

South Yuba River Planning

Public Meeting Summary

October 22, 2003 - 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

This meeting was videotaped by Chuck Scimeca for Foothill Community Access Television (FCAT, Channel 11) as a class project.

The evening began with a request to participants to meet their fellow participants and ask each other the question:

Question:

“If there was one thing you would change about the South Yuba River, what would it be?”

Answers:

- Manage the watershed, not the corridor
- Government agencies engage the public more.
- No smoking at key places (Bridgeport, Edwards Crossing, etc.) mid-summer due to fire hazards.
- Study the outflow from Malakoff pit and determine costs and benefits.
- All garbage packed in is packed out. (2)
- Management agencies need to involve public in making decisions.
- Mercury clean-up (2)
- More trash clean-up (3)
- More toilets (at trailheads) (2)
- “Wild and scenic” signs on the river (2)
- Remove poison oak on S. Yuba Trail from Hoyt’s Crossing
- Preserve protect river & canyon – respect and recognize responsibility to do this.
- Look at overuse and its destruction and reduction in quality
- Eliminate access and use on private property
- Keep visiting public to limited specific parks
- Get tourists out
- Do away with parks, public access, trails and return river to a more natural state
- No glass containers

- Identify stakeholders
- Permanent protection from dams on river
- People cleaning up after themselves
- On the planning process chart, no secondary box under scoping addresses
- private property rights
- private landowner concerns
- private property protection
- Where did that little box go?
- Respect for private property owners
- Signs and maps showing where on the river, where public has access, to let them know where these lands are and respect their wishes of not trespassing
- Preserve the river as it is
- Preserve the canyons
- No dams – but trash free
- Port-a-potty at Purdon Crossing
- Reopen the river to dogs on leashes.
- Less signs on State Parks land directing people’s behavior – seems like more and more signs are sprouting & the river is starting to feel like an urban park rather than a wild area.
- No dredging allowed.

The following answers related to water flows and anadromous fish introductions are listed below. **This process will not address these issues.**

- Regulate flows during spring melt.
- Reintroduce anadromous salmon, steelhead trout
- Guarantee of sufficient water flow to support sustainable fisheries.
- Access for salmon on/in the Yuba (2)
- Water flow up to 50 cfs to keep cleaner
- More water

Voting Procedures

In an attempt to clarify the voting procedures, the Management Team offered the following *Terms of Agreement*:

- 1st Vote – Preliminary; see how close to Agreement we are
- Discussion – What changes need to happen if we are to reach agreement?

- 2nd Vote – Taken if it looks like we will reach agreement
- Last resort – Agencies will make the decision

General Discussion

Suggestions heard:

- We go for total consensus.
- We accept a 2/3rds vote.

Vote #1: *Those who abstain from voting will not be counted in the total.*

- Result: Total consensus

Proposal 1: A minimum of 10 people are required to be present to vote at a meeting.

Results:

- 22 agree/can live with
- 23 no
- 45 voting

Not passed

Proposal #2: There is no minimum number of people required to be present at to vote at a meeting.

Results:

- 49 agree/can live with
- 7 no
- 56 voted

Passed

- What constitutes agreement?
- 80 % agreement is currently in place
- We voted to revisit this.

Proposal #4: 67% or 2/3rds of the votes will constitute agreement. If voted down, we stay with 80%

Results:

- 49 agree/can live with
- 18 no

- 67 voted

Not passed

The management team offered to continue the lively discussion following the 9:00 pm scheduled end of the meeting rather than continue it to the next meeting. A vote was taken. Agreement will be further discussed at the next meeting scheduled for November 5th.