/Reprint Riverfront Poster/Brochures	Not started
Develop Joint Riverfront events	Working on a major event and other activities

***Resource Development Team:***

<b><u>Project</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
Application for SACOG Community Design Funding	Completed
Proposition 50 River Parkways Grant Application	Both cities and SAFCA collaborating on strategies for applications – applications due October 18, 2005
Assist with Regional Funding Options	Ongoing
Apply for Boating and Waterways/Conservation Grants	Pending Project Design
I Street Bridge-Seek Federal Funding	Not started

**ATTACHMENT 4**

**Riverfront Entity Feasibility Project Cost Share Plan**

<b>Consultant</b>	<b>City of Sacramento</b>	<b>City of West Sacramento</b>	<b>SAFCA</b>	
Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)	\$24,720			
Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC)	\$28,180			
Waterfront Center (kick-off event)		\$10,000		
Total before COWS reimbursement	\$52,900	\$10,000		
COWS reimburse COS	-\$21,450	\$21,450		
Resources Law Group (RLG)			\$20,000	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$31,450</b>	<b>\$31,450</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$82,900</b>

**RESOLUTION NO. 2005-XXXX**

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

August 23, 2005

**APPROVING THE PROPOSED GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE FEASIBILITY  
PROCESS FOR A PROPOSED REGIONAL RIVERFRONT ENTITY**

**BACKGROUND**

- A. Since the City Councils of West Sacramento and Sacramento accepted the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan in July of 2003, both cities and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), in conjunction with the Counties of Yolo and Sacramento, have worked together to develop a process to identify and manage riverfront project implementation.
- B. A fundamental element of the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan implementation program is the establishment and/or redefinition of a regional management and financing entity to support riverfront improvement efforts and to provide a more stable funding source for capital, maintenance, and operational expenses.
- C. Staff from the two cities and SAFCA have developed a process for stakeholder review of potential entity models. A cabinet of key stakeholders will be presented with a statement of the challenge and potential approaches. The stakeholder group will assemble a strategic mission, develop objectives, and refine a critical path for the development of an effective streamlined riverfront organization.

**BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL  
RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

- Section 1. The proposed governance and finance feasibility process for a proposed regional riverfront entity is approved.

**Table of Contents:**

Exhibit A: Governance and finance feasibility process for a proposed regional riverfront entity – 1 page

## Exhibit A

### Governance and finance feasibility process for a proposed regional riverfront entity

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Waterfront Advisory<br>Committee meeting               | Presentation and acceptance of process<br><i>* Took place June 29, 2005</i>   |
| 2. | City Council Meeting                                   | Approval of process and direction to staff<br><i>* Process approved by City of West Sacramento<br/>City Council on July 20, 2005</i>  |
| 3. | Kick-off Event   | Formally begin the "brainstorming" process.<br>Mayors and Council members (WAC) invited to<br>deliver opening remarks. Representatives of<br>nationally recognized riverfront entities will<br>present examples of success.<br><i>* Scheduled for September 8, 2005</i> |
| 4. | Workshop 1<br><b><i>Begin the<br/>Discussions</i></b>  | Discuss principles and objectives. Review findings<br>from stakeholder interviews and information on<br>governing structures and funding options. Identify<br>key issues.   |
| 5. | Workshop 2<br><b><i>Discuss Options</i></b>            | Review list of principles and objectives, in-depth<br>discussion of governance and funding options.<br>This meeting will focus on delimiting options and<br>identifying information needed to make a final<br>recommendation.   |
| 6. | Workshop 3<br><b><i>Develop<br/>Recommendation</i></b> | Review reports from stakeholders, consulting<br>firms, and staff and develop a consensus<br>recommendation.   |
| 7. | Workshop 4   | If needed   |
| 8. | Parks and Recreation<br>Commission                     | Present recommendation  |
| 9. | City Council Meetings                                  | Present recommendation to respective Councils.  |