

4-15-26

TO IDL <MIKE

SOME ITEMS I WISH TO MENTIONED AT THE HEARING LAST WEEK

1. HAS THERE BEEN A CASE IN THE STATE PERMITTING COMMUNITY DOCKS ON SINGLE FAMILY HOME LOTS WITH AS NARROW A GAP ON THE WATER AS WILL BE (IF ALLOWED) ON THE SPOKANE RIVER.
2. EVERYONE SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY FOR A SINGLE DOCK ON A SINGLE FAMILY HOME LOT.
3. WHY WAS THE SHERIFF'S POSITION CHANGED ON SUCH A SHORT NOTICE?
4. WITHOUT ADEQUATE WATER PATROLING ON THE RIVER (AND THERE IS NOT) BY THE SHERIFF'S DEPT., THERE WILL BE AN INCIDENT (ESPECIALLY ON WEEKENDS WHEN NON DOCK OWNERS CONVERGE ON THE WATER.
5. DENY THE APPLICATION & GRANT^A SINGLE DOCK PER LOT.
6. RULES ARE TO SET AS GUIDE LINES BUT COMMON SENSE MUST PREVAIL.

TOBY SHELDON JOB 691-7706 TNCADDEN FALLS @
4826 W. FOOTHILL DR. CDA 83814 YAHOO.COM

From: [John Preston](#)
To: [Navigable Waterways](#)
Subject: Rivers Edge community dock application
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 10:21:00 AM

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

From: John Preston, jjkp@earthlink.net
Date: April 15, 2026 at 0915 AM PDT
To: navigablewaterways@idl.idaho.gov
Subject: Rivers Edge community dock application

Re: Application L95S6193. Rivers Edge

We are year-round residents living on the river and have followed the Rivers Edge permit application process as well as other new/expansion dock applications on the river.

The Rivers Edge application does not offer reasonable provisions. It is in violation of both the spirit and legal definition of a community dock. It is also located in one of the most precarious spaces on the river given the narrow channel and multitude of pilings. Adding the level of boat, float and swim traffic the application presents heightened safety and risk levels for an already crowded and high traffic area.

We request the application as presented be declined. Hopefully the applicants can create another design that is more in line with legal and location realities.

John & Joyce Preston
208 E 1st Ave #1
Post Falls, ID 83854

From: [sheri scofield](#)
To: [Navigable Waterways](#)
Subject: Opposition to Olinger, Hamill, Vedadi, Dascalo hearing (OAH Case Number 26-320-05)
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 10:11:37 PM

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Madame Hearing Officer:

Please consider these points and do not grant the above-referenced permits as they have been submitted. They violate rules as well as show favoritism.

- **The Sheriff/Marine Deputy's safety warning letter was mysteriously withdrawn** by Sheriff Norris on the day of the hearing! So, although Norris submitted an *official safety warning in the River's Edge dock proposal* for a narrowed channel of 433' and 678' after construction (from 522' and 769'), apparently, he doesn't think this project with 301', 301', 354' and 364' to the piling obstructions across from each of the four lots, are not choke points? With the navigation regulations on distances from docks (and pilings?) and 50' separation between boats, will two boats be able to safely pass?? Why would the KCSO safety letter be withdrawn in a *narrower corridor*?
- ***Misappropriated definition of a Community Dock being approved.** IDAPA and the Lake Protection Act both define a Community Dock as "A STRUCTURE..." NOT 4 STRUCTURES as The Applicants have applied for. The IDL is knowingly misappropriating definitions and approving applications that consist of each lot having its own dock yet posing as a "community dock in order to be granted MORE DOCK FOOTAGE than the standard 700 sq ft for others! In this case, 4 SEPARATE STRUCTURES. IDL is not enforcing their own definitions correctly; one Concerned Citizen validated this point at the hearing because he had built a community dock for secondary houses, and IDL required ONE structure. This definition was also misapplied in the River's Edge project – with 5 separate dock structures – NOT "A STRUCTURE", yet it was approved. Is IDL applying their own rules properly?
- **Excessive Moorage Density.** This application proposes a density of **4 to 6 slips per residence/littoral owner**. By processing this application as a "Community Dock" and not according to individual private dock regulations, IDL is giving special treatment to certain homeowners and BYPASSING the "Public Benefit" tests required by IDAPA and LPA. Is IDL honoring their duty to weigh benefits v. detriments on the Spokane River? Are they honoring The Public Trust Doctrine? *This is important in a choke point* with docks extending 36', 40', 56' and 70'.
- **Navigational Safety and Oversight.** Idaho Code mandates the denial of any permit that "unduly interferes with navigation." This project is situated at a documented **navigational choke point**, however, no **Navigational Impact Study or Maximum Carrying Capacity study** or engineering report on sediment disturbance has been presented to justify this project. The scale of all these projects we have opposed, should at the very least trigger U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 oversight (regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into public waters!), since Mike Ahmer with IDL has generously suggested that the City of

Coeur d'Alene could remove all the logging pilings to make it a safer boating corridor. Yet, NONE of the departments (including IDEQ) have presented comments into the records – the sheriff's department has removed their opposition comment. Only citizens' opposition comments are present in the record. Maybe we should properly assess this corridor?

Submitted by Concerned Citizens protecting the Spokane River