



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Comments on Consent Calendar item 2-16-0032

1 message

Jim Mitrisin - El Dorado County <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Fri, Mar 18, 2016 at 10:59 AM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Please add the email and attachment as public comment for Item 2 (16-0032) on March 22.
Thank you.

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

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

From: **hilde schweitzer** <hilde@amriver.us>

Date: 2016-03-18 9:08 GMT-07:00

Subject: Comments on Consent Calendar item 2-16-0032

To: Jim Mitrisin - El Dorado County <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Please add to the Supervisors packet for the 3-22-2016 meeting
Thank you,
hilde schweitzer
hilde@amriver.us

 **Untitled.docx**
484K

Board of Supervisors meeting 3-22-2016
Re: Consent Calendar item #2-16-0032
Comments by Hilde Schweitzer

At the 2-23-2016 Board meeting a motion was made to:

Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division recommending the Board:

- 1) Receive a presentation on the update to the River Management Plan and process;
- 2) Direct staff to explore the opportunity with the Bureau of Land Management and California Department of Parks and Recreation of the potential feasibility and interest for input for more efficient and beneficial management of whitewater recreation on the South Fork by removing redundancies and reducing fees which may result in the County not needing to continue with its past level of management of whitewater recreation on the South Fork of the American River; and
- 3) Direct staff to return to the Board with a report on the discussions and recommendations from those meetings.

FUNDING: N/A

The motion states that “staff”, meaning El Dorado County staff, is authorized to meet with these organizations to discuss options. Ms. Sanders indicated that she would be the one meeting with the two groups and the Board requested that the Economic Development Officer also attend. The funding clearly states “NA” which I take to mean that there is no direct cost associated with the motion aside from staff salary.

The attached budget transfer request document is also very confusing. The total on the top of the document shows \$100,000. What are the other \$75,000 in funds associate with? There is no written explanation attached to the request.

I am opposed to using the River Trust Fund to pay for the meeting with BLM and State Parks as it is clearly within the scope of staff duties and abilities and should be covered by their County salaries.

I regularly hear that there are not sufficient funds to implement all of the programs of the River Management Plan to fund current staff and

question why River Trust Fund monies are not managed better. To approved \$25,000 additional dollars to chat with BLM and State Parks about managing the river is a blatant waste of Trust money.

I would also request that the contract between the County and Steve Peterson for the Update to the River Management Plan be made public and published.

Questions I request the Board to consider regarding this contract are:

What is the consultant tasked to provide and what is the timeline for these services?

What is the total cost of the contract?

Who authorized the contract? Was it Board approved?

Have the goods and services agreed to in the contract been provided to the County?

Are there provisions for cost over-rides and increases to the scope of the contract and what triggers them?

Why are the interview comments and individuals that were interviewed by the Consultant not made available to the public in the Draft red-line edit of the RMP Update?

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the above,
Hilde Schweitzer