

Consultation Meeting Notes
Pursuant to SB18
between the City of Chico and
the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of the Chico Rancheria

Project: City of Chico General Plan Update 2030

Meeting Date: August 6, 2008

Attendees from the City of Chico:

Brendan Vieg, Principal Planner

Holly Keeler, Principal Planner

Bob Summerville, Senior Planner

Pam Johns, Project Manager, Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC)

John Nadolski, Archaeological Director (PMC)

Attendees from the Mechoopda Indian Tribe:

Arlene Ward, Cultural Coordinator

Mary Brentwood, Environmental Director

1. Pam Johns was introduced as the City's consultant Project Manager for the General Plan Update, and John Nadoloski was introduced as the City's consultant Cultural Director for the Cultural Resources/Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan Update.
2. Arlene recapped preconsultation meetings between the City and the Tribe, beginning with preconsultation for the Bidwell Park Master Management Plan (BPMMP).
3. All agreed that a printed agenda will be important for future consultation meetings.
4. Arlene believes that a separate Element of the General Plan (i.e., a Cultural Resources/Historic Preservation Element), will be helpful for future issues and set a tone for BMPs (Best Management Practices) or other policy documents that can filter down into other City departments.
5. Arlene noted that Bidwell Park serves a public need that must be balanced with tribal priorities. Modifications or impacts to some (Tribal) sites can be negotiated, unless burial exist which has much less flexibility. The removal of climbing implements from Big Man's Talking Rock represents the first successful consultation solution after meeting with Dennis Beardsley.
6. The recently approved MOU between the City and Tribe goes one step beyond SB18 standard public comment processes. An educational program for the public and City staff is important until a protection plan is in place, such as Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP), e.g., impacts to house pits at the 5-Mile Recreation Area during wildfire suppression about two years ago.
7. Arlene noted that hopefully the General Plan Update can set up a foundation for observing

- sacred sites, and that there should be an education component in the General Plan, how to make public aware.
8. Pam and Bob clarified that the GP can provide protection/education via policy and the GP diagram. It is important to distinguish what the GP can do vs. a CRMP which will provide greater detail of how to deal with such resources. The Element can also provide education on the history of Mechoopda Tribe. John added that interpretive signage can also serve as educational tools.
 9. Arlene suggested that Bidwell Park could be a National Register District for additional protection. Some tribal elders are not comfortable in public speaking, but offer great history on resources (i.e. Eileen Conway). Public outreach via CARD programs also suggested for kids. Native American values are in great accord with sustainability and the Verbena Fields project is an important educational opportunity. Education must be provided to all City staff including Park and Maintenance personnel. Archaeological expertise/education should be provided to all City staff. Even a single old tree can provide reference points to tribal elders (e.g., in the Rancheria street areas).
 10. Arlene suggested for education to provide a systematic “check list” for protection of sites. Current GP archaeo maps are not specific. Need greater analysis of sites, contextual analysis. Arlene is very cognizant of budgets for archaeo surveys , e.g. BPMMP update, CRMP, etc., but it is important to keep records of investigative work. Basic tribal knowledge is missing, need more involved info, not “boiler plate” narrative, need continuity between Native American and John Bidwell (post-Euro-contact), fill in the gaps between these eras.
 11. Construction personnel need to be educated and trained to identify artifacts.
 12. Pam: Identify specific objectives of GP, then Action Items, (such as public or construction education/outreach), then cost impacts for realistic programs. What are key issues to be addressed in the General Plan.
 13. Arlene: Creeks are major depictions of potential sites, does not want public education to replace consultation. Keep interactive communications.
 14. Pam: while a CRMP will address specifics, all users should be able to understand, but greater direction can be provided to the CRMP via the GP policy.
 15. Arlene: The Tribe can provide sensitivity training to City staff.
 16. John: “Site Stewardship” is a very important concept to be elaborated in the GP. Mary added that those values need to be translated to the public.

17. Arlene: the Tribe is very pro community partnership and understands that concessions may be necessary. Helps public to be proud of the Mechoopda heritage, along w/ the Tribe, and to overcome horrible incidents of the past.
18. Arlene is worried that project comments may be confidential, so no comments are made. Tribe should at the minimum comment that sensitive resources exist, need confidential comments, and review of maps.
19. Bob: Need to distinguish comment period vs. consultation. Mary and Arlene want to begin their comment period before a public notice is mailed. Tribe wishes much earlier comment period or consultation, because comments may require a Tribal Council position, which can take additional time. Need more detailed maps.
20. Bob: At this stage of the GP Update process, staff can assist you in explaining the three Growth Alternative maps, to identify constraints of archaeological sites that may redirect development areas. Arlene: Need overlay maps of significant resources to comment on Growth Alternatives, e.g., cultural plants are important, may create constraints. Staff will provide larger Growth Alternative maps to the Tribal office. Bob is asking for comments on the larger maps to help select a growth alternative.
22. Arlene: in many cases, all that the Tribe can know about a site or area are general topography characteristics, plant types and their general locations are of great concern. However, whether resources exist may yet to be known, even by the Tribe.
23. Much of the details that Arlene and Mary wish to see will be addressed in a CRMP, but the General Plan must set the tone for emphasis on procedure and policy, action, etc.
24. Pam: Draft language can be provided to the Tribe regarding policy, etc.
25. Pam clarified for Arlene that the highlights of today's meeting are good coordination of moving forward with issues, clarifying confusing issues, e.g., processes of public notices vs. consultation, meeting w/Bob to look at larger Alternative Maps, including archaeo sensitivity maps as constraints to the preferred Alternative.
25. Holly: we are identifying the shortcomings of current City processes, and need to identify how the GP can facilitate changes to City procedures.
26. Brendan: educational programs can occur outside of GP process for City construction staff, etc.
27. Arlene: how can GP improve procedures? Suggested to look at a "white paper" that was recently published and distributed at a conference in Redding that identified a good model to

fix CEQA shortcomings. (John is aware, and will provide a copy to staff.) Good examples also from City of Riverside, Ontario, and San Diego. (John can provide copies.) John also suggested to look at National Tribal Consultation Guidelines.

28. Arlene and Mary want the GP process to address the Tribal issues presented in writing at the Pre-Consultation on 1/25/08. Bob will provide additional copy to John.