

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and Response
to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

This page intentionally left blank.

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and Response
to Comments on LCP Volume II

Feather River Watershed

This page intentionally left blank.

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
FEATHER RIVER WATERSHED			
Bucks Lake Planning Unit			
<p>[Condensed from letter] I am a second generation Bucks Lake resident. Between the first and now FOURTH generations, we are a family and a part of the Bucks Lake community dedicated to the preservation of our beautiful surroundings.</p> <p>With 85% of Bucks Lake’s shoreline available to the public, I must question why access via established neighborhoods is being considered. Our narrow roads are hard pressed to handle the minimal residential traffic, let alone the potential of additional due to public access. Other than the driveways allowed the individual residences, there is no parking area. The creation of additional parking would result in destroying the surrounding forests. The outcome would likely result in constant and expensive maintenance for the roads, congested parking and ecologically abusive use of the forest.</p> <p>Furthermore, creating pedestrian access through long-established cabin sites would impinge on the cabin-owner’s privacy as well as compromise the public’s safety. Use of the beaches has long been established, but the additional traffic due to further opening of the beaches to the public will require the development of picnic areas, sanitary facilities such as bathrooms and wash areas, as well as additional barbecue and fire-pits. As a result, the fire abatement costs as well as general maintenance costs will sky rocket. These costs are presently bourn by the lease-holders that conscientiously maintain their holdings. It is doubtful the public will be as dedicated as custodians as the generations of cabin-owners have shown themselves to be over the years. The end result of any additional development of the already congested south shore seems contrary to the Stewardship’s mission.</p> <p>Why not focus instead on your mission to preserve the historical, cultural and environmental aspects? – NOT more public access.</p> <p>A property designed Conservation Easement can be a benefit to all of us [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	Irene Amodei	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use or change the character of the lake area, nor are they expected to increase safety risks. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to enhance recreational access only at the existing Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. The site of the potential enhancement measure has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court). This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. No additional parking is recommended. Funding mechanisms will be developed during the disposition process. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process. The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>if it preserves what we value most while protecting us from incompatible uses.</p> <p>What would the increased liability be for current leaseholders and private land owners if the proposed increase in public activity emboldens them with prescriptive rights over other's property? Currently, PG&E requires us to be insured and have PG&E named, as well. Where will the additional liability lie?</p>			
<p>As lease-holders, we are a large source of revenue for PG&E. Likewise, as tax payers, we generate income for Plumas County. It seems to me that if Lakeshore Resort were to re-open, it would generate additional income to both PG&E and Plumas County.</p>	Irene Amodei	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.</p>
<p>Any thoughts for day use and additional youth facilities could be expanded on the south shore of Haskins Inlet and/or from Sundew to Sandy Point on the north side of the lake. This would provide greater access to the outdoors without residential distractions.</p> <p>Perhaps we should back up a moment and consider the need for additional day use. IS THERE A NEED? Would you please provide us with occupancy figures on the campsites? In my lifetime at Bucks Lake, I'm aware of 100% occupancy twice a year – on the fourth of July and over Labor Day. The rest of the summer, one finds many available campsites from one end of the lake to the other. Does two weekends a year seem like a good justification to expend large sums of money on unnecessary improvements? I think not.</p>	Irene Amodei	No	<p>Comment noted. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas. This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. Sundew and Sandy Point are U.S. Forest Service (USFS) sites, and therefore are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council; however, PG&E and USFS have collaborated on plans for recreation enhancements at those and other sites outside the planning unit. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. Existing and Projected Recreation Use Studies conducted by PG&E in 2001-2002 were reviewed during the development of the LCP. No campsite expansion has been recommended by the Stewardship Council.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Other concerns are in regards to the lack of leaseholder representation on the Council. Early on, we leaseholders were told that PG&E would represent us. However, at the Bucks Lake Homeowners meeting held in July, 2007, the PG&E representative made it very clear to us that they are neutrals.</p> <p>As we go forward, a leaseholder representative needs to be added to the Council.</p>	Irene Amodei	No	<p>The Stewardship Council Board of Directors are appointed by Organizations and Government Agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and also includes other public members, such as the representative of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The public Board Members are appointed by the CPUC to "...assure adequate and balanced representation of all ratepayer interests affected by the Land Conservation Commitment..."</p>
<p>Another concern is the need for a fuel reduction plan. Bucks Lake is highlighted as "severe" on the Cal Fire severity map. One of the missions of the Stewardship Council is to increase public access and recreation in the Bucks Lake area. Unlike the leaseholders and private land owners, the general public may not share our concerns of fire danger thereby further increasing the likelihood of a catastrophic forest fire.</p> <p>In conclusion, as the Council well knows, the Bucks Lake residents are indeed, your best stewards. Whether leased or private we have a vested interest in maintaining our ecosystem to preserve Bucks Lake for the generations that follow.</p>	Irene Amodei	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of reducing fuels at Bucks Lake. Therefore, a fuels management plan for the planning unit has been recommended.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Our family and friends are deeply concerned over the prospect of the Stewardship Council considering any changes in land management plans, real or implied, on PG&E properties at Bucks Lake, Plumas County. We have always been impressed with the abundance and availability of camping and picnic areas around the lake, which seem to be well maintained. They are easily accessible and give a variety of opportunities for the public to participate in the Sierra experience. In our experience over many years, these venues (which include the vast majority of lake front acreage) are seldom occupied at or near capacity. Four generations of family and friends have used our cabin, which was built by a senior family member in the 1930's. We have all tried to be good stewards of the land and have a deep attachment to the property. We have carefully maintained the structure, improved waste management, cleared brush and dead trees from the lot, and have done everything possible to keep the forest areas in as natural a state as was possible and minimize the impacts of our visits. Having recently reviewed your proposal for changes in the area, we see potential for degradation, not improvement. Pollution and safety at the lake shoreline are examples. We are also concerned over boat and dock liability, as well as the increased risk of forest fire danger caused by careless actions of picnic-er's and novice campers. It is also puzzling, when there are other camping and outdoor experiences available at established Bucks Lake campgrounds and Lower Bucks Lake, why it seems necessary to make changes to Lakeshore Resort. Lakeshore Resort has traditionally provided a source of competition to Bucks Lodge (the only other such venue in the area), keeping costs low and quality high for services to Bucks visitors. Based on our experience, the management plan is an expensive proposal which offers duplicative services (to those already underutilized) along with significant risks to the pristine forest and lake areas. The high costs of such a plan would be better applied to including deserving youth in a more diverse Sierra experience.</p>	Jean C. Baxter	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use or change the character of the lake area, nor are they expected to increase safety risks, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) of the planning unit. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to enhance recreational access only at the existing Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. The site of the potential enhancement measure has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court). This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. These modest enhancements are not intended to conflict with potential future use of the site by resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort. The Stewardship Council potential measures also include development of a fuels management plan to reduce fuel loading and fire hazard.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>I am still having many misgivings about the direction that the Stewardship Council is taking in the Bucks Lake Plan. I am a fifth generation resident of the Bucks Lake area and have served in leadership roles with the Bucks Lake Home Owners Association for over 40 years and have headed up such activities as the adoption of the Bucks Lake Wilderness. A year ago I sent you the results of our Association's recreation survey along with plans for a proposed day use area and amphitheater in Haskins Bay and a disability accessible trail from the Kiosk to Haskins campground. The trail designed to eventually become a part of a loop-trail around the lake. This does not seem to be a part of the proposed plans. The homeowners also worked with PG&E and the Forest Service to improve the access to the lake between West End Cove and the Indian Rocks. This project is now underway.</p>	Jim Rutherford	No	<p>Comment noted. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. The access improvement project at West End Cove is located on USFS land and therefore is not under the purview of the Stewardship Council.</p>
<p>If you studied the survey I sent you, it is quite apparent from the comments from the campers and homeowners that they are quite adamant about maintaining the quiet atmosphere and lack of over development that is characteristic of so many recreation areas and lakes. The Forest Service will not even allow overhead phone lines because it creates, as they call it, a "Wal-Mart" atmosphere.</p>	Jim Rutherford	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council potential measures for the Bucks Lake Planning Unit are not expected to change the character of the lake area, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) of the planning unit.</p>
<p>The term "Conservation Easement" is an ambiguous term. It can mean that property owners who have spent a lifetime enhancing their small residential lot will now be faced with losing what they came to Bucks Lake for, as they will now have a public right of way through their lot with the added noise, trash, and associated parking problems. There are already too many cars and trailers along the road between Bucks Lodge and Bucks Creek for safe walking or bicycling.</p>	Jim Rutherford	No	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process. The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>If the Stewardship Council feels that they must come in and make the changes you are proposing, then the council should be working much closer with the group that represents the residents of Bucks Lake. These people have carefully and successfully guarded the resources of Bucks Lake for over 70 years.</p>	<p>Jim Rutherford</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is committed to ensuring that local communities, neighboring property owners, and key stakeholders are given a meaningful opportunity to participate in the work of protecting and enhancing the Watershed Lands. The Stewardship Council has traveled extensively throughout the Watershed Lands to conduct community open houses, site visits, and dozens of meetings with stakeholder, agency, and Native American entities to ensure that the planning process is informed by discussions with the people and organizations who know the lands best. As part of the Stewardship Council's public outreach efforts, the Stewardship Council has met with the Bucks Lake Homeowners on several occasions. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Areas that could use enhancement might include the "4-H Camp", the aforementioned Haskins Day Use, or expanding the Sandy Point Day Use westward towards Sun Dew Camp. Also join forces with PG&E and the Forest Service to complete the parking and sanitation the Bucks Creek area. The current proposed plans only have limited parking and one SST at the three Bucks Creek trail heads. There needs to be a SST and bear proof trash container in the area along the road where the fishermen park and access the lake west of the bridge. If the trail headed towards Mill Creek was improved slightly, this could then open easy access to another lake area with a fine beach and swim area.</p>	<p>Jim Rutherford</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Bucks Lake Camp (former "4-H Camp") facilities are privately owned and therefore, the Stewardship Council cannot propose enhancements to these facilities. Sundew and Sandy Point are U.S. Forest Service (USFS) sites, and therefore are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council; however, PG&E and USFS have collaborated on plans for recreation enhancements at those and other sites outside the planning unit. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure for consideration of chemical toilet and refuse container to be installed along southeast Bucks Lake Road. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>A real word of caution should also come with these proposed developments in the Stewardship Council plans. As you introduce more people, you also increase the chance of wildfires and medical needs. Nowhere in the Stewardship Council plans do I see provisions to help support the Bucks Lake Fire Department. The very people who are being targeted for loss of their use of Bucks Lake are the ones who pay for our fire department. It is only through the dedicated hours of volunteer training and effort that we have a group of people who have responded to fire and emergency medical needs of all the people at Bucks Lake.</p>	<p>Jim Rutherford</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not developed any potential measures that would significantly increase recreation use. The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a fuels management plan for the planning unit. Funding mechanisms will be developed during the disposition process.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>If the Stewardship Council is genuinely interested in doing what their stated goals are, then they need to quit working behind closed doors and meet and work with the Bucks Lake representatives. If the decisions that are going to be made by parties who have little or no background of Bucks Lake and do not pay attention to those who have many years of experience and a vested interest the results will never be satisfactory. So far I have not seen much evidence that the Stewardship Council committee is truly listening to the people at Bucks Lake. When will there be a real work session where we can have some input and not be told "that is the way it is"! It is time for the Council to make its operations and planning process much less secretive. Why go to the Stewardship Council hearings when we come way with no real answers or only verbal promises?</p>	<p>Jim Rutherford</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has encouraged public participation and input and has taken the input received into consideration in revising the documents to date. Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs), consistent with the LCP, Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, will be developed through a multi-step process described generally in Volume I, which will include stakeholder participation. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process. It is anticipated that the Stewardship Council will host stakeholder meetings focused on the Bucks Lake Planning Unit, and as part of developing the Disposition Package.</p>
<p>No specifics given in any of the areas outlined. Too many things that still need to happen such as surveys, studies, development plans. As a cabin owner need to have the specifics not generalities. When these surveys, studies and development plans occur will the public have the chance to comment?</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements, overall objectives for management plans, as well as specifics of implementation, will be developed as part of the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Lakeshore Resort - This is one of the historical landmarks on the lake. I can't believe that PG&E wants to "do away with" such a landmark. PG&E has got to work with prospective owners to bring the site up to code and get a business re-established. I can't believe that PG&E is wanting to loose the potential income.</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.</p>
<p>Putting portable chemical toilet & Bear Proof refuse containers will only advertise to people that go into the Wilderness area is acceptable and encouraged. This would bring people into the area that are not conscious to the hazards that could happen such as fire. Who is going to monitor the area and clean-up after disrespectful people visiting?</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use or change the character of the lake area, nor are they expected to increase safety risks. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Potential fee title owners or easement holders will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>
<p>What type of communication will be sent advising cabin lessees that there is an opportunity is to become more involved with the recommendations and implementation of the project?</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process. The communications will include email messages sent to individuals in the Stewardship Council's contact database who have indicated that their address is in Shasta County or have indicated interest in the Bucks Lake Planning Unit. In addition, notices will be placed in local newspapers.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat - With added day use the "special status species" will over time probably not continue to be seen. The more people that are interrupting the environment will ultimately interrupt wildlife. What will be done to protect the "special status species"? How will this be enforced?</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use nor change the character of the lake area, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to develop a wildlife and habitat management plan for the planning unit. As stated in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, the plan would describe "goals and objectives for habitat and species, as well as measures to enhance and protect habitat for both plant and wildlife species."</p>
<p>Should have by now details of the "Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan" laying out all details including inspection measures of areas and what will happen if wildlife is interrupted? Will the public have the opportunity to comment on this plan?</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>
<p>Open Space - Anytime you develop an area such as trailhead parking and trail signage, you are only encouraging visitors that could potentially damage the existence that is there. Where are the details of the Conservation Easement plan? How will this be monitored and enforced.</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has not developed any potential measures to develop trailhead parking or signage. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process. The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. Monitoring plans will be developed for each parcel or set of parcels. Responsibilities for and methods of monitoring (including frequency and timing) will be established as part of the disposition process. Please see Volume I section 2.3.9 for more information on monitoring. The holder of a conservation easement is responsible for enforcement and monitoring of the terms of the easement unless otherwise assigned in the easement to a third party.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Outdoor Recreation - What are the recommended enhancements to recreational facilities in specifics. Will the public have an opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to enhance outdoor recreation at Bucks Lake including providing public day use area amenities and improved pedestrian shoreline access at the existing site at Lakeshore Resort and considering installation of a portable chemical toilet and bear-proof refuse container at an appropriate site near the south shore of Haskins Bay and south shore of Bucks Creek inlet. Please see Volume II and the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations for more information on the three potential outdoor recreation measures developed for the Bucks Lake Planning Unit. Specifics of these measures will likely be developed during the disposition process. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>
<p>Sustainable Forestry - why isn't the long-term vision for forest management included in this documentation. Will the public have the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council recommends a potential measure to develop a forest management plan to provide a long-term sustainable forestry-based vision for the forest resources at Bucks Lake. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Preservation of Historic Values - Lakeshore Resort is one of the historical values that is not listed within this area. It have been at the lake since the early 40's and would be such a waste to not re-open it to people that are not just in it for a buck!</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.</p>
<p>Who and what entity is going to patrol all of these changes? How will they be paid? The homeowners like most of the people that already visit Bucks Lake are very conscious of the hazards that can occur and take the necessary precautions. Homeowners are always good stewards at maintaining their area as well as areas that need attention. Allowing people that don't care about anything but having a good time will only bring added headaches and potential disaster to the area. We don't ever want to see fires like we have in the year of 2007.</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). The details of implementation, including funding, will be determined during the disposition process. The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use nor change the character of the lake area, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). The Stewardship Council potential measures also include development of a fuels management plan to reduce fuel loading and fire hazard.</p>
<p>Bucks Lake is a piece of heaven that I would hate to see change in a negative way!! My family has been at the lake since the early 40's when my Grandfather worked with the Farm Bureau. This is truly a legacy in our family that we want to be able to pass down to future generations.</p>	<p>Kathleen Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council potential measures for the Bucks Lake Planning Unit are not expected to change the character of the lake area, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) of the planning unit.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Our family has been Bucks lake cabin owners for over four decades. We consider ourselves “good stewards” of the land and surrounding environment. We feel the priority should be to focus on the 85% area now available to the public. Youth programs can be expanded on the south shore of Haskins Bay and from Sun Dew to Sandy Point with greater access to the outdoor without residential distractions. Focus on existing access and avoid lease holders parcels for enhancement. Prioritize preservation of the historical, cultural and environmental aspects of the area.</p>	<p>Laura L. Gustafson</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas. This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. Sundew and Sandy Point are U.S. Forest Service (USFS) sites, and therefore are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council; however, PG&E and USFS have collaborated on plans for recreation enhancements at those and other sites outside the planning unit. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. The Stewardship Council is committed to identifying synergies between the Youth Investment Program and the Land Conservation Program, to be determined on a planning unit by planning unit basis, as to what is appropriate in each area. Developing the details regarding where and how these opportunities might be brought forward into implementation will occur during the disposition process.</p>
<p>Lakeshore must be reopened as a commercial venture. Plumas County needs the tax revenue and Bucks homeowners and tourists need the competition and variety of the restaurants.</p>	<p>Laura L. Gustafson</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>One of our big concerns is the lack of leaseholder representation on the council or at their committee meetings.</p>	<p>Laura L. Gustafson</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council Board of Directors are appointed by Organizations and Government Agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and also includes other public members, such as the representative of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The public Board Members are appointed by the CPUC to "...assure adequate and balanced representation of all ratepayer interests affected by the Land Conservation Commitment..."</p>
<p>Another point, what is the increased liability for current leaseholders and private land owners if the purposed increase in public activity emboldens them with prescription rights over others property. Currently PG&E requires us to be insured and name PG&E too. Where will this additional liability lie???</p> <p>We have enjoyed our "home" at Bucks Lake for many years and look forward to many more. Please listen to the Bucks Lake Stakeholders.....it is our future and that of our children.</p>	<p>Laura L. Gustafson</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas. The site of the potential enhancement measure has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court).</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Our family has been Bucks lake cabin owners for over four decades. We consider ourselves “good stewards” of the land and surrounding environment. We feel the priority should be to focus on the 85% area now available to the public. Youth programs can be expanded on the south shore of Haskins Bay and from Sun Dew to Sandy Point with greater access to the outdoor without residential distractions. Focus on existing access and avoid lease holders parcels for enhancement. Prioritize preservation of the historical, cultural and environmental aspects of the area.</p>	<p>LaVerne Sharp</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas. This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. Sundew and Sandy Point are U.S. Forest Service (USFS) sites, and therefore are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council; however, PG&E and USFS have collaborated on plans for recreation enhancements at those and other sites outside the planning unit. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. The Stewardship Council is committed to identifying synergies between the Youth Investment Program and the Land Conservation Program, to be determined on a planning unit by planning unit basis, as to what is appropriate in each area. Developing the details regarding where and how these opportunities might be brought forward into implementation will occur during the disposition process.</p>
<p>Lakeshore must be reopened as a commercial venture. Plumas County needs the tax revenue and Bucks homeowners and tourists need the competition and variety of the restaurants.</p>	<p>LaVerne Sharp</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>One of our big concerns is the lack of leaseholder representation on the council or at their committee meetings.</p>	<p>LaVerne Sharp</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council Board of Directors are appointed by Organizations and Government Agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and also includes other public members, such as the representative of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The public Board Members are appointed by the CPUC to "...assure adequate and balanced representation of all ratepayer interests affected by the Land Conservation Commitment..."</p>
<p>Another point, what is the increased liability for current leaseholders and private land owners if the purposed increase in public activity emboldens them with prescription rights over others property. Currently PG&E requires us to be insured and name PG&E too. Where will this additional liability lie???</p> <p>We have enjoyed our "home" at Bucks Lake for many years and look forward to many more. Please listen to the Bucks Lake Stakeholders.....it is our future and that of our children.</p>	<p>LaVerne Sharp</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas. The site of the potential enhancement measure has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court).</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>i. Lakeshore Resort needs to be reopened.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. as a commercial entity-not a day use recreational spot. b. Plumas County needs all the associated taxes. c. Buck's Lake homeowners and visitors need the services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. restaurant, cabins, bar, campground, boat dock, store, propane, boat gas d. enhanced public day use/shoreline access is redundant and unnecessary at Lakeshore <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. prescribed day use next to a bar is inappropriate 2. public shoreline access already exists at Lakeshore 3. public shoreline access at Buck's Lake is about 85% already 	Ron Cooke	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to enhance recreational access only at the existing Lakeshore Resort site. This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. These modest enhancements are not intended to conflict with potential future use of the site by resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort. The site of the potential enhancement measure has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court). The bar is located within the Lakeshore Resort and not within the area proposed for public day use.</p>

Addendum 1 to Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volumes I & II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>II. Enhance public access where it is appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. enhance the north shore beginning at the trailhead <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. people need to have access to the lake and the wilderness area not have a "buffer" that makes it difficult to park and enter. 2. the concept of a north shore "buffer" is beyond me-you want enhanced access for families next to a bar but want to restrict those families from easy access to the north shore and the wilderness area. This concept alone shows serious flaws in your planning process. b. enhance the south shore at the mouth of the creek c. enhance Haskins Bay area 	Ron Cooke	No	<p>Comment noted. The proposed measure to manage north shore lands as a buffer for the Bucks Lake Wilderness area is not meant to restrict existing access, but rather would emphasize current trail use and would not alter existing wilderness access. PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure for consideration of chemical toilet and refuse container to be installed along southeast Bucks Lake Road. The site of the potential enhancement measure at Lakeshore Resort has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court). The bar is located within the Lakeshore Resort and not within the area proposed for public day use.</p>