

Public Comments and Response to Comments on  
the LCP  
General Comments

---

This page intentionally left blank.

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

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>			
I [Bill Luce, Friant Water Authority] would like to be on your mailing list (electronic or otherwise).	Bill Luce	No	The commenter has been added to the Stewardship Council database and will receive all mailings from this point forward.
[Condensed from letter] Our association has held an event known as Sierra Trek on the Fordyce OHV Trail for 40 plus years. We are glad to see in the Draft LCP that you recognize the importance of OHV recreation on our public lands. We are encouraged in the statements made in several of the management areas that you will be working with the Forest Service in coordinating OHV use. We are concerned that because many of the OHV trails we enjoy, cross PG&E lands in several of the management areas. These are important public trails and roads. We also want to make sure that the PG&E campgrounds and recreation areas stay open for public use. We agree that we need to protect our public lands for people to enjoy in the future. As stated in the Draft LCP several times, it is important for the public to have access to these lands. We also agree that signing is important so the public knows where they may recreate in a safe and environmental responsible manner. We are also encouraged by your efforts in working with the public by holding public meetings and keeping the public informed as to the process and the end result.	California Association of 4 Wheel Drive Clubs Inc.	No	Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.
[Condensed from letter] The Stewardship Council, as an entity, is due to end in 2013. In January, a question to the public was asked if their mandate should continue after this expiration date. Out of 6,000 mailings to interested parties there were only 22 positive yes responses which is a very small amount. Of the 22 yeses I would doubt that any of them have a vested interest in this area. We might also assume the possibility of 5,978 no responses. I can assure you that this writer is a firm no.	Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg	No	Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is committed to completing the disposition work by 2013.

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] Of the 140,000 acres of watershed lands identified in the plan, only four small tracts are near our parks. None of the actions proposed in the plan would have any direct effect on us. The Stewardship Council was given clear direction in preparing the plan, and you have done an admirable job. The plan is both detailed and easy to read. We know from experience that that is not an easy thing to accomplish. Future planning steps include preparation of the programmatic approach for disposition of the watershed lands, and the development of individual disposition packages. As that planning process progresses, please keep in mind the need to have wildlife-proof trash enclosures installed wherever there is to be concentrated outdoor recreation by the general public. The plan also describes the Stewardship Council's youth investment program. That is an outstanding program for which you deserve commendation. Our parks share your belief in the far-reaching value of outdoor experiences for youth, including fostering of environmental stewardship. We are strongly supportive of providing meaningful outdoor experiences for youth, particularly disadvantaged youth. We look forward to the opportunity to work with the Stewardship Council to achieve those shared goals.</p>	<p>Craig C. Axtell, Superintendent Sequoia &amp; Kings Canyon National Parks</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. 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. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on the topics mentioned, as well as others 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>[Condensed from website comment] I also have a concern with regards to the issue of the SC's mandate and whether the council should continue past 2013. My opinion is that you complete the land portion of your requirements within the time allotted. If there is more work to be done with the youth investment programs, that is a separate matter. Finish the land portion ASAP so we can conclude that chapter and move on!</p>	<p>David W. Beskeen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is committed to completing the disposition work by 2013.</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] I also have a concern with regards to the issue of the SC's mandate and whether the council should continue past 2013. My opinion is that you complete the land portion of your requirements within the time allotted. If there is more work to be done with the youth investment programs, that is a separate matter. Finish the land portion ASAP so we can conclude that chapter and move on!</p>	<p>Don E. Beskeen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is committed to completing the disposition work by 2013.</p>

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

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>[Condensed from letter] EBMUD strongly urges the Stewardship Council to consider revising the entire draft LCP to reflect water resources (supply and quality) as an individual BPV in the draft LCP. Because of the importance of water resources to both the natural environment and the economy of California (locally, regionally, and statewide), it is crucial that water resources be addressed as a stand-alone BPV or, at a minimum, a priority management issue, in the LCP. If the Stewardship Council cannot identify water resources as a stand-alone BPV, then EBMUD requests that the draft LCP be edited to include statements in each section to clarify that the protection of water resources and water quality are high priorities and critical management issues.</p>	EBMUD	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) of which water quality and water resources is not specifically included. Therefore, the Stewardship Council can not develop recommendations to address those issues directly. However, water resources protection was considered during the development of potential measures.</p>
<p>I have to pay my water bill each month. Inans. to above.. Why not just leave this land alone for 5 yrs. and see how the public decides they use it or want to use the land. I really don't think some agency needs to come along and decide what's best and for whom! Suppose the public gets some beachland that was off-limits before and now they have access to the land, why not stand back and see where they swim, fish, camp, drive, and enjoy their new beach instead of trying to determine that enjoyment. As a nation we haven't destroyed the Sierra Nevada or the Rockies, Maybe we haven't treated those as groups would have us do but we are 'The United States of America' not the 'Groups of the United States' That's all - thank you.</p>	Ed Birtcil Jr	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, the Stewardship Council is required to develop and implement a Land Conservation Plan by 2013 that will preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values.</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] We feel that the Stewardship Council should end as an entity in 2013 as originally charted. We don't need a permanent bureaucracy.</p>	Frank Spiller	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is committed to completing the disposition work by 2013.</p>
<p>Please know I am delighted that land will become available for public use. I believe it is also very important that decisions are made that help maximize open space, support ecological health of water systems, preserve flora and fauna, and lead to cleaner air for all. Thank you for your efforts.</p>	Grace Marvin, Sierra Club, Yahi Group	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including outdoor recreation by the general public, open space, and natural habitat. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from email] We appreciate the recognition in most parcels on trail managed for hikers and bikes in the LCP. Some figures, however, separate out hiking only trails. At this phase, we understand this may be a general concept recommending recreation trails. When specific trails are aligned on final maps by the managing agencies, we hope these notations can be more correct. For this phase, we recommend simply noting "trail" or "non-motorized trail."</p>	<p>International Mountain Bicycling Association</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. Fordyce Lake was the only planning unit where a certain type of trail was specified. The measure has been restated to say "non-motorized trail network" rather than "hiking trail network." Specifics of trails, such as exact route and available uses, would be determined in the disposition process.</p>
<p>The Tsi-Akim Maidu Tribe has reviewed the Stewardship Councils draft Land Conservation Plan. Thank you for this opportunity to provide you with our thoughts on this Plan. First, we would like to comment on the overall approach to the role of indigenous tribal people in the development and implementation of this plan. All of the land in our region under review was once Maidu land, and we feel strongly that the most beneficial public value that can be achieved would be to return these lands to the stewardship and care of the people who have been here for 10,000 years. We believe that the tribes from this region, comprising federally recognized, California Native American tribes, and un-recognized tribes, should be the leaders in determining the best use and management of these lands. The question of how to best identify, in order to protect, our sacred places and village sites is difficult. It is our practice to not reveal the location of these sacred sites. The best way to ensure that these sites are protected is to return them to their rightful stewards. This raises one question: in the section regarding qualifications of recipient organizations, the document states that "California Native American Tribes could be considered as qualified donees or holders of conservation easements" if they are on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. Will they be considered qualified? We searched the website of the Commission but could not find this list." Please feel free to contact the tribe at the email address above, or by calling.</p>	<p>Izzy Martin, on behalf of Don Ryberg, Chair of the Tsi-Akim Maidu Tribe</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. When developing a plan that affects religious or sacred places, special effort will be undertaken to consult with spiritual religious leaders of the tribes. 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). 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. Contact the Native American Heritage Commission at 916-653-4082.</p>
<p>As the Stewardship Council moves forward towards Volume III: Disposition Packages, we believe that Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands provide a singular opportunity to invest in California's ecological future. As emphasized in the Stewardship Council's draft Land Conservation Plan, these lands are to be permanently protected from residential conversion [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	<p>John Battles</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council will endeavor to honor the principles of 'adaptive management' during the development of the Disposition Packages, and throughout implementation. 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</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>while providing lasting public value. The long history of responsible resource management by PG&amp;E also means that lessons learned will be applicable to millions of other acres with other private and public ownership. Yet this mission faces a fundamental challenge – how do you ensure the ecological integrity and resiliency of wildlands confronted by the certainty of an uncertain future environment? While we can only speculate about the specific nature of these changes, the best information suggests a warming climate, a continuing invasion of exotic organisms, and an increasing risk of catastrophic disturbance (e.g., wildfire, insect infestations, drought-induced forest decline).</p> <p>Our honest answer to this challenge is that we do not know how to conserve lands confronted by extraordinary change. We do recognize the threats. And we are collectively convinced that tried and true approaches to land conservation are insufficient. The maintenance of functioning ecosystems will demand new knowledge and innovative approaches. Motivated by this shared understanding, we have discussed the merits of a collaboration among willing partners that emphasizes discovery and learning.</p> <p>Specifically we propose to incorporate elements of the Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands in building a long-term monitoring and research partnership dedicated to developing and testing alternative management strategies for forests and rangelands. The primary focus of this partnership is to design approaches to mitigate the manifold effects of a changing climate. By combining our expertise, existing research forests, and land-management capability with Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands, we can build a truly unique public resource that can provide valuable insights for other private and publicly owned lands in this large region. We argue that given the threat of novel ecological perturbations, simply reducing</p> <p>[COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>			<p>basis, as to what is appropriate in each area. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on the topics mentioned, as well as others 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>

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGES.]</p> <p>management intensity on former PG&amp;E lands will not make an enduring contribution to the conservation of California’s landscape. Instead, we suggest a potentially more lasting legacy of innovative land management coupled with an active public outreach and youth education program. We argue that it is in the public interest to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing risk factors of fire, insect and disease;</li> <li>• Changing values for water runoff volume, timing, and quality;</li> <li>• Changing stresses on native species associated with shifting ecological conditions;</li> <li>• Changing perceptions of California’s working landscapes from an increasingly urban population.</li> </ul> <p>We present this comment in the spirit of generating ideas to consider among stakeholders. We fully appreciate the multitude of potential constraints and look forward to vibrant, robust, and interesting discussions regarding the disposition of Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands. Below we note several elements of our three-party conversation that we all considered important.</p> <p>Open collaboration. The partnership would be open to all institutions (donees) who share this conceptual framework and management approach. We believe collaboration among institutions is the key to the success of this effort.</p> <p>Working landscapes. Essential to this partnership is the emphasis on understanding working landscapes. We envision a series of outdoor laboratories that capture the environmental gradient present in the Sierra Nevada bioregion. With these laboratories, management strategies to mitigate the impact of climate change and other novel stressors can be implemented and evaluated.</p> <p>[COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>			



Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGES.]</p> <p>Forest reserves. Within a context of sustainable management, habitat protection, restoration, and good science, it is crucial to preserve a significant fraction of the land base (e.g., a representative 20%) in reserves where no management will occur. This strategy will provide both near term refugia as well as a benchmark against which other management strategies can be measured.</p> <p>Long-term consistency. Rapid is a relative term, particularly when considering changes in forests. We are planning a network to make direct observations of forest responses that will manifest themselves decades in the future. It is a robust scientific approach – responses of contemporary forests to current conditions is arguably the most relevant indication of future sensitivity. However, to be effective there needs to be consistency in management regimes, financial support, and institutional commitment.</p> <p>Shared resources. Implementing ecologically and economically sustainable forest management is important to many aspects of the partnership. The potential to realize net revenue varies greatly among parcels. Thus we propose that any revenue from forest products be reinvested to support the monitoring, educational, and research priorities established by all partners as decided in an open, public process.</p> <p>Youth education. We are convinced that climate change creates significant uncertainty and potential risk to California’s well-being. It is imperative that today’s youth, the decision makers of tomorrow, learn first-hand the relevance of these risks posed to both rural and urban areas of the State and to the economic and ecological health of the State. Our experience has been that effective learning must include active engagement in the potential means to mitigate the impact of these changes. These outdoor laboratories would provide hands-on learning</p> <p>[COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>			

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGES.]</p> <p>opportunities for youth throughout California.</p> <p>We look forward to working with the Stewardship Council in the disposition phase of these lands, and believe that our partnership can play a key role in meeting the goals of the Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands.</p>			
<p>These comments are a result of a collaborative effort between the University of California, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the United States Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station. They represent our interest in managing some of the Pacific Forest and Watershed lands as described below.</p> <p>The University of California            Associate Professor John Battles, UC Berkeley            Professor Greg Biging, UC Berkeley            Professor Martha Conklin, UC Merced            Professor Kevin O’Hara, UC Berkeley            Associate Professor Scott Stephens, UC Berkeley            Cooperative Extension Specialist Bill Stewart, UC Berkeley</p> <p>California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection            Chief Deputy Director Crawford Tuttle, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection</p> <p>United States Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station            Dr. Peter Stine, Program Manager, Sierra Nevada Research Center</p> <p>We congratulate the staff and their consultants for providing the Stewardship Council with a well documented, thorough and reasoned land conservation plan that meets the goal of setting “the framework for            [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	John Battles	No	<p>Comment noted. The potential measures in Volume II are intended to be illustrative in nature. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>the preservation and enhancement of the Watershed Lands, and to ensure the permanent protection of these lands for the benefit of current and future generations of Californians” (LCP Volume I 1-1) . Volumes I and II of the Land Conservation Plan fulfill many of the aspects laid out in the Settlement Agreement and the Stipulation in relation to the two key requirements of ‘protection and enhancement of beneficial public values’ and ‘enhancement of overall environmental and economic benefits’ (LCP Volume I 2-1).</p> <p>For the watershed units for which we are most familiar – those from the Pit-McCloud watershed unit in the northern Sierra Nevada to the Stanislaus watershed unit in the southern Sierra Nevada – the Planning Unit Concepts did a thorough job identifying areas where noxious weed, fuels management, and forest management plans need to be developed to ensure long term benefits. The planning unit concepts also provide a number of illustrative measures and organizational structures (such as demonstration forests in some areas) that could ensure the design and implementation of the necessary plans.</p>			
<p>We are impressed with the quality of the work you have done in putting this all together. Congratulations.</p>	John Bernstein	No	Comment noted.

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE MANAGEMENT MANAGEMENT FLEXIBILITY</p> <p>The Stewardship Council should not attempt to prescribe the future management of the watershed lands in great detail. Future flexibility in management which allows adjustments to changed circumstances, within the constraints imposed by the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation and implemented by the conservation easements, will be one of the most desirable characteristics of the dispositions of the watershed lands. Land management agencies may be reluctant to accept donations of lands encumbered by detailed restrictions on management. Non-governmental recipients are not so accountable to the public and not so constrained by law and regulation; more detailed management prescriptions may be appropriate for non-governmental recipients. The Council will very likely find that disposing of the lands appropriately, without attempting to devise comprehensive management prescriptions, will be a sufficiently difficult and time-consuming task.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council recognizes the inherent challenges in approaching a project of this breadth and scale. Every effort will be made to select the most appropriate and qualified donee for each particular situation. 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. 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 III). Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>
<p>The recommended concepts for many planning units recommend numerous studies and plans. Recommending studies of and plans for the watershed lands emphasizes their separateness from surrounding lands, though coordinated management with surrounding lands is in many instances the desirable outcome. In many cases, studying and drawing up plans for watershed lands in conjunction with surrounding lands would make much more sense than studying and planning for only the scattered units of watershed land. If lands are donated to public agencies, the new managers would at some future time perform the recommended studies and plans in conjunction with project planning or general land management planning for areas including the donated lands. If lands are donated to other entities, for example land trusts, the recommended studies and plans would be a significant financial burden. What sources of funding would be available to finance them? The recommended studies and plans are likely to be a relatively low priority, compared to expenditures for management of the lands. The Council staff should consider carefully whether the benefits of the recommended studies and plans would justify their costs when negotiating disposition agreements.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council recognizes the considerable expense associated with developing myriad resource studies and plans. Every effort will be made to coordinate with adjoining landowners (i.e., federal agencies). The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support for the implementation of the LCP, the details of which will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages. There is a near certainty that additional funds (other than funds provided by the Stewardship Council) will be needed.</p>

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

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Public access for recreation is one of the most important and highly valued public benefits of the watershed lands. The Settlement Agreement and Stipulation imply that existing public access should be preserved and enhanced, subject to continued appropriate restrictions for public safety and ecosystem protection. We are very surprised that the tables of recommended objectives mention various enhancements of public outdoor recreation in the planning units, but do not mention the overall goal of preserving and enhancing existing public access for recreation. Conservation easements should be strictly worded to require at least substantially the same public access as exists at present. The easements should guarantee public rights-of-way along streams and on lakeshores. The Land Conservation Plan and conservation easements must ensure that public access may be restricted or limited only because of legitimate concerns about public safety and ecological protection that are substantiated by definite evidence.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. Conservation easements will be explicit regarding all prohibited uses necessary to maintain open space and other identified values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. Public access for recreation was considered in the development of the potential measures.</p>
<p>There are numerous opportunities to significantly enhance non-motorized access within areas of watershed land in many planning units by rehabilitating existing trails in poor repair and constructing new trails. Carefully constructed trails will minimize the environmental effects of public access. Opportunities to integrate trails on watershed lands with trail systems on adjacent ownerships should be investigated and integration of trails included in projects to improve non-motorized access.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. Where identified as needed or desired (and appropriate) the Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure recommending trail enhancements, including integration with adjacent trails.</p>
<p>At present the public generally can access undeveloped and unrestricted watershed lands whenever the lands are physically accessible. The public is not required to pay any fees for access unless services are provided. Whether or not the donees may charge fees for access should be considered in the negotiation of disposition agreements.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Currently, recreation use of most PG&amp;E reservoirs is low-intensity. The reservoirs are not crowded, and recreational facilities do not dominate the relatively unmodified lakeshores. Many of the reservoirs are small, and a higher intensity of use would degrade recreational experiences there. Users appreciate the present limited development and low-intensity recreation at these reservoirs, and future management should not provide opportunities for increasing the intensity of recreation.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not proposed recreation enhancements that we believe would greatly alter the intensity of recreation use on Watershed Lands. FERC license requirements will be honored in the Disposition Packages.</p>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>Vehicles should be kept off lakeshores and out of riparian areas, except where streams must be crossed. Keeping vehicles off lakeshores, which enhances the function of the shores as buffer zones intercepting erosion into hydroelectric system lakes, obviously has great benefits for PG&amp;E. Recommended concepts suggest coordination with the Forest Service to monitor OHV use and assess need for additional OHV trails. At the present time the Forest Service is working on the Route Designation Process to formally designate routes open to OHV's, but only on national forest land. The Process will be completed within a few years. The process is a non-recurring opportunity to coordinate with the Forest Service on OHV management that should not be missed, especially since many PG&amp;E inholdings in national forests may be donated to the Forest Service. We do not know whether or not PG&amp;E, as owner of record of watershed lands in the national forests, is participating in the Route Designation Process. If PG&amp;E is not, the Council should encourage them to promptly begin participating.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is unclear as to whether PG&amp;E is participating in the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) route designation efforts. Where identified as an issue, the Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to protect lakeshores and riparian areas from unauthorized vehicle use. The Stewardship Council will make every effort to coordinate with the USFS on this particular issue, as appropriate, during the development of the Disposition Packages.</p>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>The forested land in the PG&amp;E watershed lands provides both timber and the beneficial public values of recreation, wildlife habitat, open space, and watershed protection which future management must preserve. The conservation easements must preserve these values. The timber provides local economic benefits, and timber harvesting profits may help meet future property tax obligations. On some of the forested lands, some of the other values listed above may be more important beneficial public values than the timber values are, and timber harvesting should be strictly limited to preserve these values or be foregone altogether. For example, PG&amp;E forest lands adjacent to the Grouse Lakes Motor Vehicle Control Area in Tahoe National Forest have exceptional recreational and scenic values, are heavily visited; logging should be limited to sanitation, including removal of human hazard trees, and salvage. The PG&amp;E Grouse Lakes lands adjacent to the Lindsey and Rock Lakes are contiguous with national forest lands in the Tahoe National Forest Carnivore Network which are managed for the benefit of forest carnivores. Management of PG&amp;E lands should be consistent with management of adjacent national forest lands where the public lands are managed for special habitat and ecological benefits. Forest lands in watersheds such as Battle Creek and the Eel River below Lake Pillsbury which have important anadromous fish habitat are another example of lands with exceptional non-timber values which could be unacceptably degraded by timber harvesting. There is ample evidence that the steep canyon slopes and inner gorge of the Eel River canyon are very unstable. Potential damage to the hydroelectric system from timber harvesting on watershed lands requires that erosion and sedimentation from harvesting be minimized. Riparian buffer strips should be conservatively wide. The emphasis on preserving the environment in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation implies that timber management should not be intensive.</p>	<p>John K Moore</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has recommended developing forest and fire management plans for many planning units where forest resources are present. Details on timber management and harvesting prescriptions would be developed as part of these plans. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. Coordination of forest management plans with adjacent public landowners is also recommended.</p>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>Present PG&amp;E forest management is described by PG&amp;E foresters as “uneven-aged timber management using single tree and small group selection silvicultural systems”. In our opinion, silvicultural prescriptions systems more intensive than the present PG&amp;E forest management are not appropriate. Clearcutting and intensive shelterwood harvesting are examples of unacceptably intensive silvicultural techniques. Reforestation by plantations is not appropriate, except in post-fire restoration. These general management directions apply to each TMU, and in addition the silvicultural prescriptions applied in each TMU should not be more intensive than the current PG&amp;E prescriptions. In particular, more intensive silvicultural prescriptions should not be applied in areas currently managed by the salvage prescription. Preparation of elaborate timber management plans for higher-elevation lands with low timber-growing capability is not justified.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has recommended developing forest management plans for many planning units where forest resources are present. Details on timber management and harvesting prescriptions would be developed as part of these plans. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>
<p>Vegetation type conversion would be inconsistent with the public benefit of preserving fish and wildlife habitat. Conversion of meadows or hardwood forest would be especially inconsistent.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not recommended any conversion of habitats on the Watershed Lands.</p>
<p>There are diatomaceous earth deposits in the Lake Britton and Hat Creek Planning Units. Volume II implies that there are no active mines at present. Mining could have extremely adverse environmental impacts, especially on the renowned fishery resources of Hat Creek. Conservation easements should include a prohibition of mining.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements will be explicit regarding all prohibited uses. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat.</p>
<p>Residential use of donated lands other than existing residential leases, either seasonal or year-round, would be inconsistent with the Settlement Agreement’s requirement that the public benefit of open space be preserved. Housing for management personnel should be provided in nearby communities.</p>	John K Moore	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, the conservation easements must honor existing environmental and economic uses on the Watershed Lands. Conservation easements will be explicit regarding all prohibited uses necessary to maintain open space and other identified values.</p>



Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>At the same time, I note that recommendations for these areas—and more broadly across the entire plan—sometimes suggest a reluctance to improve recreational opportunities in favor of a approach that I would characterize as "Keep Studying, Do Nothing." While caution is appropriate in dealing with such precious resources, the Stewardship Council has an historic opportunity (and obligation) to make constructive changes to a resource management plan that has too often been defined by inertia. With regard to recreational use, maintaining the status quo would often be destructive to the very resources the Stewardship Council is charged to protect. On the other hand, development of recreational facilities can be the very best way to protect these natural resources. People will keep coming to these areas regardless—without defined campgrounds, trails, and angling access the public will camp and walk and ATV wherever they want, to the detriment of the lands and water.</p>	John Mason	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. 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>Lastly, I offer a comment that may be beyond the scope of the Stewardship Council's authority. At one time there was talk of some or all of these lands being sold by PG&amp;E. While I was glad to hear of the deal that was struck with PG&amp;E to preserve the properties indefinitely, I was also concerned that the "All or Nothing" approach might not be the best solution for these lands. I believe that some portion of these lands could indeed be sold to the public—and perhaps the proceeds of these sales could offer the Stewardship Council greater power to improve those properties it retains. Alternatively—if outright sales are beyond the scope of the Council's authority—they could consider developing a private concession structure for selected lands which might best be managed &amp; developed by private interests. These concessions could follow the template used in National Parks and other public lands—allowing for selective, planned use of the tremendous resources that are available.</p>	John Mason	No	<p>Comment noted. According to the Settlement Agreement, Watershed Lands may be sold to private entities with few or no restrictions if the Board of Directors makes a finding that the lands are without "significant public interest value." The overall goal of the LCP, however, is to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) by protecting the lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by third parties. Lands will be available for donation in fee title to qualified donees, including public entities and non-profit organizations that are not necessary for current and future hydropower operations. 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>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>In sum, while I consider myself a friend to the environment, I also see a California that has a huge and growing demand for our natural resources. At the same time I see little growth in planned, sustainable recreational facilities to meet this demand. The demand will not stop by itself. Left undirected it will spill over into our precious natural areas in unintended and destructive ways. The Stewardship Council has a monumental opportunity to create ways and places for people to use these resources in a way that minimizes the negative effects. I wish you luck in shaping the way these lands used for decades to come.</p>	John Mason	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. Conservation easements will be explicit regarding all prohibited uses necessary to maintain outdoor recreation by the general public and other identified values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] We feel that 10 years is ample for the Council to complete its work and are opposed to its extension past 2013.</p>	Judy & Scott Machabee	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is committed to completing the disposition work by 2013.</p>
<p>I would like to comment specifically on the lack of preservation of virgin timber and old growth. This plan does not address the preservation of these very special areas and I feel this is a major flaw. Virgin timber cannot be recreated, and should be protected as the unique and special treasure that it is. I feel that it is the responsibility of PG&amp;E and the Stewardship Council to preserve these stands of timber, and the Land Conservation Plan does not do this. This issue should not be overlooked! Please, save our beautiful virgin and old growth timber stands!</p>	Laura Waidelich	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has recommended developing forest management plans for many planning units where forest resources are present. Details on timber management and harvesting prescriptions would be developed as part of these plans. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>
<p>Thanks for taking on this project. Please maintain multiple uses for the lands. Do not just lock them up.</p>	Melba Fryer	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>

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

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Please don't become the victim of mountain biker propaganda! Mountain biking is one of the most destructive activities allowed in any natural areas, and should NOT be supported. Please share the following paper with all appropriate and interested parties, especially local land managers. Please restrict bicycles and other vehicles to pavement, where they belong and where they can't do much harm to wildlife (this is the policy of Yosemite National Park). Mountain biking has no place in natural areas. Anyone who wants to visit nature can already do so on foot (or via wheelchair). Mountain biking drives out all other trail users. There is absolutely no reason to allow access by large pieces of machinery, such as bicycles.</p>	<p>Mike Vandeman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] The Placer County Water Agency has reviewed the draft Land Conservation Plan and has the following comments. Through purchase of the PG&amp;E Lower Drum Division Water System in 1968 and the PG&amp;E Upper Placer Water System in 1984, the Agency has existing canal and water facilities that are located on various parcels of the watershed lands in Placer County that are under Stewardship Council's guidance. The Land Conservation Plan should include appropriate sections that address and protect the Placer County Water Agency canals and water facilities. The Agency's concerns include the following: Protection of all watershed lands that are upslope and downslope of the Agency's canal system and the PG&amp;E canal system; continue to provide high quality water for the Agency's raw and treated water customers that rely on the Yuba and Bear River water source; continue to provide appropriate access to Agency facilities for operation and maintenance activities; provide proper land uses needed by the Agency to operate and maintain its canal and water facilities. PCWA, like PG&amp;E, requires certain types of land use to maintain its facilities. These uses typically include laydown areas, sediment deposit/debris areas, spillway areas, and canal spill areas. In addition, PCWA has water treatment plants and related facilities adjacent to properties under the Stewardship Council's guidance. Due to the growth in western Placer County and the need to expand Agency facilities to meet the growth needs, additional land will be needed. The Land Conservation Plan should account for this type of land needs.</p>	Placer County Water Agency	No	<p>As described in Volume I, "Conservation easements on the Watershed Lands will include an express reservation of a right for continued operation and maintenance of hydroelectric facilities and associated water delivery facilities, including project replacements and improvements required to meet existing and future water delivery requirements for power generation and consumptive water use by existing users, compliance with any FERC license, FERC license renewal or other regulatory requirements." In addition, easements will honor existing agreements for economic uses, including consumptive water deliveries. Lastly, the Stipulation further states that any conservation easement that is created as part of the Disposition Package will: "expressly reserve the authority of PG&amp;E or other holders of applicable water rights to apply to the applicable regulatory authority to increase or otherwise modify the water storage capacities of existing licensed facilities." Thus, the LCP recommendations must recognize the continued rights of PG&amp;E and others to operate, maintain, and improve existing hydroelectric and associated water storage and delivery facilities." In addition, LCP recommendations preserve and enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) and thus the Watershed Lands upslope and downslope of the Agency's facilities would be protected through conservation easements and LCP recommendations.</p>
<p>This needs to get into the media hot-line mainstream. The TRPA was told in 2003 and in their own December 2003 memo to the Board, it is not "if" it will burn but "when". That statement remains buried in their files. The Council MUST get the media stirred up!! Hey, we all know, burn the forest, kill the critters, kill the habitats, reduce watershed values and decrease domestic water quality...hits us all!! GOTTA BEAT THE WAR DRUMS both in CA and nationally.</p>	Ralph Osterling	No	Comment noted.

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>[Condensed from letter] RCRC appreciates the emphasis on noxious weed management on the Watershed Lands. RCRC is supportive of efforts that add to or enhance the efforts of the Noxious and Invasive Weed Management Program that is administered through the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CFDA) as noxious weeds negatively impact agriculture, water quality and supply, recreation, and increase the threat of wildland fire danger.</p>	<p>Regional Council of Rural Counties</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] RCRC is supportive of the development of fuels management plans to ensure the long-term forest health and to reduce fuel loading and fire hazard, and forest management plans to promote natural forest development and structural and physical diversity for long-term ecological, economic and cultural benefits. Additionally, RCRC is supportive of the development of fire management and response plans for lands not included in FERC required plans. Priority for the development of fire management and response plans should be given to those Watershed Lands nearby rural communities. In addition, plan development should be coordinated with local governments and local Fire Safe Councils. RCRC believes that the forest management practices of the past cannot be continued if we are to protect natural resources, create economic opportunity, protect lives and property, and ensure the beneficial public values outlined in the LCP.</p>	<p>Regional Council of Rural Counties</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. One criterion for recommending a fire management and response plan was adjacent development and presence of communities nearby. It is anticipated that such plans would be coordinated with all appropriate entities, including local governments and Fire Safe Councils. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] RCRC supports the development of new recreational opportunities such as the development of day use facilities, wildlife viewing platforms, fishing platforms, trails, enhanced access, and directional and/or informative signage. Additionally, RCRC supports the legally authorized use of OHVs in designated areas. RCRC supports efforts by the Stewardship Council to work cooperatively with local communities on local projects of interest such as community park development, and youth program development.</p>	<p>Regional Council of Rural Counties</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. 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.</p>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] The agricultural industry is an important part of rural California. RCRC encourages the continued sensitivity of the Stewardship Council towards agricultural uses on Watershed Lands. It is important to find the right balance between wildlife and habitat management and continuing sustainable agricultural uses.</p>	Regional Council of Rural Counties	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including agricultural uses. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] RCRC supports the preservation of cultural resources on Watershed Lands.</p>	Regional Council of Rural Counties	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including historic values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] RCRC appreciates the Stewardship Council's commitment to work with each of the 22 impacted counties to develop the most appropriate approach to achieve property tax neutrality in that county.</p>	Regional Council of Rural Counties	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>
<p>I attended the most recent public meeting in Quincy California. After the presentation I have read and researched the issues. I can only conclude the ideas and proposals are a bit fuzzy and leaves the homeowners, lease holders, and PG&amp;E stakeholders all at risk. This entire program needs to be put on hold till all the facts are told. It appears to be a secretive society. Questions were asked how to get on the board for the Stewardship Council and we were referred to the website. As a Native American my people are not represented here. I was told the "local tribes" have had input. Where is that input? Who are these people? Since we owned the land before 1800, then we are the rightful owners and this new group has no authority. Put an end to this dictatorship and share this land. Having this small group make decisions on their own is dangerous. I was told they will take our comments into consideration but in the end they will decide. However, the PUC will see thru this charade and squash their attempts. We can only hope our courts will put this disaster in waiting on hold till much needed discussions are held.</p>	Richard J Mahoney	No	<p>Comment noted. There have not been any decisions made regarding disposition of the Watershed Lands. 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 III). 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. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process. The conservation easements must honor existing legal agreements.</p>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>I am a Lifelong Professional Forester (retired) with Forestland Management Experience on National Forests as a District Forest Ranger and other titles (such as seasonal Fire Crewman at the age of 16). I majored in Forest Management with Minors in Range, Wildlife, Watershed, Recreation, Road &amp; Trail Construction, Logging Methods &amp; Practices, Fire Prevention &amp; Fire Suppression, Forest Insects Prevention &amp; Protection, Disease Prevention &amp; Protection, and other subjects too numerous to mention. I take particular interest in Forest Products and Forest Economy as with out the production of paying products there is no Forest Economy to support the Wise Use of Forestland. As I see the Management of the former PG&amp;E Forestland, Timber Growth and Timber Harvesting make of the majority of this economy. I refer primarily to the section on TIMBER and Timber Sales. There is much false information disseminated about Forest Management and its various parts or divisions. Timber Sales as you show create a large part if not the largest part of the income from the conservative management your project. The most glaring problem that I notice is the annual harvest of Salvage Timber Volumes. This is an indication of MISMANAGEMENT! This Annual Timber Volume of Salvage Sales is substantial and it means a very large loss of income that could be used for more and better management of the entire property. I'm no longer active in my profession but there are other Foresters who could explain the difference in Log Sales between Green Logs, and dead, rotting, worm-holed, fire scarred, and logs otherwise classed as salvage logs by the primary buyers of log who are SAWMILLS. Sawmills call the shots when it comes to selling timber and they can cull (reject) logs they consider unmerchantable. However, these logs they refuse to pay for will be left at the mill as it would be the Sellers Expense to haul them away to an approved log dump. But of course the sawmill can utilize them as wood chips, hog fuel or mix it in with their Bark Production as a profitable product. Salvage Sales under the current Forest Practice Rules are limited to Dead and Dying Trees. And the CDF always questions the harvesting of dying trees that are still green but possibly infected or infested and that should be removed by a Forest Practice Method of Sanitation Logging [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	<p>Richard Wheeler</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has recommended developing forest management plans for many planning units where forest resources are present. Details on timber management and harvesting prescriptions would be developed as part of these plans. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction.</p>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>based on the Judgment of Registered Professional Forester representing the Land Owner. There may be a method of solving this problem by making this Salvage Cutting in to a Sanitation Cutting and getting ahead of the Insects and disease that causes these deaths. Formerly, before the Present Administration of the Forest Practice Act, large landowner could do sanitation cutting on a 20 year cycle. And, with diligent study by a Registered Professional Forester, I think an ongoing Timber Management Plan could be develop to prevent Salvage Logs becoming a loss.</p>			
<p>Fuel Reduction – Many of these areas are labeled as severe on the Cal State Fire Severity Map. Will funds be provided to meet the increased risk of fires at the hands of inexperienced folks introduced into tinder dry areas?</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has recommended the development of fuels management plans where considered necessary based on current information. The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support for the implementation of the LCP, the details of which will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages. There is a near certainty that additional funds (other than funds provided by the Stewardship Council) will be needed.</p>
<p>Sheriff – EMTs – Search Rescue – Obviously, increased public usage will require additional services. Money will come from where?</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has not proposed recreation enhancements that we believe would greatly increase the intensity of recreation use on Watershed Lands.</p>
<p>Liability Issues – Again increased public usage may result in an increased risk of liability that might be posed by increased access to public land over private or leased property. Who covers this risk – the counties or private individuals or ?</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has not proposed recreation enhancements that we believe would greatly increase the intensity of recreation use on Watershed Lands. Determinations regarding liability will be made during the development of the Disposition Packages.</p>
<p>6. Sustainable Forestry – Currently considerable discrepancies exist between counties, the State of California and the National Forest Service as to an appropriate policy and an agreed upon defensible space for homeowners. Will the LCP merely add to this confusion?</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council recognizes that many plans exist and that there are many agencies collaborating on natural resource management issues across the Watershed Lands. Therefore, in terms of sustainable forestry, the Stewardship Council has recommended coordination of development of the forest and fuels management plans with relevant county plans; as well as coordination with U.S Forest Service (USFS) management prescriptions and practices.</p>



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

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] I live in Placer County, near Dutch Flat, and have been receiving email from the Stewardship Council for years. I was, years ago, eager to inform the Council about some of the more important "resources" on PG&amp;E lands in this vicinity, but years ago I was told that the Council was not seeking information about the PG&amp;E lands it was entrusted with. Although I cannot afford to drive all over California to the Council meetings, when I asked if I could speak to the Council about PG&amp;E lands near Dutch Flat, at such a meeting, again, I was told that the Council was not interested in hearing about the lands; that would come later, I should bide my time. You might say I have a special interest in the PG&amp;E lands in this part of the Sierra, since I have hiked throughout this area since 1971. In fact, I had been in contact with PG&amp;E about the future of these lands, near Dutch Flat, in the late 1990s, years before the Council existed. I was, and am, very concerned about the future of these lands. So. The Council's planning process has seemed somewhat confusing. Suddenly the Council seemed to have much to do with inner-city youth. So. Very well, I am peeved. I suspect the Council is doing a bang-up job on figuring out what to do with the PG&amp;E lands, much as our would-be Homeland Security people did, with Hurricane Katrina.</p>	Russell Towle	No	<p>Comment noted. 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>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] I do not have broadband, I cannot download all the PDF files which comprise the current Draft Plan. I did manage to download a short PDF file concerning the Bear River area, from Bear Valley itself down to Dutch Flat. The map was quite hard to read. I love maps and I know how to read maps and I have made maps for a living. This map was poorly set up.</p>	Russell Towle	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council mailed CD-ROMs to all in the Council's database which included the LCP Volumes I and II.</p>

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] The PDF map [of Bear River] had two shadings for the PG&amp;E lands, one denoting "disposition," the other, "retention." Perhaps in some other document, it was specified exactly what "disposition" entails. I had heard that title to the lands would be transferred to Tahoe National Forest, but I could find no direct evidence of that in the PDF file (27_1_BearRiverText.pdf). Hence it is a little hard for me to comment upon "disposition." I would support transfer of title to Tahoe National Forest (TNF), if the admirable values of preserving open space, preserving wildlife habitat, and enhancing non-motorized recreation, protecting wildness and scenery, would be adhered to by TNF.</p>	<p>Russell Towle</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A description of "disposition" can be found in Volume I. 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 conservation easement and fee simple donees will be determined during the disposition process (Volume III). 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>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] In many ways PG&amp;E has been a good neighbor to the mountain communities. I especially appreciate that PG&amp;E has kept so much of its lands and so many reservoirs open to recreational uses, such as hiking, fishing, and so on. However, I believe I see PG&amp;E rushing to strip timber off those lands PG&amp;E itself has slated for "disposition," as, for instance, within the so-called Blue Canyon THP area. This area is one of the particular areas I wished to inform the Council about. Unfortunately, the Council was not accepting input about the PG&amp;E lands, years ago, it was only talking about talking, or having ideas about having ideas, or something. And during all this painstaking talking about talking and having ideas about ideas, PG&amp;E was allowed to harvest timber in an already over-harvested area! The whole tone of the above mentioned PDF file I did download seems to congratulate PG&amp;E on cutting timber. What, does PG&amp;E own the Council? Is PG&amp;E writing your script? Writing your PDF files for you? What is so admirable about harvesting more timber in an area PG&amp;E has absolutely hammered in past timber harvests?... I take it as a sign of cutting too much timber from the canyon walls, that PG&amp;E lands were damaged by various landslides in that general area, in the 1990s. So. Did PG&amp;E reduce its harvest, or did it increase the cut, in order to squeeze as many dollars from those lands as it possibly could, before their "disposition" under the bankruptcy agreement? I suspect it was eager for dollars, and its timber people did what they were told: get the timber out. Now, if not sooner. And we'll tell them, the Council, that it is a wonderful thing, it is "sustainable forestry."</p>	<p>Russell Towle</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Until final determinations are made, and actions are taken, regarding lands to be retained in fee title by PG&amp;E and lands to be donated PG&amp;E remains the landowner and manager. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including sustainable forestry. Details regarding how forest resources would be managed in the future, including timber management and forest prescriptions, would be developed as part of the recommended forest management plan for this planning unit. 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>

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] In this area [Bear River] are many historic things, along with, as the PDF file mentions, prehistoric sites. For instance, the Pacific Turnpike, an old wagon road connecting Dutch Flat to Virginia City, is in that exact area. So is a portion of the more famous Dutch Flat-Donner Lake Wagon Road. Both opened for travel in 1864. The 1880-1900 Towle Brothers narrow-gauge railroad runs for miles within the Bear River canyon, in that exact area, around the Blue Canyon THP Area. So does the old South Yuba Canal, which conveyed water to the mines in Dutch Flat, built in 1865. So. I want things like the old mining ditch, the old wagon roads, the old narrow-gauge railroad grade, protected from any further damage at PG&amp;E's hands, or anyone's hands.</p>	Russell Towle	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to preserve and enhance the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) at Bear River. One measure is to develop a cultural resources management plan, which would protect cultural resources within the planning unit.</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] Farther west, along the Bear River near Alta and Dutch Flat, is a beautiful spot named Smarts Crossing, where there was once a bridge. This is a recreational "resource" of critical importance to these small towns, a beautiful swimming hole and little waterfall. People have been swimming there since long before PG&amp;E existed. It turns out that, only *since* the formation of the Council, PG&amp;E has decided to play hardball. It turns out PG&amp;E is not such a good neighbor as I had once thought. It turns out that PG&amp;E thinks it can operate the Bear River itself as if it were a mining ditch. It can turn it off, it can turn it on, it can make uncontrolled releases of water from Drum, miles upstream, at any hour of the day or night. Hence PG&amp;E has posted ugly signs around Smarts Crossing, and put a gate across the historic public road leading to Smarts Crossing. This road forks away north from Drum Powerhouse Road just before one reaches the sign reading "PG&amp;E road," etc. etc. So. On your map, which I found quite hard to interpret, I can't say whether it is retention or disposition which is planned for lands near Smarts Crossing, and near the Smarts Crossing Road. It should be disposition to Tahoe National Forest. Not only that, but the Big Bully, PG&amp;E, should never ever have any pretext for believing that it can operate the Bear River like its own personal mining ditch, with sudden releases of water endangering everyone downstream. Strange, I think, that the Council does not seem to be aware of Smarts Crossing, does not seem aware that I advocated making the Towle Brothers Railroad a foot trail, [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	Russell Towle	No	<p>Comment noted. Until final determinations are made, and actions are taken, regarding lands to be retained in fee title by PG&amp;E and lands to be donated PG&amp;E remains the landowner and manager. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). The conservation easements must honor existing legal agreements and FERC license requirements. 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>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>possibly also equestrian, from Drum Forebay, north to Highway 20, and spoke to PG&amp;E's head of recreation management, as well as to my District Five Supervisor here in Placer County, as well as to Tahoe National Forest, as well as to the Nevada County Land Trust; strange that the Council had no knowledge of those things, for they have everything to do with the very PG&amp;E lands the Council is devising a Plan for. But then, I must remember that I tried to write to the Council, and I tried to go to a Council meeting, but on both occasions I was told that the Council did not want to hear about the PG&amp;E lands; it wanted to take testimony upon the idea of having ideas, or the plan to make a plan, or something of the sort. Finally, what little I have seen of the Draft Plan seems to be at least aiming in the right direction.</p>			
<p>Clarification of legal party info: we have contracts with PG&amp;E for TPPA public power. The contracts are either with us directly or through WAPA. The County also participates in PG&amp;E FERC proceedings on rate changes. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Stewardship Council's Draft Land Conservation Plan, Vols. I and II. First, I commend the Council and staff for the considerable amount of work accomplished in a relatively short time.</p>	<p>Teri Murrison, District 3 Supervisor, Tuolumne County</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The overall Plan is well-thought out and comprehensive. The holistic focus is appropriate for these private lands, certainly the environmental BPVs, but also the inclusion of preservation and enhancement of historical and cultural uses. Tuolumne County residents have a long and treasured history with these lands. It is my hope that strong consideration is given to local input and participation in their eventual disposition and management.</p>	<p>Teri Murrison, District 3 Supervisor, Tuolumne County</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including historic values. 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>

## General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>The list of surveys, plans, improvements, management, and monitoring tasks is important to wise stewardship of the lands and yet is so extensive as to likely be beyond most agencies and organizations ability to undertake in perpetuity without additional revenue streams. In order to create a local and sustainable land management and assets enhancement program, it will be necessary to come up with a creative mix of funding sources with which to accomplish everything. That could include a mix of donee funding, PG&amp;E funding, federal and state grant funding, funds generated from some uses of the lands, and other currently unidentified sources, as well. Local donees should not be competitively disadvantaged due to an inability to demonstrate full funding for the recommended actions at the time of their application.</p>	<p>Teri Murrison, District 3 Supervisor, Tuolumne County</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support for the implementation of the LCP, the details of which will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages. There is a near certainty that additional funds (other than funds provided by the Stewardship Council) will be needed.</p>
<p>The Council's emphasis on making sure the Me-Wuk Tribe is included is good, but I would suggest that beyond collaboration/coordination, a role in evaluation and planning could be offered, as well. From a holistic perspective, this level of participation by the Tribe is especially appropriate.</p>	<p>Teri Murrison, District 3 Supervisor, Tuolumne County</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders – including Native American entities - to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on the topics mentioned, as well as others 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>Where existing management practices or uses are proposed to be changed, the least "disruptive" alternatives (that still effectively mitigate the negative impacts they seek to address) to current practices should be pursued.</p>	<p>Teri Murrison, District 3 Supervisor, Tuolumne County</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Edit to LCP Made</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Volume 1 of the LCP is self explanatory and easy to understand the criteria that set forth actions that need to be taken for future resource conservation. In reviewing Volume II, the Tribe specifically targeted the Stanislaus River Planning Units (as we have significant traditional cultural heritage association with Kennedy Meadows, Middle Fork Stanislaus River, and Lyons Reservoir) and we agree that land conservation management plans are most imminent. These land management plans must address studies for, but not limited to: sustainable forestry; fisheries, native plants, and wildlife habitat; watershed enhancements; historic and cultural resource management and enhancements; agricultural use and enhancements; open space preservation; general public recreation areas; identifying hazardous waste or substance contamination areas; economic development; and associated monitoring plans. Once these studies are completed and acceptable management and monitoring plans are put in place, all parties involved will have achieved the goals and fulfilled the requirements of the LCP. The Tribe has always had paramount concern with the preservation and protection of our traditional cultural heritage associated lands and all other lands for our future generations. The Youth Investment Program is an excellent opportunity to teach youths the significance of land conservation and environmental stewardship. The Tribe is a proponent of youth education, as knowledge is empowering, and is one of the most valuable tools we can give to them. They in turn will have the ability to protect and preserve the land for their future generations. The Tribe looks forward to approval of Volumes I and II, so that Volume III can become the beginning for land conservation plans regarding PG&amp;E properties that are to be divested.</p>	<p>Tuolumne Me-Wuk Tribal Council</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. 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. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on the topics mentioned, as well as others 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>

General Comments

Comment	Commenter	Edit to LCP Made	Response
<p>I found the information in vol 1&amp;2 to be very ambiguous and general in nature. With all the existing public facilities already in place there is no need to take any land now held by leases. Also there is no homeowners representative on the Stewardship Board. The county representative is interested in how there tax base will be affected, and the PG&amp;E representative has said they are neutral regarding homeowners concerns, and their interest is in the hydroelectric facilities only. Therefore I feel that the Stewardship Council will do what they want without any concern for the homeowner.</p>	<p>William Spiller</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. 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 as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties. The Stewardship Council has not made any recommendations regarding the removal of cabins from the Watershed Lands. 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>