Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public meeting yesterday on the proposed dock storage lease for Powderhorn Bay. It was quite informative and provide the following addition comments for the record.

1. Attached are the maps I shared at the meeting of possible alternative locations for dock storage on Lake CDA which would allow the same storage capacity as proposed for Powderhorn Bay – **but entirely adjacent to public property managed either by the State of the federal government.** I did not have the resources to do a comprehensive review of the entire lake, so there may be addition locations that would also qualify for this purpose. I also heard the concerns that the current Harrison Slough permitted storage area was too shallow, but urge that options to expand and adjust this area to deeper water be examined as an alternative as docks are routinely stored there in the winter already, indicating it can be used for this purpose, at least for some type of docks.

2. The Idaho Department of Lands should absolutely prioritize **not encumbering private land without the landowners permission**, when approving leases for this purpose. In fact, IDAPA 20.03.17 rules for granting leases is quite clear in IDAPA 20.03.17.025.01 that “… the Board will take no action in derogation of or seeking to interfere with the riparian or littoral rights of owners of upland property abutting or adjoining such lands.”

3. **Permitting new pilings further from shore into the middle of Powderhorn Bay will create hazards for boat traffic, impede normal boat navigation, and should be avoided.** We learned at the 7/28/21 public meeting the proposal includes locating new permanent pilings 80’ or more into the bay from the southerly end of the proposed storage area. The proposal also appears to included running marine grade ropes from the current shore pilings 75’ or more out into the bay from the existing pilings to secure the northern end of the proposed storage. These lines would traverse waters outside the proposed storage area and effectively prohibit, or certainly impede boat navigation, throughout the entire area. Currently stored dock “rafts” do drift about some in the bay even as they are secured directly to the pilings so it is hard to visualize how this would function effectively and the impact it may have on residents use of the bay to access their property by water. These provisions may have a significant public impact, and the IDL should provide a detailed plan for securing the proposed log storage for the record and public comment.

4. Last, I would underscore the comments submitted by the 25 residents of Powderhorn Bay which provide specific recommendations for enforceable lease provisions to ensure any permitted dock storage provides for good stewardship of the Powderhorn Bay waters, resident concerns are respected, and the lease terms are followed, particularly that there are **NO permitted uses of the leased area other than in the summer months, and that the duration of the winter use should be minimized.**

Again – my goal, which I believe is shared by many of the residents of Powderhorn Bay, is to find a proposal which accommodates the interests of HDB and the other lake residents that benefit from having their docks stored in the winter, but still respecting the interests of the Powderhorn Bay residents. We think that is possible if the IDL looks beyond the simple massive expansion of the
permitted lease in Powderhon Bay. I stand ready to help in whatever way that would be helpful.
Respectfully
Jim Riley
63532 S. Powderhorn Bay Road