



LATE DISTRIBUTION 03-21-16

Donna Mullens &lt;donna.mullens@edcgov.us&gt;

**Fwd: RMAC \$25,000 agenda item**

1 message

Noah Triplett <noah.triplett@edcgov.us>  
 To: Donna Mullens <donna.mullens@edcgov.us>  
 Cc: Vickie Sanders <vickie.sanders@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 21, 2016 at 9:17 AM

Does this need to be added to public comment? If so can you add it. Thanks.

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

From: "Julia McIver" <mciverandcompany@gmail.com>

Date: Mar 21, 2016 8:44 AM

Subject: RMAC \$25,000 agenda item

To: <Nate@raftcalifornia.com>, "Tim Lasko" <Tim.Lasko@intelligrated.com>, <bdeit@parks.ca.gov>, "Marilyn Tahl" <mtahl@lookative.com>, "Faith Cushman" <faithcushman@gmail.com>, "Keith Gershon"

<kg6625@yahoo.com>, <ecarter@parks.ca.gov>, <admandrsn@msn.com>

Cc: "Noah Triplett" <noah.triplett@edcgov.us>

Hey there RMAC,

I ask that the RMAC not approve this item, which is currently on the consent agenda for tonight's meeting.

I'm attaching and pasting in a letter to the BOS opposing the proposed appropriation of \$25,000 for consultant work on interagency meetings. I'm asking the BOS not to approve the item because such meetings are appropriately a staff function, and this draft is deficient in the financial and other analyses that the public, the RMAC, and the BOS needs in order to make good decisions, and until that work is done, the plan cannot move forward.

I asked County staff to send me both the contract under which the contractor is currently working, and the proposal for the \$25,000. You were sent the contract on Friday, and below is the proposal for the \$25,000. This information should have been included in the agenda item, and definitely should have been given to you before asking you to make a decision on funding it. Incidentally, in order for the County to adopt the RMP, it will need to analyze it pursuant to CEQA. This will likely entail another request for River Trust funds for consultant services.

#### "Scope of Services

Vendor will work with County staff members to meet with members of the public, the Bureau of Land Management, the California State Parks Department and other individuals and agencies (4 meetings), as directed by the Parks Division Manager. Vendor will assist the Parks Division Manager in reviewing the results of these coordination meetings and will assist in the presentation of meeting results to the County Board of Supervisors (2) meetings and the River Management Advisory Committee (2) meetings.

Vendor will assist the County in the preparation of a summary of BLM and California State Parks coordination."

March 20, 2016

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

Regarding: River Management Plan update April 16-0032 on RMA 17 agenda, **LATE DISTRIBUTION 03-21-16**

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