

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
FEATHER RIVER WATERSHED			
Butte Creek Planning Unit			
<p>[Condensed from email] It was only by chance that I learned of your proposals to increase public access to Butte Creek in the area of Helltown and/or the Canal Access Road. I have very strong objections to either location being opened to the General Public more than it is already. The stretch of Butte Creek from Centerville Powerhouse up to the Quartz Bowl is an incredibly rich habitat - bears, otters, eagles, osprey, steelhead and of course Chinook salmon - are able to survive in this Canyon only because it is so infrequently visited by humans. The impact that tubers would have on the major pods of Chinook salmon that hold in the 7 or 8 large pools from Helltown upstream to the Canal Access Road reach would be catastrophic. There is no way for a tuber, rafter or boater to avoid going over the pod. Even increased activity in the creek by waders or swimmers stirs up so much silt and algae that the water becomes turbid immediately. From July through September is a critical period for the survival of the Chinook - even with increased flows of cooler water from DeSabra - increased human activity would severely impact the wellbeing of these threatened fish. Other factors must also be taken into account - Helltown Road is a very narrow dirt road. Already the residential and pot growing related motor traffic is too heavy for the County Works Dept. to keep the road in adequate condition. Dust covers the land on either side - including my own house. Fire danger is an ever present threat to this isolated community - a discarded cigarette or other spark could be fatal up here. Trash and garbage dumping is already a problem - have you documented the state of the roadside pullouts below the Honey Run Covered Bridge? Every 4th of July we swim/hike from the Quartz Bowl to Helltown - we love Butte Creek and its natural wonders. It is accessible to those who can be bothered to spend the energy to get to it. It should not be a water amusement park for people to drive up to. The degradation of Butte Creek that would result from your proposed plans for increased access will destroy a place that should remain wild and relatively untouched. Please reconsider your plans.</p>	<p>Adrian Roland</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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public and protection of the natural habitat and plants. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to preserve and enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include the assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] Helltown Access - Helltown Road is not suitable in its present condition for vehicle access. Walking access from parking areas near Centerville Powerhouse would be possible but the gravel road is not the best for walking and somewhat dangerous and very dusty. Paving the road to single lane specifications would be possible. Whitewater users need only one access and Hog Ranch would be a preferable access point. Hikers and anglers on foot could use Helltown Road if the road was improved but not for vehicle access. Residents will scream bloody murder if anyone tries to increase vehicle traffic regardless of road improvements.</p>	<p>Allen Harthorn, Friends of Butte Creek</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. As stated in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations (LCP p. FR-29), the Stewardship Council recommends only exploring the potential for future use of Helltown Road with the landowner, and in cooperation with user groups interested in improved access to the canyon. 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 letter] Hog Ranch Road Access (The Drag) - Access at Hog Ranch Road must be improved. PG&E has now locked the gate where the public has had public access for many years. This must be opened and improved. The trail to the creek (BLM land) should be improved. A foot bridge to the China Trail on the other side of the creek would be valuable.</p>	<p>Allen Harthorn, Friends of Butte Creek</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council potential measures regarding roads in Butte Creek canyon are aimed at providing controlled public access to the creek and canyon. PG&E rights for access in some of these lands does not equate to public access. Public rights for access to lands will be addressed during development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). Although Hog Ranch Road and existing trails in the area are not specifically mentioned in the LCP, information on these roads and trails (prior to these comments, unknown to the Stewardship Council) and any other potential routes for public access are welcome. 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>[Condensed from letter] DeSabra Powerhouse Road Access - Access to the DeSabra Powerhouse and Lower Centerville Head Dam must be improved. The road is locked where it was always open to the public before the construction of the Forks of Butte Powerhouse. PG&E excuses for not opening the road are thinly veiled attempts to deny the public legal access. The trail is completely inadequate and receives almost no use as it is extremely steep coming out. A foot bridge connection to the trail on the north side of Butte Creek needs to be built.</p>	<p>Allen Harthorn, Friends of Butte Creek</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure to conduct an assessment of the potential for providing controlled seasonal access to the DeSabra Powerhouse area. It is unclear what trail the comment refers to. However, the DeSabra/Butte Creek Trail that is served by a trailhead on PG&E lands is managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Butte Creek Trail Council, and the majority of the trail and the location for the potential trail crossing, is on BLM land. PG&E rights for access in some of these lands does not equate to public access. Public rights for access to lands will be addressed during development of the Disposition Packages (Volume III).</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] Lower Centerville Flume Trail - This trail needs signage and improvement regardless of what happens in the relicensing studies. PG&E and private landowners have attempted to limit public access. PG&E needs to work with the private landowners and the public to develop an acceptable plan for use.</p>	<p>Allen Harthorn, Friends of Butte Creek</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Due to operational and public safety concerns, the Stewardship Council has not recommended enhancement of public access of the canal/flume for hiking, although unauthorized use of the canal paths is known to occur. In addition, much of the canal crosses private property and therefore the Stewardship Council cannot make potential measure recommendations for public use in those areas. PG&E rights for access in some of these lands does not equate to public access. Public rights for access to lands will be addressed during development of the Disposition Packages (Volume III).</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] Centerville Powerhouse - Access to the Centerville Powerhouse needs improvement. The road is currently closed and locked to protect private landowners. Users are forced to park at the Centerville Museum or in dangerously small parking off the side of the road on PG&E land. Improved parking and signage is imperative at this location. An electric gate designed to allow limited use by anglers and whitewater boaters would be the best for private landowners, recreational users and PG&E.</p>	<p>Allen Harthorn, Friends of Butte Creek</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Information obtained during development of the LCP suggested that the current walk-in access to the Centerville Powerhouse was adequate to meet current needs. PG&E rights for access in some of these lands does not equate to public access. Public rights for access to lands will be addressed during development of the Disposition Packages (Volume III). However, further discussion of parking and access issues on PG&E lands at this location is welcomed. 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>I have found a great deal of valuable information here. But what I'd like to comment on is the web site design. It's superb. Thank you for clean, attractive design that is also intuitive and functional. Fine color choices. On another note, I read in the Planning Report that creek access was to be explored via the west side, in Helltown Ranch. I have heard that there may be a licensed medical marijuana farm on the Ranch. If that is so (and I cannot confirm) it would suggest that access might be difficult to obtain. Thanks again.</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measure to explore the potential for access to the west side of Butte Creek via the now privately-controlled Helltown Road would evaluate all existing barriers or constraints to restoring access.</p>
<p>Relicensing of the DeSabra - Centerville Project (FERC 803) may cause changes to DeSabra Forebay that affect recreation at this site. The Preliminary Biological Opinion issued for this Project suggests that modifications need to be made to reduce the increase of water temperatures caused by passage of water through the Forebay. While the goal would be to benefit water temperatures in Butte Creek, the effect on the Forebay is not clear. CSPA suggests that action relative to recreation and recreational facilities at DeSabra Forebay be deferred until such time as a new FERC license for the DeSabra - Centerville Project is issued.</p>	<p>California Sportfishing Protection Alliance</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>As stated in the LCP, all potential recreation enhancements would be considered in close cooperation with PG&E FERC relicensing efforts and related recreation planning.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
I OPPOSE THE PLAN TO OPEN PUBLIC ACCESS, BOTH FIRE AND SAFETY ISSUES ARE TOO RISKY, POACHING OF SALMON WILL INCREASE, POT CARTEL IS ARMED AND DANGEROUS.	Chief McAdams, Butte Creek F.D.	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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. 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.
First of all I would like to point out the proposal by the fed govt for Wild and Scenic designation of the effected reach of river. That unto itself speaks to the delicacy and specialness of this waterway as is, in tact and undisturbed.	David Coffee	Yes	The federal determination that the section of Butte Creek that crossed the planning unit area is eligible for Wild and Scenic River designation is discussed in Volume II page FR-57. Text has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations stating that access and necessary support facility potential measures would need to be evaluated for compatibility with the Wild and Scenic designation eligibility of the segment of Butte Creek down to Helltown bridge.
The proposal is focused on inappropriate parts of the creek to provide pubic access. Several reasons for this belief are: * Honey Run Rd. (especially the upper section), Centerville Rd. and [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]	David Coffee	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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>Helltown Rd are already carrying more traffic than they were designed for. Increased public access will further tax these "rural routes" leading to increased county costs, poor road conditions for residents and higher maintenance cost for our vehicles as a result.</p> <p>* Increased recreation = increased alcohol consumption (in a prohibited zone) and thereby makes these narrow winding roads more hazardous. One stretch of Centerville Rd you propose to increase use on has no center line, has precipitous edges, is narrow, ill-maintained dirt, blind curves . . .</p> <p>* Access at Helltown Rd seems terribly redundant as there already exists an access less than a mile away at the Centerville Bridge, where other structural support already exists too with parking, garbage, public information, . . . The community in the Helltown "neighborhood" leaves a lot to be desired in terms of inviting the public into a well known, well established and violent group of marijuana growers. We residence have had many discussions about the negative effects this population has on our community and your proposal would surly exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>* Alternate access at "Canal Rd" is inappropriate as the road stops well short of the creek and the hike to the creek is steep and arduous. As a whitewater boater, I can knowledgably state that this would be an inappropriate take out place. The construction of a trail to the creek would be costly and I'm sure, go unused.</p> <p>* The increased threat of wildland fire is a real threat with increased recreation use. The high level of probability for a fire would lead one to limit, not increase, general public access to the more remote, inaccessible areas of this fire prone watershed.</p> <p>....I feel that the focus of this group to increase public access should be to improve the traditional access points by providing safety, parking, garbage management, as well as concentrate the damaging effects on a fragile system to a limited region. Traditional access points exist at the</p> <p>[COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>			<p>recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include providing reasonable public access. For this reason, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The potential for impacts to local roads would be included in the assessments. The proposed access point that would be reached via Helltown Road is several miles upstream of the existing access at Centerville Bridge. An objective of providing access to the creek in this area (on the east or west side) is to facilitate boater access below the more difficult expert level whitewater run in the upstream segment of canyon. The access road to DeSabra Powerhouse is unpaved and the road is currently closed to public use starting about one mile below DeSabra Forebay. One potential measure would assess the potential for controlled seasonal use of the road by the public. Access points to Butte Creek at Covered Bridge and along lower Honey Run Road are several miles below the planning unit and are not under the purview of the Stewardship Council.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGES.]</p> <p>Covered Bridge, just below the Covered Bride at a wide gravel pullout, and on lower Honey Run, just downstream of the high voltage power lines. ("Public access" in this area is in desperate need of safe, off road parking as too often these users are in the roadway.) Traditional access also exists at Oakie Dam. DeSabla Forebay is in the plans for improvements and that too is increased access. The road down to the creek at DeSabla Powerhouse is already paved, has adequate day use parking and access a less fragile salmon spawning section of the creek. My intention is not to deny access to this watershed to those who do not live here. My objectives are to maintain safety for my family and property and to preserve this "Federally Proposed Wild and Scenic" waterway. Access already exists to several different and varied reaches of this creek. Enough. Maintain, improve and manage what infrastructure already exists.</p>			
<p>The forestry plan mentions the development of a plan to manage fuel loads in the FERC area. YES! please place resources here as the fire danger in this area is high. (as you know!)</p>	David Coffee	No	Comment noted.
<p>Friends of the River recommends that PG&E lands available for disposal in this planning unit be allocated to the BLM to expand existing public lands and enhance public access to the segment of Butte Creek eligible for National Wild & Scenic River status.</p>	Friends of the River	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>I am concerned primarily about the impacts that some of the proposed actions will likely have on the future of biological resources on Butte Creek in the section between the DeSabra and Centerville Powerhouses and along the Lower Centerville Canal. I am also concerned about potential adverse impacts of these proposed actions to current canyon residents. I live on Centerville Road near the historic cemetery and know I speak for many of my neighbors on Centerville and Helltown roads in making these comments. I have spoken with many of my neighbors directly about these specific issues.</p> <p>1. Increased human activity on the Butte Cr between the DeSabra and Centerville Powerhouses should not be promoted with new public access entry points. In fact it should be discouraged. This area is critical holding habitat for Federally threatened spring-run Chinook salmon, a species that would not fare well if there is increased human activity (tubers, anglers, etc) in the area. Butte Cr currently supports the largest population of spring-run Chinook salmon in the world! And their populations are dwindling on other rivers. Climate change will likely stress these fish as water temperatures rise and so we should do all we can to make sure that they do not suffer additional stresses associated with increased human activities in and around the pools that they need to oversummer in before the fall spawning period. Many other important aquatic and terrestrial wildlife species also currently flourish in this largely roadless area (which qualifies for wild and scenic river status). To protect these resources, increased public access should not be provided in the vicinity of Helltown road, or via any existing canal maintenance roads. Helltown Rd is already a dangerous fire trap for its residents, and it cannot handle additional traffic. Public access to Whiskey Flat (or to any of the west side of Butte Cr between the powerhouses) should not be provided. The two current PG&E access roads to the lower canal off of upper Centerville road, Helltown Drag (aka Hog Farm Road) and Burma Rd, should remain closed, behind locked gates. In addition to likely impacts to biological resources and increases in the likelihood of catastrophic human-started fires, increased access would also certainly lead to increased crime in the [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	<p>Greg Golet</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, that preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. 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>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>area. This section of the canyon already has major crime problems, as illegal dumping, drug use and production, and robberies are all too common. If this area is opened up to the public it will rapidly get out of control. There is already too small of a law enforcement presence in the canyon (no deputy is specifically assigned to this area). And importantly, none of the agencies that could take over management responsibilities for the PG&E lands that have been identified for disposition have the resources to adequately patrol and enforce regulations in the area. The one point of entry that could be acceptable is up at DeSabra Powerhouse. The gate at the top of the hill that leads down to the powerhouse could be left open if there is adequate patrolling. This area is sufficiently high in the watershed (about a mile above Quartz Bowl—the creek’s barrier to upstream migration for anadromous fish) so that there would likely not be much increased human use in the salmon holding zone. And it is far enough away from the area population centers so that it should not have very high levels of visitation. Adventurous folks could have a nice entry point into a wonderful wilderness setting at this location.</p>			

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>My second main comment concerns the lands identified for disposition at the southern end of the Butte Creek planning unit, including the parcel that contains the Lower Centerville Canal penstocks, those parcels along the canal on either side of Pasa Way and across from the Centerville Cemetery, and an additional parcel on the east side of Centerville road where the Lower Centerville Canal crosses the road. In other words, all of the PG&E parcels identified for disposition that border the paved section of Centerville Road. These parcels should be managed primarily to preserve their exceptional conservation values. Increased public access should not be provided or encouraged. There are many important biological resources in this remote setting that currently thrive because human activities are kept to a low level. The area has the highest cliffs in the canyon and is home to many species that are only found in remote locations. Falcons, other raptors, and rare bats breed on the high cliffs and in the tall forest trees, and black bears, ringtail and mountain lions are not uncommon. The Tehama deer herd, the largest migratory deer herd in California, occupies this area. Given the need to protect these phenomenal natural resource attributes, these properties should never be sold to private interests, and should not ever be developed in any way. No structures or driveways should ever be allowed on the lands, and they certainly should not be selected as future locations for any youth camps or other high-use activities. Public access should not be prohibited, but nothing should be done to promote it, much as PG&E currently manages the lands. The walkways over the flumes on the canal in this area are dangerous to hikers and cyclists. As well there are sections of the canal that are bordered by private ownership, so that a continuous trail along the canal would not be feasible anyway. These parcels should be managed solely for their conservation values with preservation of their wilderness characteristics being of paramount importance.</p>	<p>Greg Golet</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment Noted. No additional public access or new facilities are proposed for the parcels at the southern end of the planning unit. 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>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] RE: Proposal for public access to Butte Creek above Centerville Bridge, via the Centerville Powerhouse access and Helltown access. I am writing concerning the Stewardship Council proposal for public access at the above mentioned two locations. I believe that this proposal is ill advised. The portion of Butte Creek that is a spawning area for salmon begins above the Centerville Bridge and extends to above Helltown. The spring run salmon on Butte Creek are making a comeback, but remain endangered. Creating public access to the spawning ground portion of Butte Creek would increase the stress on the salmon population and would jeopardize their comeback. It is recognized that public access on the lower portions of Butte Creek stresses the migrating salmon, as well as contributes increased litter along the course of the Creek. Currently, the landowners and residents of Butte Creek canyon expend significant effort in cleaning up behind the Public along the public access portion of Butte Creek in an effort to be good stewards of the Creek and Salmon population. At the present time and in the foreseeable future, public access to this critical portion of Butte Creek should remain limited. When the spring run salmon has been removed from the endangered species list, and when the Department of Fish and Game has restored a true fishing season with actual catch limits on the fish, it will then be appropriate to consider increasing public access to the portion of Butte Creek above the Centerville Bridge.</p>	<p>Jimmy L. Roberts</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, that preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] I am a resident of Butte Creek Canyon living on Helltown Road. I am strongly opposed to increasing public access to Butte Creek at Helltown Road or further up the creek. The successful return of large numbers of chinook salmon is due (in part) to decreasing human impact. It would be a tragedy to reverse this trend. Butte Creek above Helltown, as you know, is home to many other wild animals that do not thrive in the presence of humans, especially in large numbers that are not respectful of the environment (such as tubers have proven themselves to be.) Habitats such as this are exceedingly rare and should be protected. I am also very concerned about the impact of ongoing gold mining in this section of Butte Creek. Last year was especially bad as a continuous stream of miners came into the creek at the Helltown Drag. They were a near constant presence in that part of the creek and even through the spawning season. They left trash and human waste in and near the creek and also up where they were camped. Several residents along with the Butte County sheriff worked to clean up the area and to try to put an end to illegal camping on that road. This year the caretaker for that property along with PG&E have tried multiple times (and continue to do so) to close and lock the gate at the top of the road but it is repeatedly tampered with, the chains cut and the locks stolen. Helltown Road itself would be very negatively impacted by increased traffic. It is a narrow gravel road and in the summer the residents drive slowly to decrease the clouds of dust that moving vehicles create. And finally, our greatest safety concern in Butte Creek Canyon is FIRE. The summer crowd brings increased fire danger in an extremely fire prone area.</p>	<p>Lynnea Poppenhagen</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, that preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. The Stewardship Council has not been aware of impacts from mining activity; however, existing and potential adverse impacts to natural and cultural resource from this activity would be addressed in the potential measure to develop wildlife, recreation, and cultural resources management plans.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>I am writing concerning the proposed plans to create a road and or parking lot in the Helltown Rd. or Canal Rd. area of Butte Creek Canyon. I have been a resident of upper Butte Creek Canyon for 35 years. I have watched the native Chinook Salmon run go from a virtually nonexistent population to one that finally has a fighting chance. In the 1990's, the state and federal govt. invested 30 million dollars to help revitalize this salmon run. I have witnessed a slow but steady comeback. This proposed plan to increase public access might be the salmon runs demise. Not only are humans a threat to this habitat but dogs as well. When the salmon come up in early spring all is peaceful for the fish until the summer onslaught of human activity begins in the very swimming holes these fish take refuge in. I avoid swimming in pools that are filled with these incredible creatures. I have witnessed dogs harass and pull salmon out of the shallow gravel spawning beds in fall while their owners look on. About an eighth of a mile downstream from the Helltown proposed parking lot is a swimming hole with hundreds of salmon waiting out the summer for spawning time. Upper Butte Creek is a sensitive habitat that affects the water quality of many miles of this watershed. We have so few areas like this left. Waterways can not always afford recreation as your proposal suggests. I am against this plan and will work diligently with my neighbors to oppose it.</p>	<p>Marilyn Cannon</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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. 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>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>"Reopening DeSabra Powerhouse Road to provide access to the creek at the upper end of the canyon would require that past problems with parked vehicles blocking access to the powerhouse, vandalism and dumping, and other operations, security, and public safety issues be...". This is your quote and it's true. Opening up Butte Creek will only lead to more problems. We already have enough vandalism and dumping along Centerville Road and Helltown Road. Don't open it up to more abuse.</p>	<p>Michael Connolly</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, that preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. 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>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>As a landowner in the Butte Creek area, I am concerned as to what recreational uses are planned, and what government agency will be overseeing the day to day operation of these designated recreational areas. This area is highly sensitive to salmon restoration. Will this be taken into consideration? Secondly the areas in question are in a critical fire area, will the day usage include a monitoring and control of possible fire causes? Garbage and trash? will these issues be raised and taken care of? and by whom? Thank you in advance for your time and efforts.</p>	Sars Clifford	No	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified donees will be determined during the early stages of developing the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to preserve and enhance the beneficial public values (BPVs) at Butte Creek, which are described in Volume II. As stated in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, re-establishing seasonal access to Butte Creek: "would require that past problems with parked vehicles blocking access to the powerhouse, vandalism and dumping, and other operations, security, and public safety issues be addressed satisfactorily." The document also states: "Any changes in recreation use in the canyon would require protection of anadromous fish and their habitat in compliance with requirements conferred by their listed status." The Stewardship Council also recommended a potential measure to develop a fuels management plan.</p>
<p>Bring greater public access to Butte Creek in the Helltown area at either the Helltown bridge or at Canal road (Burma Road) is problematic as management of these locations would be extremely difficult if not impossible. Other persons seeking recreation on the creek would most likely make use of any access points you create. Many residents in my community have concerns with providing access that may be further abused by tubers (the many folks that bring inner tubes to try to navigate the sometimes treacherous waters of Butte Creek. The problems that canyon residents face with tubers are extreme. Hundreds of people come to the canyon to tube the creek and leave an enormous amount of trash that includes such things as used hypodermic needles and broken bottles. So many people using the creek create many disruptions and dangerous situations on the roadway and adjacent to residents properties. Many residents have complained of problems with trespassing and vandalism of their properties with incidents that include persons climbing up from the creek to use their hot tubs. Needless to say, this is already a serious [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	Steve Flowers	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, that preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. The access road</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>problem that we do not want to see exacerbated by increased, unmanaged or supervised recreational use. We are concerned that once some groups are provided access to the creek it will be difficult to restrict others from access. Obviously, fish and game is opposed to these proposals as they know of the difficulties we face with illegal trespass of these lands and waters and F&G does not have the resources to protect these waters which are precious spawning grounds for the largest wild salmon runs in the state. One of the proposed "parking lots" is directly above a hole that currently holds some 500 spawning salmon. This creek is a treasure that could be seriously harmed by providing greater public access for recreational use and we urge you to revise your proposals to eliminate these provisions or at least if you must provide greater access, do it in an area that will be less damaging to this already threatened and precious wild salmon population. This is the largest and one of 3 remaining natural and wild salmon runs in the entire state of California and indeed one of the most healthy wild populations on the west coast. In my opinion this is a precious national resource and should be treated as a national treasure. I wish we could put it in a museum to protect it but, short of that, we could protect it as if it were in a museum. We must do everything we can - before it's too late. If you must have greater access to the creek, it seems that the access road beneath the DeSabra Reservoir would cause the least damage and disruption to the biological resources as well as the community of residents here. Boaters and anglers have many places to play. A place like this is too precious, or dare I say, sacred to risk so a few people can have some fun.</p>			<p>to DeSabra Powerhouse is one of the potential access routes to the creek to be assessed.</p>

Feather River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>I'd like to call attention to our concerns with tubers. The problems that canyon residents face with tubers are extreme. Hundreds of people come to the canyon to tube the creek and leave an enormous amount of trash that includes such things as used hypodermic needles and broken bottles. So many people using the creek create many disruptions and dangerous situations on the roadway and adjacent to residents properties. Many residents have complained of problems with trespassing and vandalism of their properties with incidents that include persons climbing up from the creek to use their hot tubs. Needless to say, this is already a serious problem that we do not want to see exacerbated by increased recreational use. We are concerned that once some groups are provided access to the creek it will be difficult to restrict others from access. Obviously, fish and game is opposed to these proposals as they know of the difficulties we face with illegal trespass of these lands and waters and F&G does not have the resources to protect these waters which are precious spawning grounds for the largest wild salmon runs in the state. This creek is a treasure that could be seriously harmed by providing greater public access for recreational use and we urge you to revise your proposals to eliminate these provisions. Boaters and anglers have many places to play. A place like this is too precious, or dare I say, sacred to risk so a few people can have some fun.</p>	Steve Flowers	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, that preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), including outdoor recreation by the general public. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. As such, the potential measures for Butte Creek include assessment of the potential for restoration of access to the canyon that was historically available to whitewater boaters and others. The Stewardship Council recognizes the importance of potential impacts to the anadromous fishery, as well as potential social impacts such as dumping of debris, littering, vandalism, increased fire risk, and squatting. The potential for social and environmental impacts associated with increased access and potential impact avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be evaluated before implementation of any potential measures. The access road to DeSabla Powerhouse is one of the potential access routes to the creek to be assessed.</p>
<p>[Condensed from email] I am working with Butte County on their General Plan update. We are in the process of developing draft land use alternatives for a series of change areas located throughout the county. I have reviewed the maps of the watershed lands on your website, and it appears that some of the watershed lands may overlap with our identified change areas. In order to better assess possible overlap of planning areas and address any possible conflicts, we would like to obtain GIS data for the Feather River Watershed (South) area indicating watershed lands in Butte County. Specifically, we are most interested in the following planning units, as they fall within Butte County: Philbrook Reservoir, Butte Creek, North Fork Feather River, Oroville. Would it be possible for you to share this GIS data?</p>	Tanya Sundberg	No	<p>Under agreement with PG&E, the Stewardship Council cannot share its Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database with the public and stakeholders. The commenter can contact PG&E with this request.</p>