

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
FEATHER RIVER WATERSHED			
Bucks Lake Planning Unit			
<p>[Condensed from letter] As a US Forest Service permittee at Bucks Lake, we wanted to put in a word of support on behalf of our fellow PG&E cabin permittees. We would like to encourage you regarding the Conservation Easements that might potentially be made of or on the subject PG&E lots to either leave the current governance intact, or, if donation is necessary, to donate the easement and governance to the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association. The cabin permittees can be considered one segment of the public. With regard to the general public, there are many places available - campgrounds, beach areas, forest trails, wilderness areas, etc. that rarely, if ever, are utilized anywhere near capacity.</p>	<p>A. Richard & Bobbie Jean Gilchrist</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. 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. 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>[Condensed from letter] We do believe your Volume II recommendations of permanent restroom facilities at both Bucks Creek and Haskins Creek entrances to the lake would be of value. Public facilities and pathways at Lakeshore would be okay as long as Lakeshore Resort is allowed to reopen with the services that they have provided to the public in the past - restaurant, store, cabins, marina, campground.</p>	<p>A. Richard & Bobbie Jean Gilchrist</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council does not control or manage any leases. However, it is the Stewardship Council's understanding that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort; and while uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities (via a lessee) for the public.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] We believe that Bucks Lake has a long history of providing great enjoyment to families - cabin permittees, campers, and day visitors - for many years, and we would like to see this continue in the future.</p>	<p>A. Richard & Bobbie Jean Gilchrist</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council potential measures for the Bucks Lake Planning Unit are not expected to change the character of the lake area, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) of the planning unit.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>We write as a family that has had a cabin on a PG&E lease at Bucks Lake since 1947. Your information does not outline or directly address the structure of Conservation Easements that are envisioned for Bucks. We have concerns about some aspects of proposed stipulations of the Stewardship Council Bucks Lake Land Conservation Plan. Let us begin with a word of thanks for your efforts so far. This seems a rapidly evolving effort, and we trust that mutually beneficial policies will result. In our judgment, Bucks Lake has fairly ample public recreational access, counting proposed facility developments at the west side Indian Rocks site. We are primarily concerned about the possible allowance for public access across our leasehold. We are in no position to constantly monitor public activity across our leasehold that may create fire or security issues. Would it not be wise to concentrate your access efforts on the Sundew and Sandy Point and Haskins Inlet areas? Concentrating public access here would greatly assist with public safety concerns. What is our increased liability if your CE allows additional rights above those stipulated in our lease? PG&E requires us to be insured and to name PG&E also. What will be the extent of additional liability? It is greatly hoped that the structure of your CE will encourage investment in the reopening of Lakeshore resort. Our lakeside community needs another viable resort, which would benefit visitors, residents, and Plumas County. Your CE should also address additional parking at the Bucks Creek lakeside trailhead, and development of rest facilities for fishermen at roadside near Bucks Creek. Additionally, we would also like to be able to improve existing structures on our lease. We are greatly concerned about the proposal for two parcels (458 acres) to be given away to a third party. We feel it crucial for these acres to remain in control of PG&E, or perhaps come under control of the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association. Third party ownership seems very threatening to us. Current summer events speak to the need for the immediate development of a Fuel Reduction plan. Please allow us to be a vital part of that process. The plan should speak to the issues of forest thinning and brush removal in cabin areas. Allow us to follow CA or Forest Service guidelines in defending our 100ft. perimeter zone. Our lease presently includes very restrictive [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	<p>Art & Sue Hurley</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the Disposition Package. Additional access is only recommended at the Lakeshore Resort and not in the cabin areas. Sundew and Sandy Point are U.S. Forest Service (USFS) sites, and therefore are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council; however, PG&E and USFS have collaborated on plans for recreation enhancements at those and other sites outside the planning unit. PG&E's recent evaluation of the potential for new recreation development at Haskins Cove concluded that additional development was not appropriate due to physical and environmental constraints. PG&E has proposed Bucks Inlet trailhead parking improvements, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project. The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a fuels management plan for the planning unit. Details regarding how forest resources would be managed in the future, including timber management and forest prescriptions, would be developed as part of the potential measure to develop a forest management plan for this planning unit. 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.</p> <p>As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages. 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</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>features that promote local safety and ecology, and it contains very stiff penalties for non-compliance. There is no compelling need to impose another layer of overly restrictive easements. While we regret that cabin owners are not directly represented on the council, we trust that by the comment process we can together develop effective conservation easements.</p>			<p>public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>To introduce myself to the Stewardship Council, I am 74 years old and have gone to Bucks Lake since I was 6 months old. My family background is that my father, Ray B Wiser, was very instrumental in developing the 4-H Campgrounds in Haskins Bay at Bucks Lake when he was with the Butte County Farm Bureau and for many years the President of California Farm Bureau. We presently are PG&E leaseholders with a lot on Mile High Road and 5 years ago built our dream retreat that we had waited 42 years to do. The preservation of the majestic beauty of Bucks Lake is a great deal of concern to our family. For all these years the homeowners and businesses at Bucks Lake have developed the area, established a homeowners group and cared for the pristine surroundings of the lake. It is disheartening to think that outside forces could come into the area and establish a plan that could endanger what has been worked on, maintained and cherished for so many years. If this were to happen the concerns are: who is going to monitor, on a continuing basis, the clean up and maintenance of areas; who will educate the people about the existing fire dangers; who will monitor that the responsible parties will carry the ultimate of liability insurance to protect all the areas opened to the public. Rather than disturb the areas that presently have leaseholder's homes and/or businesses, it would seem to be a prudent thing for the Stewardship Council to concentrate on developing and/or improving the areas that already exist with public access. This already is the majority of land area around Bucks Lake. PLEASE, I ask the Stewardship Council to consider the extreme importance of doing extensive due diligence of investigation and show a more comprehensive understanding of how your decisions will effect all the people involved. There seems to be a great many unanswered questions still on the table with very ambiguous answers up to this time. One of my biggest concerns is, "how will your decisions effect the future for many years of our beautiful Bucks Lake and the future of how my grandchildren will be able to enjoy and continue to nurture this beautiful place?" Thank you for listening to my love and concerns for our future at Bucks Lake. THE COUNCIL HAS A HUGE RESPONSIBILITY IN MAKING THE RIGHT DECISIONS!!!</p>	<p>Betty Evanoff</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Monitoring plans will be developed for each parcel or set of parcels. See Volume I section 2.3.9 for more information on monitoring. The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a fuels management plan for the planning unit; education could be a component of this plan. The Stewardship Council has recommended potential measures to preserve and enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) at Bucks Lake. Should these measures be implemented, they are not expected to negatively affect the resources at the lake, but rather enhance the BPVs within the planning unit. Enhancement of public access is recommended only at the Lakeshore Resort, at an existing developed day use site.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
There is serious concern among the Bucks Lake Community that the "vision for close cooperation" with the local community is actually being addressed.	Bucks Lake Homeowners Association	No	Comment noted. Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs), consistent with the LCP, Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, will be developed through a multi-step process described generally in Volume I, which will include stakeholder participation. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Council will notify all interested members of the public and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.
[Condensed from letter] The homeowners on Mile High Road maintain our road. This is a very narrow dirt road and really only able to handle the homeowners traffic. If the public had use of this road it would create congestion in the area and abuse to the road. The only parking we have is the parking in front of our home and any additional traffic would cause constant expensive maintenance and deterioration of this small country road.	Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg	No	The Stewardship Council has not developed any potential measures that would lead to additional public use of Mile High Road.
[Condensed from letter] A major concern of the homeowners and leaseholders in this area is the extreme fire danger we face due to the lack of fuel reduction plans for this area. Bucks Lake is highlighted as severe on the Cal State Fire severity map. To increase public access and recreation in the Bucks Lake area would surely increase the fire danger. Many of these people who are day recreation people have no respect for the environment and potential fire danger. We who live here are concerned about it on a daily basis.	Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg	No	Comment noted. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of reducing fuels at Bucks Lake. Therefore, a fuels management plan for the planning unit has been recommended.
[Condensed from letter] If you are looking for areas to expand at Bucks Lake the obvious place would be the Sun Dew and Sandy Point areas. We can attest that both areas for the 4th of July and Labor Day times were no more than 50% occupied. Sandy Point has the ability to be expanded 2 times it original size. I, as a businessman, who handles many financial accounts cannot understand in my wildest dreams why anyone would want to invest more money in public use when the public does not even use what they already have.	Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg	No	The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for additional day use access only at the Lakeshore Resort site. Sundew and Sandy Point are on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands and are therefore not under the purview of the Stewardship Council; however, PG&E and USFS have collaborated in developing plans for future enhancement of these and other sites in the context of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project.

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] There is not any need for additional use for public access. They already have plenty of access. If you want to make improvements to this area might I suggest the mouth of Bucks Creek with installing parking, sanitary facilities (permanent ones so they do not tip over) and along the SE Bucks Lake Road for all the fisherman.</p>	<p>Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>As part of the implementation of the FERC license for the Bucks Creek Project PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for the installation of a portable chemical toilet to be considered for the southeast shore near Bucks Creek inlet. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] I understand there are 458 acres of the 2165 PG&E acres at Bucks Lake that are earmarked to be given away to a third party entity. Why don't you leave these to PG&E or give these to the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association?</p>	<p>Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified 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>
<p>[Condensed from letter] With more public access into private neighborhoods this will bring more liability. We, as lease-holders, should not have to bear the additional cost for this liability. Currently the Forest Service requires us to be insured and have the Forest Service named as well. We should not and will not be responsible for the general public's liability. Who will be that party, you?</p>	<p>Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for additional day use access only at the Lakeshore Resort site, not in the cabin lease areas.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] With respect to Lakeshore Resort, this needs to be reopened again as a commercial venture not as a day use recreation spot. Plumas County needs the tax revenue and Bucks Lake homeowners and visitors need the competition and variety that reestablishing a restaurant would bring. Youth camps can be expanded on the south shore of Haskins Bay, Sun Dew and Sandy Point, as I previously pointed out above. Why not focus instead on your mission to preserve the historical, cultural and environmental aspects? Not more public access.</p>	Christine Gerwin & Christopher Walberg	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The Stewardship Council has developed potential measure to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) at Bucks Lake including cultural resources, open space, outdoor recreation, habitat, and sustainable forestry. The potential measure to enhance public access at the existing developed site at Lakeshore Resort is not intended to conflict with future resumed operation of the resort. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] After reviewing the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, I was able to better understand the Council's concept for day use at the Lakeshore Resort location. As expressed in my November letter, I am concerned that the resort be provided with enough resources to succeed when it is re-leased. Tables and interpretive signage are a good idea. BBQ facilities may compete with the resort. The stairs and a retaining wall may serve a dual purpose in preventing erosion, while creating safer pedestrian passage for resort and public users. Let me repeat however, that Bucks Lake and the Quincy community need a comprehensive and successful commercial operation at the Lakeshore Resort!</p>	Chuck Leonhardt, Plumas County Assessor	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The potential measures for public day use improvements at the site are not intended to conflict with future operation of the Lakeshore Resort.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] Thank you for hearing our request for bathroom and trash disposal facilities at Bucks Creek. Facilities at Haskins are also a good idea. The installation of any facilities in the Haskins area should take into consideration that the meadow is a designated helicopter landing site for medical emergencies.</p>	Chuck Leonhardt, Plumas County Assessor	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for the installation of a chemical toilet and refuse container at Haskins Cove, which would not conflict with medical helicopter landing in the meadow. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>After attending several meetings, I still cannot understand why with 85% of public access areas there is a need to create conservation easements [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	Clauss	No	<p>As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>on our leased properties. Our leases are already extremely detailed with PG&E able to take away our lease if any conditions are violated. Why would we not take care of our properties we cherish so much?! We want to maintain them for our children and grandkids. We feel extremely vulnerable to your council taking away our lease for your youth program access because it is closer and easier or you just feel you need more than the 85% that already exists and have the power to do so. When asked at the last meeting, we were told this council would not take away our leases, but that does not insure us, if you want the land you will just have PG&E take our lease away. WHY can't we get in writing that our leases will not be terminated, by you or PG&E unless we violate the rules according to our lease? A proper conservation easement could benefit all of us if it protects and improves what we already love and does not create harsh feelings and consequences because we have been unfairly taken advantage of after taking care of our properties and surrounding areas for so long. WHY since this can so directly affect our leases with PG&E are we unable to have leaseholder representation ON THE COUNCIL or at committee meetings? WE SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT to correct representation. PG&E cannot and admitted they are neutral in decision making when it concerns our leases. They are only concerned about the utility portion of their involvement. OUR LEASES AND PROPERTIES DESERVE REPRESENTATION after being the "stewards" of this land for so many generations. If you are truly stewards of youth and land, PLEASE have consideration for the families that already exist.</p>			<p>third parties. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). The easements will describe all prohibited uses, including the level of uses allowed. 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.</p> <p>Should PG&E remain the landowner of the lands that are referred to in the comment, which is highly likely, leases will continue to be held and managed by PG&E. Please see Appendix 7 of Volume I for an overview of the Stewardship Council's official policy on existing agreements.</p> <p>The Stewardship Council Board of Directors are appointed by Organizations and Government Agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and also includes other public members, such as the representative of the Native American Heritage Commission as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The public Board Members are appointed by the CPUC to "...assure adequate and balanced representation of all ratepayer interests affected by the Land Conservation Commitment..."</p> <p>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>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] To be perfectly honest, we don't need to be advised, told, assisted, or helped to "preserve and enhance our biological and cultural resources" (Vol. 11 FR-69) at Bucks Lake, because we have been doing just that without direction from your council since 1932. If it weren't for conscientious and dedicated cabin owners, who understand that ownership is something highly valued and is worth protecting, saving, preserving, and fighting for, Bucks Lake would not look as good as it does today. My hope as a cabin owner is that you would focus your public enhancement intentions on the areas of the lake that are already publicly designated areas or the parts of the lake that do not directly affect cabin owners. To create more public access, especially on or through cabin lots is unnecessary, unneeded, and frankly ridiculous.</p>	<p>David W. & Don E. Beskeen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure to enhance day use access at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas.</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] With respect to the conservation easements (CE), I do not believe this is a necessary instrument from the cabin owner's perspective. Our current leases are very restrictive with what we can and can not do on the land, so the necessity of CE escapes me. Plus, a poorly written CE has the potential of decreasing property values and county tax revenue, which would affect many people. It seems to me that a conservation easement would only be necessary if the use of the land were to change from its current use (privately held cabin leases) to another private or public use. However, since a CE is being developed, my concern is that the CE would focus on preserving the existing conditions and environment of cabin lots, that is the historical, cultural, and environmental aspects as they currently exist. There is nothing wrong or broken with the current use or condition of the PG&E cabin lots at Bucks Lake and the CE should not be used as a tool to interfere or establish conditions which would change the current use of cabin lots. Any CE should only be used to preserve the existing use of cabin lots, period.</p>	<p>David W. & Don E. Beskeen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by third parties. The potential measures for the planning unit are not intended to change the current use of the cabin lots. However, potential measures to conduct biological surveys and development of a wildlife and habitat management plan, in coordination with lessees, may identify opportunities to preserve and enhance habitat. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] If it is the council's desire to fund youth programs in the area, I would suggest you take advantage of the many existing facilities already built and in place around the lake or in other areas specifically developed for such purposes. There are numerous campgrounds and private camps that are not fully occupied that could be used for such programs. At Bucks, there are shoreline areas from Sundew campground to Mill Creek campground that are conducive for such programs, which would not interfere with cabin owners.</p>	<p>David W. & Don E. Beskeen</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 are no potential measures that would lead to youth access and/or programming occurring on the cabin lots. Developing the details regarding where and how these opportunities might be brought forward into implementation will occur during the disposition process, where there will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic and others related to future use and management 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] Knowing that the council must give away lands to a third-party entity, I would recommend that the council give away the 458 acres of PG&E land to the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association or leave it with PG&E to manage.</p>	<p>David W. & Don E. Beskeen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). 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>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] I feel that Bucks Lake is one of the few places in California that "is" in good balance with the land. I also feel that we as lessees have been good stewards to the lands we occupy. I do agree however that there is always room for improvement but I find it hard to believe that taking away our unique privileges of having our cabins would be one of them since we occupy such a small part of the lake. We as leaseholders have been holding our breath for years now and personally I'm bothered by the fact that we seem to have no "say so" or representation within the Stewardship Council. In the mean time each one of us is dealing with our own unique situations of needing to do improvements, fixing our water systems, rebuilding to be able to maintain our current insurance standards or wanting to sell (with PG&E's permission) and can do nothing without knowing where we stand. Though I do agree with Ms. Battey that we need to look to the future in preserving the lands for future generations and for bringing youths to this area I too would like to feel secure in knowing that my family and friends can continue to enjoy our cabin instead of feeling that at the age of 60 my cabin will be taken away from me and I will have nothing to show for my investment. In a nutshell I'm very scared and very upset. To close my letter I can only say that I hope we can work together in achieving both your goals of youth programs and conservation as well as our goals of maintaining our leases. I would like to ask that you please consider us an equal and vital part of maintaining and developing the future of Bucks Lake.</p>	Donna Lingle	No	As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, the LCP must recognize all existing economic and environmental uses on the Watershed Lands. The Stewardship Council has not recommended the removal of any cabins.
<p>[Condensed from letter] I have appreciated being kept informed about your deliberations concerning PG&E property at Bucks Lake. But I also feel that neglecting to include leaseholders on the Council has limited your ability to have all the information at hand to help you make fully informed decisions. The backbone of Bucks has been the lessees, the lodges, and the campgrounds and recreational vehicle use areas that have existed for as long as I can remember. I sincerely hope that your upcoming recommendations to increase the use of Bucks will at the same time affirm, strengthen, and preserve this important fact.</p>	Doug Waterman	No	Comment noted. The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use nor change the character of the lake area, but are expected to enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs).

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] I heartily support your good intentions toward the use of PG&E watershed lands. In the specific case of Bucks Lake however I do question some of your proposals. The most obvious reason to severely limit any changes to the area's management is the generally pristine condition of the place as you mention in your research. Aside from the cabin sites, most of the lake area is available to public access, and can get very busy on weekends. For a small, fragile place, I do wonder how much more population can be safely supported.</p>	Frank Hoffman	No	The Stewardship Council has not recommended any measures that would significantly increase recreation use.
<p>[Condensed from letter] I support your ideal of inner city youth access to the Sierra, but I do wonder how appropriate this severe fire risk area at Bucks would be for this purpose. Kids unused to this completely different and more fragile environment than home would need total supervision at every moment. The current Haskins campground area does seem like the most safe and practical location for such a camp, and I would hope it would be started on a small scale initially to assess safety issues.</p>	Frank Hoffman	No	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. Developing the details regarding where and how these opportunities might be brought forward into implementation will occur during the disposition process.
<p>[Condensed from letter] In closing may I suggest that the paying leaseholders and caretakers of cabin lots should be given more representation in your planning process. Also, for the 458 acres that you plan to give away - why not consider the Homeowners Association that has proven its careful stewardship and environmental compliance for many years?</p>	Frank Hoffman	No	Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine qualified donees, which can include public entities or non-profit organizations. 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.

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] Our family has built and owned a cabin on Forest Service property since 1949. We did a major re-model in 1987. Currently the cabin is in a family trust and is enjoyed by many family members. In all those years Bucks Lake has remained a pristine and lightly used area for recreation. Through our homeowners association, fire protection is provided and cabin owners insure that the forest areas around their cabins are cleared of any growth that represents a fire hazard. Our concerns are of a very general nature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current recreation areas at Bucks are quite adequate and very lightly used. We doubt that any cost benefit analysis would justify spending more money on recreational access. 	Frank Spiller	No	<p>The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure to enhance recreational access only at the existing Lakeshore Resort site. This measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. These modest enhancements are not intended to conflict with potential future use of the site by resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort.</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] We would like to see Lake Shore Resort re-opened as a viable commercial establishment. We doubt that this will happen because of the uncertainty created by the Stewardship Council.</p>	Frank Spiller	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] We cannot understand why the Bucks Lake homeowners were not represented on the Council. What better way to get input on the area! Was this oversight intentional?</p>	Frank Spiller	No	<p>The Stewardship Council Board of Directors are appointed by Organizations and Government Agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and also includes other public members, such as the representative of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The public Board Members are appointed by the CPUC to "...assure adequate and balanced representation of all ratepayer interests affected by the Land Conservation Commitment..."</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] The Bucks Lake area has always been very safe with low crime. Has the Council considered the need for increased security because of increased usage and expanded youth programs?</p>	Frank Spiller	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has not developed any potential measures that would significantly increase recreation use.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from website comment] Our Bucks Lake Homeowners Association is prepared to give you recommendations on what recreational areas need improvement. It's too bad they weren't represented on the Council.</p>	Frank Spiller	No	<p>The Stewardship Council Board of Directors are appointed by Organizations and Government Agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and also includes other public members, such as the representative of the Native American Heritage Commission as appointed by the Board of Directors, and other public members selected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The public Board Members are appointed by the CPUC to "...assure adequate and balanced representation of all ratepayer interests affected by the Land Conservation Commitment..."</p>
<p>[Condensed from website comment] With increased recreational usage shouldn't the Council consider providing funds for improving fire prevention?</p>	Frank Spiller	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a fuels management plan for the planning unit. Funding mechanisms will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>One of the treasures of the Bucks Lake watershed is the dedicated wilderness area that extends northward from the north shore. We hope that your ultimate planning will keep this shoreline undeveloped except for walk-in trails and the current California Riding and Hiking Trail. This should be one of your stated goals. Thank you for keeping us all informed and for the opportunity to comment.</p>	George Gleghorn	No	<p>The Stewardship Council does not propose any development along the north shoreline adjacent to the wilderness area, and developed a potential measure that the north shore lands be managed as a buffer for the Bucks Lake Wilderness Area. Such management would emphasize current trail use.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] One objective of the Bucks Lake Planning Unit is to "provide additional public access" through enhancement of recreational facilities (LCP Vol. II, FR-70). I believe that the Stewardship Council's goal of additional public access can be met in ways that will complement (and not compete with) existing uses. Public access should be enhanced in areas where such access is needed and in ways that preserve the existing uses of individual cabin owners and maintain the integrity of the Bucks Lake community, which is an important stakeholder at the lake. An appropriate balance has been struck between private and public, permanent and temporary, recreational uses around the lake, and it is important to preserve the role that existing leaseholders play in that balance. Increased access should be implemented in ways that will incentivize the leaseholders to continue investing in the Bucks Lake community.</p>	James Pollock	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use access at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. The modest potential enhancements are not intended to conflict with existing use or future resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] The Land Conservation Plan also discusses the possibility of creating a permanent conservation easement. Because such an easement could take many different forms, it has been the source of much discussion and concern for the Bucks Lake leaseholders. The outlines of any conservation easement affecting the leaseholders should recognize the successful resource management procedures and methods that are already in place. Any conservation easement should avoid unnecessary replication of procedures and methods that are already in place to ensure that environmental conservation and maintenance goals are met. I'm worried that a conservation easement might add an additional layer of administrative process and expense to a system that already works. I am hopeful that any future conservation easement can be tailored to meet the needs of existing and future users of the lake, protecting the interests of cabin residents who have successfully implemented conservation measures and allowing for continued private recreational cabin uses. Modifications contemplated by the Stewardship Council should maintain and enhance the relationships that have resulted in such willingness to invest time and money in the Bucks Lake area.</p>	James Pollock	No	<p>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 be held by third parties. The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. The Stewardship Council will utilize existing information and data, as well as existing plans to inform the development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, a donee of fee title and/or a conservation easement can be either a public entity or a non-profit organization. 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. 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>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>My most significant concern regarding Bucks Lake is with respect to the term of the ground leases for the cabin tenants. In the past, PG&E renewed the ground leases for terms of 10 years. The renewal term has recently been shortened from 10 years to less than 4 years, which has caused concerns and uncertainty in the community of leaseholders. Questions about the future of Bucks Lake could negatively impact the community's willingness to invest in the maintenance and improvement of the lake. As an example, the Lakeshore Lodge has recently closed its doors after many years in operation due to questions about the future of Bucks Lake. In order to increase confidence about the future of the existing cabins and to motivate continuing personal and financial investment in the lake area, long term lease renewals should be implemented. The cabin owners' commitment to the sensible management of the lake would be strengthened by the increased certainty of being able to enjoy the benefits brought by their considerable investments in Bucks Lake, and I ask for the Stewardship Council's support for continuing long-term lease renewal terms.</p>	James Pollock	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. PG&E remains the lease manager and has committed to follow the Stewardship Council recommendation to extend leases not longer than December 31, 2013, which time the disposition of lands is to be complete, in terms of Stewardship Council responsibilities. Should PG&E remain the landowner of the lands that are referred to in the comment, which is highly likely, leases will continue to be held and managed by PG&E.</p>
<p>Forestry: All forestry activities in Plumas County should specifically mandate coordination with the community specific prescriptions in the Plumas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan, adopted by the State Fire Marshall, the Board of Supervisors and the Plumas County Fire Safe Council on private land as well as the Herger Feinstein Quincy Library Group Act on National Forest lands. Objectives should stress collaboration with these two efforts, any future county policies affecting forestry and fuels management as well as prescriptions suggested by the Bucks Lake Fire Department. PG&E is currently (actively promoting carbon offset opportunities for its ratepayers. PG&E also controls and manages a substantial land base in "timbered acres" (V.1, Appendix 6-2). The 51,700 acres statewide (including 5,350 acres in Plumas County) could be managed in ways designed to enhance carbon sequestration and "additionality". This would assist the implementation of AB 32 (global warming response) for both the state and the ratepayers.</p>	John Sheehan	Yes	<p>Text has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations and main Volume II documents to include coordination of development of the forest and fuels management plans with relevant county plans. Details regarding how forest resources would be managed in the future, including timber management and forest prescriptions, and addressing carbon sequestration, would be developed as part of the potential measure to develop a forest management plan for this planning unit. 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.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Lakeshore: The Draft's call (FR 67 & 73) to "Provide day use" is much far too equivocal on whether or not the "former" resort will return. PG&E's responsibility should be to provide the circumstances for the needed resort to return, including, if necessary, financing for wastewater improvements as part of a lease arrangement with a new resort operator/owner. The Supporting Analysis (V. II FR 35) reviews the background for the potential public day use area at Lakeshore (in addition to a restart of the resort). Further analysis should be given to this concept, particularly its effects upon adjacent cabin lessees to the east. Additionally, this proposed day use area management must be coordinated with the new resort operation so as to not provide either a financial drain, inadequate maintenance or inappropriate competition.</p>	John Sheehan	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The modest potential day use and shoreline access measures at the Lakeshore Resort site are not intended to conflict with existing use or future resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort, nor with cabin leaseholders to the east.</p>
<p>Open Space Easements: No conservation easements should be instituted until and after proposed easement language has been disclosed and publicly vetted with current lessees and Plumas County for Property Tax implications (FR 73). Plumas Corporation has requested inclusion on the donee registry. Plumas County has requested the right of first refusal for all lands. We trust these requests will be responded to in the final LCP.</p>	John Sheehan	No	<p>Conservation easements developed during disposition will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. Qualified conservation easement and fee simple donees will be determined during the disposition process (Volume III). As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties. 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>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Rest Rooms: Draft calls to “consider” restrooms at Haskins and Bucks Creek should move beyond consider into “provide funding to install and maintain”. Language in the narrative concerning the possibility of others (presumably USDA Forest Service) installing a facility at the Bucks Creek trailhead should be removed and resolved in the final LCP to PG&E taking full responsibility for construction or maintenance and whichever site is chosen at Bucks Creek. The Supporting Analysis (V. II, FR 35) suggests a portable chemical toilet. This is insufficient. A permanent accessible restroom, either a vault or tied in to a larger wastewater collection system, should be constructed.</p>	John Sheehan	No	<p>The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for the installation of a portable chemical toilet to be "considered" for the southeast shore near Bucks Creek inlet in recognition of a perceived need by Bucks Lake residents, but also recognize a need for future discussion with PG&E about this potential enhancement in light of other planned or proposed enhancements and operational considerations. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] We are proud that more than 85 percent of Bucks Lake is currently available for public access and believe this access should continue. We don't feel that public access would be beneficial through parcels of leaseholders, due mostly to liability concerns.</p>	Judy & Scott Machabee	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] We feel that Lower Bucks Lake, the south shore of Haskins Bay and the area from Sun Dew Campground to Sandy Point would be ideal locations for the implementation of youth programs and additional public access. These areas would allow greater access to the wonders of Bucks Lake without residential distractions.</p>	Judy & Scott Machabee	No	<p>Lower Bucks Lake and the Bucks Lake area from Sundew to Sandy Point are U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands and are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council. Recent analysis by PG&E has concluded that the south shore of Haskins Bay is not an appropriate area for recreational development due to physical and environmental constraints. The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] We support Lakeshore's reopening as a commercial operation and not as a day-use recreation area.</p>	<p>Judy & Scott Machabee</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The modest potential day use and shoreline access measures at the Lakeshore Resort site are not intended to conflict with future resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] We have enjoyed Bucks Lake for more than 30 years and feel there are a few areas that need improvement: the parking and restroom facilities at the mouth of Bucks Creek and along southeast Bucks Lake Road. In addition, we have learned that two parcels totaling 458 acres owned by PG&E are to be given to a third party. It seems logical to us that the US Forest Service receive this land, as it has systems in place for management of these parcels.</p>	<p>Judy & Scott Machabee</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The Stewardship Council developed potential measures for consideration of chemical toilet and refuse containers to be installed along southeast Bucks Lake Road. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during 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 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>
<p>There are several points that seem in need of emphasis in regards to the Stewardship Council's plans for the PG&E lands at Bucks Lake. Firstly, there seems to be plans for expanding the public access and recreational [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	<p>Kevin & Gail Owens</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>uses for Bucks Lake. As Bucks Lake summer residents for many years, it is clear that there are abundant opportunities for the public to utilize this area. With over 85% of the Bucks Lake area available already for public use, it would appear that taking these existing resources and developing them further should be the first step. There are several campgrounds at the lake, and they are rarely at full capacity. These camp areas are an excellent spot for the public to use when staying and exploring the Bucks Lake area.</p> <p>Next, it is important to point out the excellent job being done by both PG&E and Forest Service lease holders with regards to stewarding the Bucks Lake area. The tireless energy continually funneled into this area by these people have served the area well. The pride shown by these stewards is obvious to anyone who visits the area. The Forest Service relies heavily on us to pick up trash, maintaining trails, and providing the manpower for countless other services in and around the lake. The volunteer fire department was created by and is maintained by the local residents. These volunteers not only serve the local residents, they also aide and assist all public who visit the Bucks Lake area.</p> <p>We are concerned with the Stewardship Council's plans for this area. The residents and lease holders at Bucks Lake have shown through their actions for years that they understand the issues and requirements to steward this land. However, it appears that the council has chosen to push forward with their ideas, with no significant input or representation of the current stewards for this area. We feel that representation by members of the Bucks Lake community is essential if the Stewardship Council truly desires to develop a sustainable plan for this fragile recreational location.</p> <p>We fully support the planned termination of the council in 2013. There is no need to perpetuate this council past that date. During the next 6 years, [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>			<p>The Stewardship Council is committed to substantially completing the land disposition planning work by the end of 2013. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on disposition and long-term management and monitoring as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management 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>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGES.]</p> <p>it is our hope and desire that the council and the local residents work hand in hand to do what is best for this region. The council's legacy should be that of cooperation and understanding as it works with all involved parties. The Stewardship Council can by its actions promote and improve this area, or irrevocable damage to the quality of this area. Let that not be your legacy.</p>			
<p>My grandfather built his cabin up at Bucks Lake in the 1930's. Through 3 generations, we have taken good care of our property, keeping the land clear and submitting to the forestry standards to decrease the risk of fire around our cabin. I am very impressed of how well Bucks Lake residents keep up their property also. It is a very well maintained area. There is now 85% of Bucks Lake that is available to public access. If anything, the existing public access is underutilized and creating more public access through leaseholder parcels doesn't make sense. Develop what you already have. The primary focus for the Conservation Easement should not be more public access; instead it should be involving the preservation of the historical, cultural and environmental aspects. A properly designed CE can be of benefit to all if it preserves what we value most and protects from incompatible uses. Once again, Lakeshore must be reopened as a commercial venture, and not a day use recreation spot. Plumas County needs the tax revenue and all associated taxes, not just property taxes. Also, the Bucks Lake Homeowners could use the competition and variety that reestablishing a restaurant would bring to the area. The area of Haskins Bay and from Sun Dew to Sandy Point can be expanded for youth programs with greater access to the outdoors without residential distractions. Have you taken time to look at the Bucks Lake campsite occupancy figures? Why would there be a need for further occupancy if we only experience a 30-40% occupancy rate? Sanitary facilities and parking at the mouth of Bucks Creek and along the south east Bucks Lake Road for the fisher people are some areas needing improvements- and [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	<p>Laura Hoffman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. The modest potential day use and shoreline access measures at the Lakeshore Resort site are not intended to conflict with future resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort. No camping enhancements are recommended. PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure for consideration of chemical toilet and refuse containers to be installed along southeast Bucks Lake Road. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process. Preservation and enhancement of public access is a mandate of the LCP as directed by the Stipulation Item 12(e)(2). The Stewardship Council is committed to identifying synergies between the Youth Investment Program and the Land Conservation</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>permanent structures- not just portables that can be tipped over. On the California State fire severity map, Bucks Lake is highlighted as severe on the map. The SC's "Beneficial Public Values" is to increase public access and recreation in the Bucks Lake area. Many of these people using the area will not have respect for the fire danger. Right now, there is not a fuel reduction plan for public, private, Forest Service and PG&E. Our County Supervisors are concerned that the SC's plan is in direct and material conflict with Plumas County's. Let us cut some trees and defend our 30-100 foot parameter based on California or forestry guidelines. There is no need for a very restrictive Conservation Easement when our leases themselves are very restrictive and defined with violations punishable by loss of lease ie: Lakeshore. An improperly written CE that adversely affects the parcels will diminish land values and this CE will be "held by an (as of yet) unidentified third party.</p>			<p>Program, to be determined on a planning unit by planning unit basis, as to what is appropriate in each area. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for a fuels management plan for the planning unit. However, details of such a plan, including defensible space areas, would be developed in the disposition process. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] I understand 458 acres (two large parcels) of the 2165 PG&E acres at Bucks are destined to be given away to a third party entity - We suggest you leave these with PG&E or consider giving these to the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association.</p>	<p>Loree & Steve K. Gorman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). 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>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] It concerns us greatly that you are considering public access between cabins. What's the increased liability for us as leaseholders and private landowners if the proposed increase in public activity emboldens them with rights over others property? Currently PG&E requires us to be insured and name PG&E too. Where will this additional liability lie? Who will police them and if there is a need for medical attention who is responsible? Since 1947, my family and I have been stewards of the ground on Mile High Road. I know from my years of morning walks the litter, dirty diapers, cigarette butts and aluminum cans left behind are picked up by those of us who cherish the area. I hope you will address the need for waste management. We have witnessed visitor's who have no respect for fire danger. The devastating losses in the South Lake Tahoe fire make me wonder will we have to worry that stranger's might threaten our cabin? Based upon CA or Forestry guidelines we know PG&E should let us defend our 100 foot perimeter not 30 feet!</p>	<p>Loree & Steve K. Gorman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of reducing fuels at Bucks Lake. Therefore, a fuels management plan for the planning unit is included as a potential measure.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] It is my opinion that there are plenty of campsites not occupied the majority of the time. It would be our suggestion that you enhance the existing public campgrounds Haskins, Sun Dew to Sandy Point.</p>	<p>Loree & Steve K. Gorman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has not developed a potential measure for any additions to camping facilities, and no need for expanded camping opportunities has been identified. The Sundew and Sandy Point areas are on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) land and are thus not under the purview of the Stewardship Council.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] The existing Lakeshore Resort needs to be reopened. Plumas County needs the tax revenue and Bucks homeowners and visitors would certainly support it. Bucks Lake needs improved sanitary facilities. They should be permanent structures. Not portables to be tipped over!</p>	<p>Loree & Steve K. Gorman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The improvements may include a new vault toilet. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>
<p>Forestry: All forestry activities in Plumas County should specifically mandate coordination with the community specific prescriptions in the Plumas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan, adopted by the State Fire Marshall, the Board of Supervisors and the Plumas County Fire Safe Council on private land as well as the Herger Feinstein Quincy Library Group Act on National Forest lands. Objectives should stress collaboration with these two efforts, any future county policies affecting forestry and fuels management as well as prescriptions suggested by the Bucks Lake Fire Department. PG&E is currently (actively promoting carbon offset opportunities for its ratepayers. PG&E also controls and manages a substantial land base in "timbered acres" (V.1, Appendix 6-2). The 51,700 acres statewide (including 5,350 acres in Plumas County) could be managed in ways designed to enhance carbon sequestration and "additionality". This would assist the implementation of AB 32 (global warming response) for both the state and the ratepayers.</p>	<p>Ole Olsen, Plumas County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Text has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations and main Volume II documents to include coordination of development of the forest and fuels management plans with relevant county plans. Details regarding how forest resources would be managed in the future, including timber management and forest prescriptions, and addressing carbon sequestration, would be developed as part of the potential measure to develop a forest management plan for this planning unit. 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.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Lakeshore: The Draft's call (FR 67 & 73) to "Provide day use" is much far too equivocal on whether or not the "former" resort will return. PG&E's responsibility should be to provide the circumstances for the needed resort to return, including, if necessary, financing for wastewater improvements as part of a lease arrangement with a new resort operator/owner. The Supporting Analysis (V. II FR 35) reviews the background for the potential public day use area at Lakeshore (in addition to a restart of the resort). Further analysis should be given to this concept, particularly its effects upon adjacent cabin lessees to the east. Additionally, this proposed day use area management must be coordinated with the new resort operation so as to not provide either a financial drain, inadequate maintenance or inappropriate competition.</p>	<p>Ole Olsen, Plumas County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The modest potential day use and shoreline access measures at the Lakeshore Resort site are not intended to conflict with existing use or future resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort, nor with cabin leaseholders to the east.</p>
<p>Open Space Easements: No conservation easements should be instituted until and after proposed easement language has been disclosed and publicly vetted with current lessees and Plumas County for Property Tax implications (FR 73). Plumas Corporation has requested inclusion on the donee registry. Plumas County has requested the right of first refusal for all lands. We trust these requests will be responded to in the final LCP.</p>	<p>Ole Olsen, Plumas County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Conservation easements developed during disposition will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed. 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 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>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Rest Rooms: Draft calls to “consider” restrooms at Haskins and Bucks Creek should move beyond consider into “provide funding to install and maintain”. Language in the narrative concerning the possibility of others (presumably USDA Forest Service) installing a facility at the Bucks Creek trailhead should be removed and resolved in the final LCP to PG&E taking full responsibility for construction or maintenance and whichever site is chosen at Bucks Creek. The Supporting Analysis (V. II, FR 35) suggests a portable chemical toilet. This is insufficient. A permanent accessible restroom, either a vault or tied in to a larger wastewater collection system, should be constructed.</p>	<p>Ole Olsen, Plumas County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for the installation of a portable chemical toilet to be "considered" for the southeast shore near Bucks Creek inlet in recognition of a perceived need by Bucks Lake residents, but also recognize a need for future discussion with PG&E about this potential enhancement in light of other planned or proposed enhancements and operational considerations. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>12. Conservation Easements & Implementation - As leaseholders in one of the pilot units, we were assured at the recent Quincy community meeting by Jayne Battey that 5 – 6 new environmental folks were going to be hired. The concept being that a “lead” environmental planner would be assigned to the pilot units to work directly with the stakeholders in formulating a conscientious, palatable conservation easement. The large number of Bucks Lake people present look forward to this as part of the process.</p>	<p>Rick & Jani Frey</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is currently expanding its staff to support the work related to disposition process, which will occur between 2008 and 2013.</p>
<p>2. Lakeshore Resort - must be reopened, once again, as a commercial venture not a day use recreation spot. Vol. II Table FR-8 states “Provide public day use area amenities and improved pedestrian shoreline access at the existing site at Lakeshore Resort.” Plumas County needs the tax revenue (all associated taxes not just property taxes) and Bucks homeowners and visitors need the competition and the variety that reestablishing a restaurant would bring.</p>	<p>Rick & Jani Frey</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The modest potential day use and shoreline access measures at the Lakeshore Resort site are not intended to conflict with future resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
3. Youth programs - Expand them on the south shore of Haskins Bay and from Sun Dew to Sandy Point with greater ease of access to the outdoors without residential disruptions.	Rick & Jani Frey	No	The area from Sundew to Sandy Point is U.S. Forest Service (USFS) land and is not under the purview of the Stewardship Council. Recent analysis by PG&E has concluded that the south shore of Haskins Bay is not an appropriate area for recreational development due to physical and environmental constraints. The Stewardship Council is committed to identifying synergies between the Youth Investment Program and the Land Conservation Program, to be determined on a planning unit by planning unit basis, as to what is appropriate in each area.
4. Occupancy Figures - Most of the time, there are very few homes or campsites occupied. Have you compiled "occupancy" figures on Bucks campsites? If we already experience a 30-40% vacancy rate or more, why is there any need for more expansion?	Rick & Jani Frey	No	Existing and Projected Recreation Use Studies conducted by PG&E in 2001-2002 were reviewed during the development of the LCP. No campsite expansion is recommended by the Stewardship Council.
5. Areas we need improvements - mouth of Bucks Creek parking, sanitary facilities there and along the SE Bucks Lake Road for all the fisher people. Permanent structures – not portables to be tipped over.	Rick & Jani Frey	No	Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The improvements may include a new vault toilet. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>6. Disposition Process - 458 acres (two large parcels) of the 2165 PG&E acres at Bucks are destined to be given away to a third party entity. Please seriously consider the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association (501c3) a viable option.</p>	<p>Rick & Jani Frey</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. A final determination regarding lands available and appropriate for donation will be made during the development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). While the current maps in Volume II indicate which lands <u>may</u> be available for donation, they are not a final indication of what will be retained or otherwise donated by PG&E. Further, 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. 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>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>7. Conservation Easements - With the leaseholders, focus the Conservation Easement on the preservation of the historical, cultural and environmental aspects, not more public access. A properly designed CE can be a benefit to all of us if it preserves what we value most while protecting from incompatible uses. All landowners or leaseholders (Forest Service or PGE) are directly or indirectly affected by the conservation easements (CEs). With this onus hanging over Plumas County's head, real estate sales (private or leased) and commercial revenue has plummeted the past three years, Lakeshore has been closed as a commercial establishment, diminishing sales taxes and other revenue to the county. A CE could be good if it's not too restrictive. But if it is, it will not only effect the PGE properties but also those surrounding them. If it doesn't allow for structure improvements, for adequate fuel control, for limitations of public access across leaseholders' property then adjacent private properties may also suffer. If the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association (a 501c3) or a relevant type of group is qualified to hold the CE can Plumas County qualify? This would be more desirable than an unrelated "third" party.</p>	<p>Rick & Jani Frey</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Stipulation, potential fee title and conservation easement donees can include public entities and non-profit organizations. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). 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. Preservation and enhancement of public access is a requirement of the LCP, as directed by the Stipulation Item 12(e)(2), along with preservation and enhancement of the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation the implementation of the LCP must be property tax neutral to the affected counties.</p>
<p>9. Sustainable Forestry – Appears that there could be considerable discrepancies between Plumas County and the Stewardship Council as to the appropriate policy and defensible space for homeowners. Will the LCP merely add to this confusion?</p>	<p>Rick & Jani Frey</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, including timber, fuels and fire management and response 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.</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>	<p>Rick & Jani Frey</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of reducing fuels at Bucks Lake. Therefore, a fuels management plan for the planning unit is included as a potential measure.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>We have several concerns that we will outline briefly below. Though Volumes I & II profess to be in a user friendly format, we found them very labor intense for “laypeople” to review and found very little specificity:</p> <p>1. Good Stewards - As outlined in Volume II, Bucks Lake residents have been good stewards of their land (whether leased or private) and the surrounding environment for decades. Over 85% of Bucks Lake is currently available for public access. Enhance those existing access areas but don’t create more through leaseholders parcels.</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas.
<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	The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. The site of the potential enhancement measure has historically been used by the general public as part of the resort's lease area (existing facilities include a small patio, lawn, and volleyball court).
<p>Sheriff – EMTs – Search Rescue – Obviously, increased public usage will require additional services. Money will come from where?</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	The Stewardship Council has not developed any potential measures that would significantly increase recreation use.
<p>Due to the severe fire danger in Plumas County and at Buck's Lake, the grazing rights of the cattlemen MUST be preserved for fuel reduction.</p>	Rick & Jani Frey	No	Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is not recommending any changes to grazing use.

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] Table FR-8 [for Bucks Lake]. Thirteen of [the potential] measures came from SC staff recommendations and all are written in a forceful fashion. Two of the measures came from the public and equivocally begin with "Consider..." and obviously carry a lesser degree of importance than the others. Yes, this is a picky, little point. However, it illustrates how we, the public, perceive our interaction with the SC. You explained that the "consider" wording was done to give the new owner flexibility. It is clear from reading the table heading "Potential Measures to Preserve and/or Enhance BPVs-Not Requirements" that all 15 of the measures are suggestions, not requirements. You also state in the LCP, "Volume II also identifies a number of preservation and/or enhancement measures that may contribute to the conservation management program for each planning unit. These measures 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 objective for each planning unit." Why didn't all 15 measures begin with consider? Or, none of them? One measure from the public was "Consider installation of a portable chemical toilet and bear-proof refuse container at an appropriate site near the south shore of Bucks Creek inlet." Consider this, many more cars park south of the mouth of the creek than the trailhead. Many families with children stay most of the day south of the creek and fish. People at the trailhead park their cars and leave immediately to hike the trail or enter the wilderness area. Perhaps facilities on the southern side would eliminate the need for an enhancement at the trailhead. The mouth of Buck's Creek is not just an informal access point, it's where the fish are. As the lake is drawn down, the mouth of the creek moves to the west and so do the cars and the people. So, once again, why was the word "consider" put in the two measures that came from the public?</p>	<p>Ron Cooke</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>PG&E has proposed improvements at the Bucks Inlet trailhead, subject to future survey results, as part of FERC license implementation for the Bucks Creek Project, as described in the Revised Recreation Use Plan (Exhibit R) submitted to FERC in 2006. The improvements may include a vault toilet building. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for the installation of a portable chemical toilet to be "considered" for the southeast shore near Bucks Creek inlet in recognition of a perceived need by Bucks Lake residents, but also recognize a need for future discussion with PG&E about this potential enhancement in light of other planned or proposed enhancements and operational considerations. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] The purpose of this letter is to comment on the Stewardship Council (SC) Draft Land Conservation Plan (LCP), Bucks Lake Unit. In particular, file 15_VOL_1_APPENDIX_5_INDIVID, page 5-51. For some people (Stewardship Council officials, PG&E officials) this table is completely adequate. You know the code numbers of SBE parcels and associated acreages. You know how these relate to the Plumas County Assessor plats, you know where the project boundary lies in relation to the parcels. From all this information, you know how much acreage is available for donation and where it is located. Unfortunately, you won't share your GIS data! Neither will PG&E. This means that for some people (the public), the table is completely inadequate. If my assessment is correct, the project boundary goes through my leaseheld property (Lot 76). Maybe this is nothing to worry about! But, maybe it is. Could it mean two owners? What about two different conservation easements? Might these mean a decrease in value? What about the cabin owners that think they are within the project boundary but are not? Interested members of the public in the Bucks Lake Unit possess a great deal of collective knowledge about the area and can help with the LCP and deal with problems as long as we are informed. When one party possesses all the knowledge and refuses to share it creates a void that is difficult to cross.</p>	<p>Ron Cooke</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Information in Appendix 5 is incomplete. The Stewardship Council will be developing parcel level detail maps during the disposition phase of work. Lease data provided to the Stewardship Council by PG&E indicates that all of the 70 recreation homesite leases at Bucks Lake, with the exception of the three leases on the south side of the Oroville-Quincy Highway (south of Haskins Bay), are within the FERC Project boundary. Parcel splitting, ownership changes, and conservation easement language will be determined during the disposition process. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on these 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>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>We just wish we had better representation on the Council and/or the meetings. I have written before and want to make one last effort to make sure everyone understands just how important our cabins are to us at Bucks. There are pages I could write outlining why the Stewardship Council should allow us to "live in peace" and leave us alone but mainly I just want to say how frustrated we all are that we are even having to address this situation. We are all so confused why something needs to be possibly done with our little community when "it ain't broke and does not need fixing"!!! There are acres at Bucks available now for public access. Getting Lakeshore Resort up and running (not just for day use), provide shoreline access to the public at Lakeshore and improve the already existing "public use" areas all make so much sense. Our leases are very restrictive as they are and we do not need more restrictions regarding our easements. We need to know soon that our leases will be extended and that the Council will see their way clear to let us go on being good stewards and knowing we are going to be left alone "in perpetuity".</p>	<p>Roslyn Zimmerman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Should the parcels that are referred to in the comment be retained by PG&E, which is highly likely, leases will continue to be held and managed by PG&E as the landowner. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, preserve and enhance the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. 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 email] We are the Westover family. We have been good stewards of the Bucks Lake area since 1948. Lakeshore (ex resort) should be reopened either as a private lodge or public lodge. As a private lodge the STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL could use it as headquarters for camping facilities (i.e., the boy and girl scouts or youth center programs. PG&E, at the homeowners meeting, said they are repairing the water and sewer system and rebuilding the boat ramp. With that done, it should be fairly easy to reopen. I'm sure that Plumas County would like the added tax revenue as well as PG&E. With 70 million to spend on land preservation and improvement, Lakeshore resort should be reopened, Bucks Creek inlet parking and sanitary facilities should be established, along with road repair to PG&E's Three Lakes and Grizzly Lake. The Bucks Creek campground has been closed. This is the season for camping and that campground should be opened. Probably it's closed, because it does not have up to date sanitary facilities. Permanent facilities should be built and maintained. We would like to see the 70 million spent prior to the expiration date of 2013.</p>	<p>Russ Westover</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. Bucks Creek campground (no such named facility - assume that the comment is intended to refer to the Whitehorse Campground on Bucks Creek, east of Bucks Lake), Three Lakes, and Grizzly Lakes are on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands and are therefore outside the purview of the Stewardship Council. The Stewardship Council is committed to substantially completing the land disposition planning work by the end of 2013.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from email] I understand that there is some pressure to make more of the property (including some of the lots on which the families have built cabins) the subject of unrestrained public access, either through some form of Conservation Easement or general fiat. I must respectfully disagree with any assessment that suggests that that is necessary or appropriate. My understanding is that something approaching 90% of the shoreline is already available for public access. In my annual walks around the lake, I observe (with some variation, depending upon weather, season, fire reports, and the state of the American dollar) a number of campsites unused, or used very sporadically. In other words, I simply don't see the need for significantly increased access to the public to those relatively few areas where families have built cabins, and where those families have made significant investments in both money and sweat equity to protect and preserve the lakefront. There are significantly increased liability risks to the property owners whose facilities might be used or misused by uninformed members of the public. Moreover, such unrestricted access would discourage the current tenants from the active maintenance of that portion of the lake: why cut brush, take down trees, ensure litter removal, shore up eroded lake banks, if the beneficiaries are primarily others? I appreciate the considerable work that has gone into the Land Conservation Plan. I know that the vast majority of stakeholders act and speak in good faith. I believe that the families that have so much history of good stewardship of their leased parcels deserve the opportunity to continue that stewardship. I am convinced that there is more than enough unused or underused shoreline to accommodate current and reasonably foreseeable recreational use without compromising the interests of the families that have put so much of themselves into their leased parcels.</p>	Steve Burke	No	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to provide public day use amenities and improved pedestrian shoreline access at the existing site at Lakeshore Resort. The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] Our family has had a Forest Service lease at Bucks Lake since the late 1940s. I support maintaining access to our open spaces. I ask that the Stewardship Council maintain a balanced view and keep the interests of all stakeholders (our youth, leaseholders, local municipalities, Bucks Lake businesses) in mind as decisions are made regarding the Land Conservation Plan. I am sure that you have received input from other leaseholders. The points that are of most concern to me include: Make use of existing available space for new youth programs before creating new available space that will create conflict of interests. These areas can be improved providing much of the new access that is proposed. Much of the current available space at Bucks Lake is underutilized. Recognize that the current Bucks Lake residents have been good stewards of Bucks Lake and the surrounding areas for the past 70 - 80 years. Ensure that there is not a negative revenue impact to the local communities. Lakeshore resort should be opened as a business, assisting with the above bullet. Ensure the Conservation Easement is not too restrictive. Decisions made should not have a negative impact on property values. Leaseholders and other stakeholders should have a voice at Stewardship Council meetings.</p>	Steve Spiller	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public. The Stewardship Council has only developed a potential measure for additional day use at the Lakeshore Resort site, not into the cabin lease areas. 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 these topics 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>[Condensed from letter] It has come to my attention that this Stewardship Council has been formed to give back to the State of California a number of acres of land owned by PG&E. There are 30 residences that are located on Mile High Road [at Bucks Lake]. The land they have been built on is owned by PG&E. I would like to outline several thoughts as to why it may not be financially feasible to restructure the existing land usage...no paved access...roads have extensive water and sewer systems buried under them...surrounded by Forest Service lots and road...only accessible four months out of the year...actual usage would appear to be minimal...long family history rooted at the lake...I would appreciate your consideration in the above statements and allow the existing easements to stay as is.</p>	Steve Ward	No	<p>As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, the LCP must recognize existing economic and environmental uses. The Stewardship Council is not recommending the removal of any cabins, nor is it recommending any other major changes in land use.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>I, and my family and friends, representing over four generations of visitors to Buck’s lake, are deeply concerned over the prospect of the Stewardship Council considering any changes in land management plans, real or implied, on PG&E properties at Bucks Lake, Plumas County.</p> <p>We have always been impressed with the abundance and availability of camping and picnic areas around the lake, which seem to be well maintained. They are easily accessible and give a variety of opportunities for the public to participate in the Sierra experience. I was recently visiting Buck’s Lake (4-12 August), and noticed that many of the camp sites were unoccupied. This is typical of my experience and the experience of my family and friends over many years. Our cabin, on PG & E Lot #1, was built by my Grandfather (Frank Baxter) in 1933-1934. We have all tried to be good stewards of the land and have a deep attachment to the property. Over the 75 years we have visited Buck’s, we have carefully maintained the structure, improved the water systems and waste management, cleared brush and dead trees from the lot, and have done everything possible to keep the forest areas in as natural a state as was possible and minimize the impacts of our visits. Having recently reviewed your proposal for changes in the area, we see potential for degradation, not improvement. Pollution and safety at the lake shoreline are examples. We are also concerned over boat and dock liability, as well as the increased risk of forest fire danger caused by careless actions of occasional visitors who do not have the commitment shared by those in my family who have responsibly carefully cared for this area for over 70 years. It is also puzzling, when there are other camping and outdoor experiences available at established Bucks Lake campgrounds and Lower Bucks Lake, why it seems necessary to make changes to Lakeshore Resort. Lakeshore Resort has traditionally provided a source of competition to Bucks Lodge (the only other such venue in the area), keeping costs low and quality high for services to Bucks visitors. Based on our experience, the management plan is an expensive proposal which offers the same services already available in abundance (which are underutilized) along with significant risks to the pristine forest and lake areas.</p>	<p>Ted Hoffman</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding Bucks Lake are not expected to significantly increase use or change the character of the lake area, nor are they expected to increase safety risks. The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to enhance recreational access only at the existing Lakeshore Resort site. This potential measure is in response to the lack of suitable public day use or shoreline access on the south shore of the lake, most of which is occupied by commercial and cabin lease sites. These modest enhancements are not intended to conflict with potential future use of the site by resumed operation of the Lakeshore Resort. The Stewardship Council potential measures also include development of a fuels management plan to reduce fuel loading and fire hazard.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Many of the cabins that are on Bucks Lake PG&E leased property were built in the nineteen thirty's and forty's. Most cabins are of adequate size and construction, but there are some that are less than four hundred square ft and some cabins need major update such as foundations. There are already two bureaucracies to deal with when trying to obtain building permits. It would be nice if this new layer of oversight didn't add extra time and money to the permit process. We all win when properties are improved and well maintained.</p>	<p>Tim Eade</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>BPV#1: The three points of measure are accomplished today via the studies completed, the lease, and the Shore Management Plan along with the Wilderness Act of 1984. BPV#2: With greater than 85% open space at high water line and 100% shore access at lower lake levels, coupled with the requirements for no development on over half the lake implements the BPV#2. This value is enforced and enhanced by the lease requirements, Shore Management Plan, and Recreation Use Plan. BPV#3: First measure would be harmful to the commercial lease. The area considered for public day use is used for wedding, BBQs. and other fund raisers for the commercial lessee. The parking area above is used for paid parking of trailers; another source of income for the commercial lessee. Why are the next two measurements in the "Consider" category verses "provide" (these were suggestions from the stakeholders)?</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The potential measure to develop a wildlife and habitat management plan would identify opportunities to enhance habitat in all areas and would provide specific guidance or requirement, which are not contained in the PG&E lease agreements. Conservation easements will provide open space protection to the entire planning unit, as some areas are not covered under existing documents. The potential measures to make enhancements to day use facilities and shoreline access at the Lakeshore Resort site are not intended to conflict with future re-operation of the Lakeshore Resort; the site appears to offer room to accommodate this use and past commercial uses, with minor modification. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for installation of a portable chemical toilet to be "considered" in recognition of a perceived need by Bucks Lake residents, but also recognize a need for future discussion with PG&E about this potential enhancement in light of other planned or proposed enhancements at Bucks Creek inlet and operational considerations. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>BPV#4: Existing documents already exist with PG&E. There implementation has proven to be successful and adaptable throughout the years. The THP has been reviewed by numerous governmental and environmental agencies and complies with all current state and federal regulations. BPV#5: The Vol II indicated the occasional grazing by cattle and horses near the south end of Haskins Bay. Are there no provisions to continue? BPV#6: This effort has been on-going (at least within the FERC land) since the re-licensing process in the 1960s, and continues each re-licensing period. Request that the coordination be accomplished with those lessees who have cabins over 50 years old, which qualifies as historical building.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A Timber Harvest Plan (THP) is a one-time document that guides the harvesting of timber resources. The Stewardship Council recommends a potential measure to develop a forest management plan to provide a long-term sustainable forestry-based vision for the forest resources at Bucks Lake. The Stewardship Council has not suggested any changes to grazing use within the planning unit; the grazing lease would continue. Cultural resource data is lacking for areas outside the FERC Project Area of Potential Effects (APE), which includes most land within the planning unit. Development of a cultural resources management plan would include identification of cultural resources, potentially including some cabins, and associated coordination with cabin owners. 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.</p>
<p>Consider the potential measure section to be accomplished by a review process of existing documents and not recreate the information at considerable expense.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has reviewed numerous management plans and resource studies for the Bucks Lake area. It is expected that this information would be utilized, as appropriate, to inform the development of the Disposition Package.</p>
<p>Fish, Plant, & Wildlife Habitat, second para. Ref the completed resource protection plans...this exhibits a living commitment to the environment that cannot be duplicated in a onetime, less flexible CE.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by third parties; and that will preserve and enhance the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs).</p>
<p>Historic Resources. Suggest adding the cabins that are older than 50 years (considered historical by both county and state) to the historical and cultural resources of Bucks Lake.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Text has been added to Existing Conditions stating that some cabins may be historic resources.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
Outdoor Rec, right col, first para. Ref Lake Shore Resort...The Stewardship Council should support PG&E by investing in the environmental upgrades necessary to, once again, make Lake Shore a viable commercial resort.	William A. Nicholau	No	Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that PG&E is in the process of identifying a new lessee for the Lakeshore Resort. Although uncertain due to required regulatory approvals, PG&E has indicated that it anticipates that the resort will be open to the public for the 2009 recreation season. In the interim, PG&E will continue to operate and maintain the campground and RV facilities for the public.
Right Col, Last sentence - Included in the Shore Management Plan are requirements for the lessee that are considerably more than boats and docks.	William A. Nicholau	No	The referenced page describes the Shore Management Plan (SMP) as addressing "management of boat docks and other shoreline facilities and uses," which accurately summarizes its contents.
Right Col, second para. That which is stated coupled with the other lease and Shore Management Plan requirements cover all the BPVs associated with the LCP and are levied on the lease holders today. Once again, suggest these legal documents be used to implement the CE requirements.	William A. Nicholau	No	As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by third parties; and that will preserve and enhance the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs).
Right Col. First para. The Bucks Lake Planning Unit should continue to be updated and enhanced by the ongoing studies required by FERC. The more than 20 studies currently completed cover the BPVs in great detail with mechanisms to ensure compliance legal documents in place to monitor and adjust with the changing environment. This process should be conclusive proof that CE requirements can be implement in an existing process and not require a separate CE process.	William A. Nicholau	No	As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by third parties; and that will preserve and enhance the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs). The studies and management plans primarily relate to lands within the FERC Project boundary. However, nearly 600 acres of land within the planning unit is located outside the FERC Project boundary.
Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, fire management & response plan: Much work has been done on this topic through the combined efforts of Plumas County, Meadow Valley FD, and the Bucks Lake FD. Suggest a review of the plans for a basis to ensure fire preparedness.	William A. Nicholau	Yes	Text has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations and main Volume II documents to include coordination of development of the forest and fuels management plans with relevant county plans.
Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, first & second para: FERC requires PG&E to accomplish these types of efforts. Also suggest cultural resource measures be coordinated with historical building owners (cabins over 50 years old) in addition to Native American entities.	William A. Nicholau	No	Comment noted. The development of a cultural resources management plan would include identification of cultural resources, potentially including some cabins, and associated coordination with cabin owners as appropriate.

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, Fish Plant & Wildlife Habitat: Should evaluate the cost of this document versus the present condition based on the years of lessee care, establishment of a Wilderness Area in 1984, and the fundamental (in place) restrictions on development that has lead to a significant increase in Osprey, Eagle and waterfowl nesting at Bucks Lake. These facts along with individual programs to increase native fish, protect land animals and restrictions to preserve various native vegetation should all be considered before expending additional funds.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The potential measure to develop a wildlife and habitat management plan would include an assessment of current conditions on leased sites and other lands within the planning unit. The Wilderness Area does not overlap the planning unit. Review of existing lease requirements, resource studies, and management plans suggest that a need remains for comprehensive information and consistent guidance for wildlife and habitat management.</p>
<p>Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, open space protection: Suggest review of existing open space and consider existing rules and regulations on development restrictions prior to a CE overlay that may be duplicative in nature. (ie SMP, Leases, Wilderness Area, PG&E basic requirement for Pacific Power in 1929 that states no development (ever) on half the lake and provided public access between recreational home sites at appropriate intervals). With over 85% of the shoreline available to the public at high water and 100% available when the lake is drawn down may be adequate for open space.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). 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>
<p>Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, Outdoor Rec Potential Measures: Take exception to measure one being "provide" and measure two being "consider", given measure two is stakeholder input versus measure one being Staff input. All options should be equal at this stage of development</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure for the installation of a portable chemical toilet to be "considered" in recognition of a perceived need by Bucks Lake residents, but also recognize a need for future discussion with PG&E about this potential enhancement in light of other planned or proposed enhancements at Bucks Creek inlet, as well as operational considerations. Specifics regarding implementation will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, Potential measure: Suggest making extensions to existing PG&E and USFS Plans if necessary. Suggest Stewardship Council support the development of a single PG&E and USFS fuels management plan that all Bucks Lake parties can implement.</p>	<p>William A. Nicholau</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>There is currently no fuels management plan for the planning unit. The Stewardship Council cannot make recommendations for the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) or their lands. However, text has been added stating that the potential measure to develop a fuels management plan for the planning unit would be developed in coordination with the USFS.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, second para: With the oversight of the USFS, State Laws and the County, plus the extensive requirements to get a THP approved (various environmental groups, etc) one should review the success to date in forest management and weigh it against the cost of duplicating these tasks.	William A. Nicholau	No	A Timber Harvest Plan (THP) is a one-time document that guides the harvesting of timber resources The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a forest management plan to provide a long-term sustainable forestry-based vision for the forest resources at Bucks Lake.
Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, top of page: The forest management plan has been accomplished through the THPs which include fuels management and wildlife and habitat management.	William A. Nicholau	No	A Timber Harvest Plan (THP) is a one-time document that guides the harvesting of timber resources. The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a forest management plan to provide a long-term sustainable forestry-based vision for the forest resources at Bucks Lake.