

Comments on RMAC Agenda Feb 22, 2016

Discussion Item 2 : 16-0158

I have the following questions directed to the Planning Commission regarding permit transfers:

Does the Planning Commission consider the impacts that the transfer of user days has on the river and the environment when transfers of this type are approved by making sure that the land use capacities associated with the permit can support the increase?

In the case of OARS you have a company with a current weekend user day number of 193 jumping up to 321 user days. Is the infrastructure at OARS compatible with this large an increase?

It would be helpful to inform decisions if the current capacity numbers of the associated SUP's of where Outfitters camp, put in, lunch, and take out were included in these proposed transfers so a real determination about the impact to the river and the environment can be studied.

It is also a bit presumptuous to assume that there will be no change to the river use numbers. If Company A, who does not fill it's user day capacities on a regular basis sells to Company B who is able to fill the user days each weekend there is a definite impact change from status quo. It would be helpful to track use patterns in terms of user day numbers before trades and sales of this type are approved when a Negative Declaration is used for the CEQA requirement like it is in these cases.

Discussion Item 5: 16-0161

I believe it premature for RMAC to comment on the suggested changes to the RMP given that the report was only made public on Feb 10, 2016. There are 13 documents included in the material and the process is being rushed to the point of potentially overlooking items that should be considered to make informed comments. I request that the comments by RMAC be considered at the March meeting and forwarded to the Planning Commission at that time. That is in line with the March 18, 2016 deadline given the general public to comment.

Discussion Item 6: 16-0160

I would like it noted that there was not unanimous agreement or a vote taken among all of the members of the AD HOC committee for the items included for consideration, but that the items were brought to the table for consideration by some of the members present.

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