

Cow-Battle Creek Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
COW-BATTLE CREEK WATERSHED			
Cow Creek Planning Unit			
<p>[Condensed from letter] Please be aware that there are minor discrepancies in the acreages stated for this planning unit (CCPU) and the Shasta County Assessor maps. It is difficult to have a high degree of confidence for the acreage figures summarized in Volume I, Appendix 5, page 22. First the numbers in this spreadsheet total 2316 not 2310. Furthermore many SBE's are redundant for the Legal Parcel ID; and have essentially zero 1:1 correlation with like SBE's shown on the Shasta County Assessor maps that say the CCPU is comprised of 2263 acres total (2218+ 40+5). Two acres (1+1) of the delta is associated with the two small parcels. The remaining delta of 51/45? acres is of minor importance with respect to issues/comments associated with the CCPU large parcel of 2218 acres principally along Mill Creek.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	<p>Comment noted. The Appendix 5 total has been adjusted to 2316. This could have been the result of a rounding error. This data was obtained by the Stewardship Council from PG&E. The Stewardship Council is aware of the lack of correlation between State Board of Equalization (SBEs) and legal parcel numbers and the occurrence of redundant SBEs. This data will be revised during the development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs); at which time the Stewardship Council will develop parcel level maps on a planning unit by planning unit basis that identify legal parcels.</p> <p>As a public utility, PG&E is assessed for property tax purposes by the SBE rather than by the respective county Assessors. As such, the SBE parcel boundaries are not always the same as the legal parcel boundaries and therefore will not have a 1:1 correlation. Some legal parcels may be comprised of one or more SBE parcels while others may cover only a fraction of one SBE parcel.</p>
<p>"White alder is the dominant riparian forest community in the Cow Creek Watershed." Is statement made with respect to CCPU? See this report statement, page CB-20 1st paragraph on Forest Resources. White alder doesn't match writers impression of the limited CCPU area that he has hiked.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	Sentence deleted.
<p>"Freshwater marsh or seeps are common within the region and likely occur near South Cow Creek and the Cow Creek Powerhouse and Forebay" change to "and within the CCPU possibly occur along South Cow Creek. There are no seeps at the Forebay itself, and I do not remember seeing any in the small 5 acre parcel around the Powerhouse or where South Cow Creek touches the CCPU at Mill Creek. Before the September Redding meeting, I will on the 40 acre parcel, try to climb down the canyon below and explore this limited area for evidence of seeps. Any assessment for seeps in the CCPU most eastern ¾ mile contact South Cow Creek in that deep canyon is a major undertaking.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	<p>The Kilarc-Cow Creek Initial Information Package states that freshwater marsh or seeps could occur adjacent to the South Fork Cow Creek, that seeps may also be present adjacent to other project facilities (Cow Creek Powerhouse, etc.), and that freshwater marshes occur along the edges of ponds and creeks located at lower elevations, including the Cow Creek Forebay. "Likely" changed to "may" occur.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>"Aquatic species found in South Cow Creek include brown and brook trout, native resident fishes, and fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead. Late fall-run and possibly spring-run chinook salmon also utilize South Cow Creek." Statements with respect to salmon need proper wording to be correct. There is well documented historical, and current data, to support statements concerning existence of these salmon in South Cow Creek in lower regions below Wagoner Canyon and west of CCPU lands. In South Cow Creek to the east in and above Wagoner Canyon where the CCPU lands are, there is no historical record of their presence; and I believe there is no Resource Agency modern supporting data either.</p>	David W. Albrecht	No	<p>The Kilarc-Cow Creek Initial Information Package states that fall-run chinook salmon are found in South Cow Creek, late-Fall Chinook Salmon occur in South Cow Creek downstream of Wagoner Canyon and may reach the Cow Creek Diversion, and that although adult spring-run chinook salmon have been reported in South Cow Creek, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) does not believe South Cow Creek is suitable for spring-run. In 2005 responses to the Initial Information Package, the National Marine Fisheries Service, DFG, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service all stated that Central Valley fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout have been documented in the project area and the portion of South Cow Creek within the Project boundary is managed for anadromous and resident fish including fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and rainbow trout. The text within the Existing Conditions does not state that salmon occur within the portion of South Cow Creek within the planning unit due to their unknown existence within the creek, only that they occur in South Cow Creek.</p>
<p>"There is likely some fishing use of the Cow Creek Forebay by adjacent landowners as..." Please delete – not true.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	Sentence deleted.
<p>"LaTour State Forest and Lassen National Forest are located within approximately five miles. " Much further.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	Distance within the text has been changed to approximately 10 miles.
<p>Add to first Overview bullet : in 3 parcels of 2218, 40, and 5 acres with the latter two significantly separated from the large parcel acreage.</p>	David W. Albrecht	No	Comment noted. The planning unit maps are not intended to identify features at the parcel level of detail. During the disposition process, the Stewardship Council will develop maps that will include parcel information.
<p>Change acreage in second Overview bullet to "14 of 2263 acres are inside"</p>	David W. Albrecht	No	The acreages used in the LCP were obtained from PG&E. During the disposition process, a parcel level map will be developed and all acreages will be confirmed if necessary.
<p>Add to last Overview bullet: but is currently operational by PG&E until March 31, 2008 under a FERC one year extension issued April 10, 2007. PG&E received FERC approval on June 21 2007 for its decommissioning schedule submitted on March 23 2007, and the completed application is due by March 2009.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	Comment noted. The text has been revised to indicate that the project is currently operating under a one-year license extension, granted by FERC, until March 31, 2008.

Cow-Battle Creek Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Add to Overview: The Cow Creek Planning Unit (CCPU), that received its name label from the associated FERC hydro project, is located in Shasta County within a very large expanse of 50,000+ acres of primarily undeveloped agricultural, semi-timbered, and timbered lands). This vast area of open space land begins about 20 miles east of the City of Redding, and spans 20 miles to the east and is as great as 8 miles wide in a north/south direction. This region is defined by three improved State and County roads: on the south by State Rt. 44 running east/west, on the north by the Millville/Whitmore (Tamarack) running generally in a northeasterly direction, and on the east by Ponderosa Way running generally north/south. A significant portion of the above area is shown in Figure CB-5. Rugged volcanic geology in combination with the waters of Old Cow Creek, South Cow Creek, and Bear Creek define the lands, especially in terms of access (or lack of access) into it. Within this defined area, 18 large (600-6542 acre) agricultural/timber land holdings comprise 45,251 acres, or (77%) of the total acreage. Two of the 18 holdings are USA lands (1280 acres in 8 parcels), and the CCPU (2263 acres in 3 parcels). Two of the other tabulated large holdings (1 agricultural/1 timber) have significant acreage north and east of the Tamarack Road and Ponderosa Way respectively. Fourteen small ranches (200-600 acres), 19 small parcels (80-200 acres), and about 552 rural development (<80 acre lots/10 acres average) comprise 5450 acres (9.3%), 1912 acres (3.2%), and 6175 acres (10.5%) respectively. The latter rural development fundamentally lies at the perimeter areas along the improved roads. Excepting for some limited improved secondary roads near Rt 44 and Ponderosa Way, the only improved secondary County roads that penetrate the area are the two separate and unconnected 5-6 mile long dead-end sections of South Cow Creek (SCC) road. The one section, at low elevation (800 feet), leads in from Rt. 44. The other section, at 1800 feet elevation, leads in from the Tamarack Road near Whitmore.</p>	<p>David W. Albrecht</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The information provided is helpful, however given the level of planning at this stage, is beyond the detail of the descriptive text in the LCP. During the disposition process, the Stewardship Council will develop parcel level maps and text that include descriptions of specific land use features, roads, and other important information.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Add to Overview: The CCPU is comprised of 2263 acres in 3 parcels (2218 acres, 40 acres, and 5 acres) of semi-timbered grazing land. The principle parcel of 2218 acres (about the same size as the average large ranch acreage in this area) ranges in elevation from 1600-2300 feet, and is located just south of the Tamarack Road lying generally in an east/west direction along the waters of Mill Creek. Four large and one small ranch, two other 160 acre parcels, and rural development directly abut this CCPU parcel that is accessed, and is approximately bisected and cut, by the first part of SCC road running generally to the southwest from Tamarack Road. On the south boundary of this CCPU parcel; distributed along or reached by secondary gravel roads branching from SCC road is about 940 acres (about 95 lots) included in the aforementioned 6175 acres of rural development; part being known as "Mill Creek Estates". Another 1250 acres nearby in the "small lot category" included in the tabulated 6175 acres of rural development lies south of the Tamarack Road east of Fern Road, and on to the northern part of Ponderosa Way. There is other significant small lot rural development acreage north of the Tamarack Road in the Whitmore region that is not included in the tabulated 6175 acre number. The 40 acre CPUC parcel, abutted by two large ranches and a 80 acre parcel; and having part of the existing small Forebay (1600 ft elevation) for the Cow Creek Hydro project is located over 2 miles from the end of SCC road (Whitmore side). It is generally accessed from this point over unimproved/un-graveled secondary roads across private lands. About a mile to the southwest from the Forebay at 840 feet elevation is the remaining 5 acre CCPU parcel having the Powerhouse for the existing hydro project. This parcel lies totally within the bounds of a large 1444 acre ranch at the end of SCC road from the Rt 44 side; with the only access again across private property. The above two small CCPU parcels are situated approximately in the center of the 50,000+ acre undeveloped open space agricultural/timber region previously described.</p>	<p>David W. Albrecht</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The information provided is helpful, however given the level of planning at this stage, is beyond the detail of the descriptive text in the LCP. PG&E rights for access in some of these lands does not equate to public access. Public rights for access to lands will be addressed during development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). During the disposition process, the Stewardship Council will develop parcel level maps and text that include descriptions of specific land use features, roads, and other important information. Some of the information provided may be used at that point.</p>

Cow-Battle Creek Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Add to Overview: Although the entire CCPU spans a length of about 5.5 miles east to west; and South Cow Creek (SCC) also crosses this span, SCC's contact with the CCPU lands is limited to three areas; with all these areas totally surrounded by large tract private lands having no public access. In the southeast corner of the eastern most ½ Section of the CCPU, where SCC has just begun its rapid climb from 1900 feet elevation to its very high origins in the Latour region, it crosses that parcel for about ¾ miles in a very rugged canyon that is both steep and deep. SCC retouches the CCPU again briefly (for about 100 yards) on the southern boundary of the large parcel in the west at the confluence with Mill Creek. SCC also crosses the northwest corner of the isolated 40 acre Forebay parcel for about 1000 feet at an elevation of 1300 feet in the deep and rugged recess of Wagoner canyon as the creek descends from the above valley land at 1600/1880 elevation to the lower valley at less than 800 feet elevation. For several years now, all the waters of SCC the entire way to its headwaters, have been closed to fishing except for catch and release.</p> <p>The associated Kilarc-Cow Creek FERC Project 606 hydro infrastructure with the CCPU is minimal (0.6%) at a total of 14 acres with only 0.1% or 1.8 acres associated with the large 2218 acre parcel, with all the features within 500 feet of the southern boundary of that parcel in an area just east of the SCC/Mill Creek confluence. FERC project infrastructure is 7.2 acres on the 40 acre parcel, and 100% of the 5 acre Powerhouse parcel.</p>	<p>David W. Albrecht</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The information provided is helpful, however given the level of planning at this stage, is beyond the detail of the descriptive text in the LCP. PG&E rights for access in some of these lands does not equate to public access. Public rights for access to lands will be addressed during development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). During the disposition process, the Stewardship Council will develop parcel level maps and text that include descriptions of specific land use features, roads, and other important information. Some of the information provided may be used at that point.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Add to last Overview paragraph after ...and other project stakeholders: none were from the immediate local community, or were the private landowners directly affected to terminate the relicense process and seek to decommission.</p> <p>Add to last Overview paragraph after ...was denied by FERC: in December 2006. PG&E submitted a decommission schedule/timetable to FERC on March 23, 2007 that received FERC approval on June 1, 2007; and is due by March 2009. Since April this year PG&E has held several community meetings soliciting Stakeholder input, and has very recently initiated more specific discussions with affected local landowners as to how possibly FERC infrastructure features on their land would be removed or treated as a consequence of decommissioning. At least one more annual license for PG&E will be necessitated before the present decommissioning application process is completed. Recently during the last nine months, another outside entity has expressed an interest in the Project, especially the Kilarc portion. Therefore in March 2009 there may yet be another application to continue operating this hydro project.</p>	David W. Albrecht	No	<p>Comment noted. The LCP provides an overview of land use and management, and is to serve as the framework for disposition of the Watershed Lands. The information provided is important, however, a detailed description of FERC license issues is beyond the detail intended in Volume II. PG&E has provided a copy of the Draft LCP to FERC. The Stewardship Council will keep apprised of the status of the FERC license. During the disposition process the Stewardship Council will take into consideration the status of the license and/or the decommissioning process.</p>

Cow-Battle Creek Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Add to Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat after ...and aquatic habitat: primarily along Mill Creek (that has relatively little seasonal variation in flow levels and its low temperatures) and also along those limited lengths of SCC whose contact with the CCPU have been explicitly described. As long as the hydro project is operational; there is aquatic habitat at the Forebay and along the main SCC canal on private property leading to it; along the short Mill Creek diversion canal that is also on private property as well as CCPU lands, and in the limited section of Hooten Gulch that is downstream of the powerhouse before its confluence with SCC. That section is a small fraction of the total length of Hooten which is a seasonal tributary of SCC. Therefore, if and when the Project decommissions, and the infrastructure removed; within the CCPU the changes are minimal as follows: that aquatic habitat now along the CCPU portion of the Mill Creek canal transfers back to the nearby short length of the creek's natural stream bed below the Mill Creek diversion structure that is only about 200 yards upstream of the creek's confluence with SCC; the flows in SCC increase significantly in Wagoner Canyon through the 1000 length in the 40 acre CCPU parcel, with less than two acres of Forebay wetlands above reverting back to the typical semi timbered condition as on those lands around it for great distances. A short length of Hooten Gulch also reverts to the same seasonal conditions as the rest of Hooten upstream of the Powerhouse.</p>	<p>David W. Albrecht</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment Noted. The Kilarc-Cow Creek Initial Information Package states that fall-run chinook salmon are found in South Cow Creek, late-Fall Chinook Salmon occur in South Cow Creek downstream of Wagoner Canyon and may reach the Cow Creek Diversion, and that although adult spring-run chinook salmon have been reported in South Cow Creek, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) does not believe South Cow Creek is suitable for spring-run. In 2005 responses to the Initial Information Package, the National Marine Fisheries Service, DFG, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service all stated that Central Valley fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout have been documented in the project area and the portion of South Cow Creek within the Project boundary is managed for anadromous and resident fish including fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and rainbow trout.</p>
<p>Add to the end of the Open Space paragraph: that is very consistent and in keeping with the surrounding 50,000+ acre of agricultural/timberlands previously described.</p>	<p>David W. Albrecht</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Existing Conditions text has been revised to indicate surrounding land use. The text now reads "Open space values are found throughout the planning unit. The primary land uses are grazing and timber production and there is a lack of development and recreation facilities. These land uses are congruent with the surrounding 50,000+ acres of agricultural and timber lands."</p>
<p>Add to Outdoor Recreation: These public recreation areas, <i>together with that now existing in the nearby Kilarc Planning Unit</i>, provide a larger variety...</p>	<p>David W. Albrecht</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Report has been revised to say, "These public recreation areas, together with the recreation areas in the nearby Kilarc Reservoir Planning Unit, provide a larger variety and quantity of recreation activities and facilities than those available within the planning unit and thus receive greater use."</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Add to Agricultural Uses after first sentence: One small ranch and 5 of the 17 aforementioned large ranches directly abut the CCPU lands. Nearby, many other referenced small and large ranches lie within the region about the waters of SCC, Old Cow Creek, and Bear Creek.</p>	David W. Albrecht	No	<p>Comment noted. The information provided is helpful, however given the level of planning at this stage, is beyond the detail of the descriptive text in the LCP. During the disposition process, the Stewardship Council will develop parcel level maps and text that include descriptions of specific land use features, roads, and other important information. Some of the information provided may be used at that point.</p>
<p>Replace first sentence of second paragraph under Historic Resources with: "There is one known, and possibly one other recorded site within the CCPU." Please do not reference sites that can't be substantiated to be on CCPU lands.</p>	David W. Albrecht	No	<p>This information has been substantiated.</p>
<p>Add to Endnotes: 2. Many secondary unimproved dirt roads shown on the planning maps are not well maintained or signed and navigation can be difficult; and therefore appropriate caution should be exercised. 3. For the 50,000+ acre area in and around the CCPU lands, a separate detailed land use map has been provided by a private landowner, and is on file for this planning unit.</p>	David W. Albrecht	Yes	<p>Comment noted. The planning unit maps are not intended to identify features at the parcel level of detail. During the disposition process, the Stewardship Council will develop more detailed maps including all roads as well as other features. The following text has been added to the Existing Conditions text: "Many secondary unimproved dirt roads in the planning unit are not well maintained or signed and navigation can be difficult."</p>
<p>There are 2300 acres of land in Unit 8, PG&E lands. I believe maintaining and conserving these lands for their present uses; open space, timber, grazing, flora, fauna, and wildlife; benefits all present and future residents of the watershed. Any other uses including opening the area to campers, or day hikers with planned parking areas leaves the lands and my land (surrounded on three sides by PG&E) open to fire, vandalism, and lots of garbage. I am also worried about any changes to Kilarc/German Ditch will impact my adjudicated/riparian water rights.</p>	Debbie	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not developed any potential measures for additional recreation use at Cow Creek. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for monitoring of recreation use and evaluating the potential for educational facilities/programs to demonstrate and promote appropriate grazing and sustainable forestry practices. This use would be specific and restricted to educational purposes only. 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), of which water resources is not specifically included. The Stewardship Council may not take any actions that result in impacts to water rights.</p>

Cow-Battle Creek Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Management direction provided for this planning unit should avoid any possible conflict with the decommissioning of the Cow-Kilarc project.</p>	<p>Friends of the River</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Kilarc-Cow Creek project affects only 0.7% of the planning unit and nothing is proposed specifically for that area. In addition, Volume II states: "We recommend this effort be conducted in close coordination with PG&E and the decommissioning process."</p>
<p>In the LCP the Stewardship Council recommends that permanent conservation easements be applied to ensure a higher level of open space protection. We recommend that the Stewardship Council identify a framework to be used to ensure that the requirements of any conservation easements administered are adhered to. There should be a check and balance system to ensure that the permitted and prohibited uses including the level of uses are adhered to. Please comment regarding the application of conservation easements in relation to the creation of the management plans the Stewardship Council is recommending. Will the management plans be created prior to the application of conservation easements? Will the conservation easements be directly associated with and based on these management plans? Thank you for addressing these comments.</p>	<p>Kelly Miller</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E is required to protect the watershed lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). Monitoring of the conservation easements is a specific requirement of the Stipulation. Please see Volume I section 2.3.9 for more information. 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. The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. 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>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>We would like to offer a comment regarding the Outdoor Recreation aspects of the Cow Creek planning unit. We recommend that type and level of recreation use on these lands are not only monitored, as suggested in the LCP but rather that a recreation plan is created to determine the appropriate types and levels of recreation for these lands. While it is assumed that there is very little recreation use on these lands due to limited access and proximity to state and national forests and parks it would be in the best interest of the adjacent community to have a recreation plan created in close cooperation with grazing lessees, and the Cow Creek Watershed Group to identify types and levels of recreation use on these lands are permitted and prohibited. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p>	<p>Kelly Miller</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. Text has been added to the potential measure regarding monitoring of recreation use to state that a recreation management plan would be developed if determined to be needed based on monitoring. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that: "If additional facilities or management is needed, efforts should be coordinated with the grazing lessees and management of forest and agricultural resources."</p>
<p>I am extremely disappointed to see that any plan is going forward so quickly, without a full ecological study being conducted as I have requested. It is far too soon to even begin making plans. The Eagles, the migratory birds, the other water life that are dependent on that body of water are just as important as the salmon that have never migrated up that river even prior to the dams construction. Once again politics seems to be taking the primary role in directing the outcome rather than what nature requires. Doing what is right will cost the same as decommissioning. So please lets do what is right. A FULL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY is requested and required before any decision is made. Thank you.</p>	<p>Laura Carnley</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. No decisions regarding implementation have been made at this time. The measures provided in Volume II are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive, and will be amended, deleted, or augmented over time in coordination with future land owners and managers to best meet the objectives for this planning unit. Baseline surveys will be completed prior to conveyance of the conservation easements and/or fee title. It is likely that additional surveys will be conducted to inform implementation, including the development of Land Management Plans. The overall objectives of the Land Management Plans will be described in the conservation easements, while the specifics will be determined post transaction. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders regarding 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>

Cow-Battle Creek Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>As a member of Friends of Cow Creek Preserve (FoCCP) and the Cow Creek Watershed Management Group (CCWVG) we support your objectives for this land unit. FoCCP has 33 active members and another 70 people in the watershed who have attended our meetings. We offer a proactive group who will be active in the management of these lands. An example of our "adaptive management" concerns your recommendation for recreation. Where you mention "monitoring recreation use" we urge limits such as no motorized travel, no firearms use, no fires. Our adaptive management will change accepted recreation as conditions evolve.</p>	RJ Roth	No	Comment noted.
<p>Thanks for your good work, and long hours, in order to conserve all the PG&E properties. I urge you to grant "Cow Creek Planning Unit" title and stewardship to Shasta County, Western Shasta Resource Conservation District, and the Cow Creek Watershed Management Group. There can be no better stewards than conservation districts which are dedicated to educating and helping local citizens conserve land, water, forests, wildlife, and other natural resources.</p>	RJ Roth	No	<p>Comment noted. 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.</p>
<p>We like the open space of the Section 8 area in Whitmore. We'd like to preserve this and additionally maintain the quality of life that we presently have in Whitmore. Thank you for hearing our comments.</p>	Ruth Patrick	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to preserve and enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) at Cow Creek, one of which is open space. Conservation easements that will be placed on the property will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed.</p>