

## MEMORANDUM

To: DCR Stewardship Council  
From:  
Date:  
Re: RMP review and approval

---

Below are elements that could be considered in assessing the adequacy of RMPs:

***Process:***

If the development of RMPs should have a consistent, inclusive and robust public process, what does that entail and what is the role of the Council in insuring that process?

How will the process reach out to stakeholders who may not be likely participants in the formal public process? In other words how do we insure that all interests are protected as opposed to only those who are the largest and loudest?

Should inter- and intra- agency consultation be required and documented? For example with Natural Resources and Endangered Species Program?

***Content:***

RMPs should be based on a realistic assessment of the history and current conditions of the site, including previous plans, inventories, reports and other data. Compliance with general DCR standards/guidelines should be clear. Additional data needs (user surveys, resource inventories etc) should be scoped at the outset of the RMP. Does the Council have a role in guaranteeing that these content guidelines be met.

***Decision guidelines:***

- “Do no harm” – the agency charged with resource protection should not allow uses that damage important natural, scenic, cultural and/or historic resources (rare species, water quality, historic/archeological etc.). RMPs should also assess how to enhance resources (for example, management of invasive species; restoration of rare species habitat, etc.)
- Public safety – RMPs need to assess safety issues, including whether there is sufficient enforcement capacity. How can the Council measure questions of adequacy and sufficiency?
- Additional uses and new facilities – these must be based on a realistic assessment of management, infrastructure, maintenance and enforcement capability. How can the Council provide sufficient review on these questions?
- Management requirements – if a proposed use requires disproportional management resources – maintenance, enforcement, monitoring etc – should the RMP take that into account in determining the scope and scale of that use?
- Consistency – as a body of RMPs is developed, the agency should be looking to create consistency in applying guidelines to similar sets of facts/conditions. RMPs are a chance for the agency to ensure consistency of decision-making – or at least provide for deliberation in making exceptions or applying different standards to similar conditions.

How should determine that DCR has met these decision guidelines and how does it do so without inserting its own judgment into the RMP? Is it enough that the Council determines that the process of developing the RMP was fair and rigorous and its conclusions are reasonable based on the guidelines?