



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

## RMP update item 16-0032, March 22

1 message

Julia McIver <mciverandcompany@gmail.com>

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Mar 21, 2016 at 8:47 AM

**LATE DISTRIBUTION**

**DATE**

3/21/16

BOS 3/22/16

Julia McIver

Lotus, California 95651

March 20, 2016

Supervisor Mikulaco, Chair  
Supervisors Frentzen, Veerkamp, Novasel, and Ranalli

Regarding: River Management Plan update item 16-0032 on March 22 agenda,

Dear El Dorado County Supervisors:

I'm writing to oppose Item 2, 16-0032, on the consent calendar for your March 22 meeting. The current draft plan fails to supply sufficient financial data and analysis to make such meetings productive, nor, in fact, to make it possible for you to make good decisions on this plan. Further, the Board's direction was for *staff* to meet with public agencies to explore ways to improve river management, not for a consultant to do so.

Spending \$25,000 of scarce River Trust Funds on further consultant services is premature, at minimum. The current draft version of the Plan update lacks very important information that is supposed to be there, as it is specifically described in the consultant's scope of work for their current contract. Task 1.2 of the scope calls for, among other things:

- a fiscal analysis of the operation and management of the River Trust Fund;
- an examination of possible additional new revenue streams, specifically including the "SMUD fund"; and
- identification of potential strategies to streamline and minimize the costs of operating the Plan.

The draft shows an appalling lack of financial analysis. Text in the draft says "lack of cost estimates for full implementation of the RMP make actual funding needs unclear". If there aren't cost estimates, how can those numbers be shown in Exhibit 1? The basis and assumptions for the "Full Program Level - estimated funding requirements from Trust" in Exhibit 1 of the draft plan should be detailed and made explicit. Subsequent analysis should be presented showing which Plan expenses are required (for example, water quality testing) and which are discretionary. A management plan should lay out current conditions, County goals, required actions, desired activities, funding sources and funding opportunities, and map out strategies for getting there. This draft makes a number of assertions about how the RMP has failed due to lack of funding, but completely fails to provide the analysis necessary to improve future decisions.

The Board's last discussion - that led to this item being proposed - focused heavily on the assertions made in the current draft that costs have risen while income has not kept pace. True or not, this draft fails utterly to make the case. The County's current scope of work for this project has not been fulfilled yet, and until a strong and detailed fiscal analysis is provided, the plan update process cannot move forward.

I say this for three reasons: 1) the County and the public should get what they're paying for; 2) it's impossible to make good, informed decisions about managing the river without this information; and 3) there's no point meeting with other public agencies about management

without factual financial data. The first question they'll ask is - how much do these activities cost?

Further, such meetings *are* a staff function, and there's no need for consultant participation until and unless other public agencies are willing to become more involved. It would be inappropriate for the County to relegate negotiating river management responsibilities to a consultant.

I have worked for public land management agencies at both the local and state level, created a county parks department, and created and implemented a parks plan. I moved to El Dorado County for the river. The South Fork American is both an economic engine for the County, and an environmental and recreational resource of enormous value. Decisions about its management must be made with care and based on facts. This draft doesn't have the ones you need.

Please do not approve this item. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Julia McIver



**BOS Itr RMP 3.22.16.pages**  
148K



## Julia McIver

March 20, 2016

Supervisor Mikulaco, Chair  
Supervisors Frentzen, Veerkamp, Novasel, and Ranalli

Regarding: River Management Plan update item 16-0032 on March 22 agenda,

Dear El Dorado County Supervisors:

I'm writing to oppose Item 2, 16-0032, on the consent calendar for your March 22 meeting. The current draft plan fails to supply sufficient financial data and analysis to make such meetings productive, nor, in fact, to make it possible for you to make good decisions on this plan. Further, the Board's direction was for *staff* to meet with public agencies to explore ways to improve river management, not for a consultant to do so.

Spending \$25,000 of scarce River Trust Funds on further consultant services is premature, at minimum. The current draft version of the Plan update lacks very important information that is supposed to be there, as it is specifically described in the consultant's scope of work for their current contract. Task 1.2 of the scope calls for, among other things:

- a fiscal analysis of the operation and management of the River Trust Fund;
- an examination of possible additional new revenue streams, specifically including the "SMUD fund"; and
- identification of potential strategies to streamline and minimize the costs of operating the Plan.

The draft shows an appalling lack of financial analysis. Text in the draft says "lack of cost estimates for full implementation of the RMP make actual funding needs unclear". If there aren't cost estimates, how can those numbers be shown in Exhibit 1? The basis and assumptions for the "Full Program Level - estimated funding requirements from Trust" in Exhibit 1 of the draft plan should be detailed and made explicit. Subsequent analysis should be presented showing

**6105 Clark Mountain Road  
Lotus, California 95651**

which Plan expenses are required (for example, water quality testing) and which are discretionary. A management plan should lay out current conditions, County goals, required actions, desired activities, funding sources and funding opportunities, and map out strategies for getting there. This draft makes a number of assertions about how the RMP has failed due to lack of funding, but completely fails to provide the analysis necessary to improve future decisions.

The Board's last discussion - that led to this item being proposed - focused heavily on the assertions made in the current draft that costs have risen while income has not kept pace. True or not, this draft fails utterly to make the case. The County's current scope of work for this project has not been fulfilled yet, and

until a strong and detailed fiscal analysis is provided, the plan update process cannot move forward.

I say this for three reasons: 1) the County and the public should get what they're paying for; 2) it's impossible to make good, informed decisions about managing the river without this information; and 3) there's no point meeting with other public agencies about management without factual financial data. The first question they'll ask is - how much do these activities cost?

Further, such meetings *are* a staff function, and there's no need for consultant participation until and unless other public agencies are willing to become more involved. It would be inappropriate for the County to relegate negotiating river management responsibilities to a consultant.

I have worked for public land management agencies at both the local and state level, created a county parks department, and created and implemented a parks plan. I moved to El Dorado County for the river. The South Fork American is both an economic engine for the County, and an environmental and recreational resource of enormous value. Decisions about its management must be made with care and based on facts. This draft doesn't have the ones you need.

Please do not approve this item. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Julia McIver



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: Consent item 16-0032**

1 message

---

**The BOSTHREE** <bostthree@edcgov.us>  
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 21, 2016 at 10:21 AM

**Kathy Witherow**Assistant to Supervisor Brian K. Veerkamp  
District Three - El Dorado County  
530.621.5652

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nathan Rangel** <nate@raftcalifornia.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 21, 2016 at 10:15 AM

Subject: Consent item 16-0032

To: bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bostthree@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Dear Chairman Mikulaco and Members of the Board:

I am writing you to request removal of Item # 16-0032 from your consent calendar for a discussion prior to any action you may take. I believe that your RMAC will have some suggestions regarding that item at our meeting this evening and I'd like to share that input with you tomorrow morning.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Nate Rangel

Chairman

River Management Advisory Committee



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 3/21/16

#2

Public Comment for 03/22/2016 Board of Supervisors meeting

BOS 3/22/16

Item 16-0032:

“Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division recommending the Board approve and authorize the Chair to sign a Budget Transfer increasing the use of fund balance and operating transfers out by \$25,000 in the River Trust Fund and increasing operating transfers in and professional services by \$25,000 in the River operating budget to fund a consultant to meet with Bureau of Land Management and California Department of Parks and Recreation regarding the County's management of whitewater recreation on the South Fork of the American River, per the Board's direction of February 23, 2016. (4/5 vote required)”

Contrary to what is stated in the consent item, there was no direction from the Board of Supervisors on 2/23/2016 to hire the same consultant that has submitted a River Management Plan Update for an additional \$25,000 to participate in cost saving discussions with State Parks or BLM. Rather, the BOS directed staff to conduct this meeting, with the County Economic Development Manager. I agree with Julia McIver's comments on this item and opposition to it.

This consultant has not proven to be cost effective. The last time this consultant was hired to update the RMP, his fees totaled over \$500K. Today neither the county nor the RMT can afford a six figure bill for a RMP update.

After two years of consulting work, the draft RMP update failed to include the core known and needed element updates that had been discussed at RMAC meetings and deferred for this update process:

- a. Institutional permit, where the consultant footnoted the following:
  - Element 4.2 (new numbering) “This analysis suggests that the County consider either invoking new Institutional Group management methods, as identified by the RMAC (Proposal Draft Institutional Permit Update to the River Management Plan, El Dorado County River Management Advisory Committee, March 2013), or transition Institutional Groups into the Commercial Outfitter management protocols (see RMP Section 6.2).” The consultant failed to deliver a proposed institutional permit element, even though the RMAC had already completed a proposed draft, and the River Supervisor had submitted a proposal to transition institutional users to commercial permits.
- b. User Day Transfer, where the consultant commented as follows:
  - Element 6.2.1.3.6: “The County should either modify the RMP to create a marketplace for the temporary transfer of user days between outfitters or enforce current prohibition on these practices. The practice of the River Manager allowing this clear violation of the existing RMP management framework undermines its implementation.”

The consultant failed to comprehend the difference between outfitter subcontracting and user day transfers, but more importantly, failed to deliver a proposed element for user day transfers. In the RMAC meeting on August 14, 2014, time 2:14, Parks Manager Vicki Sanders promised RMAC that the RMP update would include an analysis of user day transfer options for commercial outfitters, which was not fulfilled.

- c. Pirate boaters, where the consultant commented as follows:
- Element 8.1: "Revision of the existing Pirate Boater Ordinance should be coordinated by County Counsel, the District Attorney's office and the Sheriff's Department should be encouraged to identify a more effective strategy for addressing this issue."

The consultant failed to deliver a proposed element to address currently unenforceable pirate boater violations (which were noted in a 2011 Sheriff's report).

Given the drain on trust balances and the known RMP update requirements that remain unaddressed, spending more trust funds on this consultant cannot be justified.

Instead of asking the BOS to approve more consultant spending, I would instead suggest that the BOS approve an RMAC request that it proceed with an RMP update by tapping volunteer resources in an ad-hoc committee. I would be willing to volunteer on the ad hoc committee provided meetings can be held in the Lotus Coloma valley.

Karen Mulvany



#2



LATE DISTRIBUTION

EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

DATE 3/21/16

Fwd: Comments: River management plan 2016

BOS 3/22/16

1 message

Jim Mitrison - El Dorado County &lt;jim.mitrison@edcgov.us&gt;

Mon, Mar 21, 2016 at 3:10 PM

To: EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

Please add to public comment for Item 2 on tomorrows agenda. Thank you.

Jim Mitrison  
 Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
 County of El Dorado  
 Ph. 530.621.5390 Main  
 Ph. 530.621.5592 Direct  
 Email jim.mitrison@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Joe and Margrit Petrofsky** <JoeandMargrit@earthlink.net>

Date: Mon, Mar 21, 2016 at 2:54 PM

Subject: Comments: River management plan 2016

To: noah.triplett@edcgov.us, jim.mitrison@edcgov.us

To Noah and the BOS of EDC:

My name is Margrit Petrofsky. I am a resident of Lotus, a riverfront land owner, and have been a passionate whitewater boater and advocate since my first trip on the South Fork American River back in in 1991.

I attended the special meeting last month in Coloma to hear from the consultant about the updated River management plan. By far, the most distressing thing I learned of was the notion that the management of the river would be handed over to the BLM, thereby dismantling the River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC), our county committee with representation from all the diverse interested parties.

This recommendation tells me that the consultant does not know the history of why the RMAC was formed, nor did he "consult" with anyone in Coloma, Lotus or the greater river community. For, if he did, he would know why RMAC was formed (post People ex rel. Younger v. County of El Dorado, 1979).

Since that time, RMAC has been the voice and the advocates of the greater river community: River runners (both commercial outfitters and private boaters), visitors, land owners, local businesses, etc.. To dissolve this entity would be to take away the voices and opinions of this diverse population. Since there are so many points of view to consider when managing the river, to dissolve RMAC is to risk going back to a time of all voices not being heard, and all the attendant problems that scenario can bring. And, for the record, I don't trust the powers that be-BOS, Parks & Rec., and BLM to always act in the best interest of the river community.



With RMAC, I am informed in a timely manner of issues affecting the river and surrounding environment; I can go to them with any problems I am having (or to tell them when problems have been resolved). If I don't understand an issue, they explain it so I do understand. These things are done in a timely manner, without delay. I get no "thank you for your call" & no real response; nor do I get a form letter stating the same. They keep the peace of this very special place I call home. This was also true before I became a full-time resident in 2006.

In short, I am strongly against this recommendation of dissolving the RMAC. I hope you actually hear, as I did at the recent meeting in Coloma, that the community is strongly against this, too.

And, I think it would be imprudent and downright wasteful to pay the consultant an additional \$25k to talk to BLM & other entities. Isn't that the job of the parks & rec dept.? Isn't there a better use for scarce funds that would provide more benefit to the river community?

Very Sincerely Yours,

Margrit Petrofsky

P.S. One last point: I think it was a hostile move to take the RMAC meetings out of Coloma, where more of the river community could attend, and move it to the BOS chambers in Placerville. I strongly advocate moving it back to Coloma, where it belongs./MP