

Pit-McCloud River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
PIT-MCLOUD RIVER WATERSHED			
McArthur Swamp Planning Unit			
Agricultural Uses...Much existing data regarding McArthur Swamp stocking rates and timing is available through Larry Fererro, Shasta County UC Davis Cooperative Extension Office.	Robert Capriola	No	Comment noted.
Continuing with Recommendations, page PM-14...under outdoor recreation... interpretive signage is important, but include specific information regarding habitat restoration, management, and the cultural values and contributions modern day hunting and fishing activities. Making people (birdwatchers) aware that hunting may be taking place may avoid potential discomfort due to encounters between hunters and non-hunters on the site.	Robert Capriola	Yes	Measure has been changed to also include interpretive signage regarding habitat restoration and fishing & hunting use. Congruent text has also been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations.
Existing Conditions and Uses: Overview: Include Bullet for most important existing public uses: Fishing, waterfowl hunting and access to Ahjumawi SP At the end of the overview, and before the discussion of Fish, Plant and Wildlife Resources, it would be helpful to describe how the PIT 1 FERC areas are intermingled with the Stewardship lands. Existing management for public use, wildlife, and agriculture is dependent on flexible use of both FERC and non-FERC lands. In addition, it would be helpful to have some discussion of the extensive planning work already completed by PG&E during the 1990's with the team of agencies including CWA, State Parks, et al to come up with the original MSMP produced in 2000.	Robert Capriola	Yes	An Overview bullet has been added, stating that the planning unit provides the only public access to Ahjumawi Lava Springs State Park. The purpose of the overview bullets is to generally describe the main features of the planning unit. The first overview bullet already states that the planning unit is an important waterfowl area. Fishing is not a main feature of the planning unit (as compared to grazing and wildlife habitat uses) and therefore it was not added to the overview bullets. All lands within the planning unit are under the purview of the Stewardship Council, both lands within and outside the FERC boundary. Lands within the FERC boundary are clearly visible on the Existing Conditions and Recommended Concept maps. Therefore, the text does not include a discussion of where the FERC lands are, and are not, located. A sentence has been added to the end of the paragraph discussing the McArthur Swamp Management Plan (MSMP), stating that the MSMP is modeled on a similar plan developed by the Technical Review Team from 1998-2000, however it does not address properties or issues located outside of the FERC Project boundaries.

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>on page PM11, second paragraph on the left within the discussion on wintering bird use..."When winter rains pool within the short grass habitat, these areas provide important foraging for geese, waterfowl and shorebird species. This important habitat is only made possible through the rotational grazing program developed by UC Cooperative extension and carried out by the grazing leases."</p>	<p>Robert Capriola</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. Text has been added to Existing Conditions stating that grazing activities carried out within McArthur Swamp are carefully managed to encourage waterfowl use and have specifically enhanced winter use by migrating waterfowl. However, the rotational grazing program was developed and implemented by PG&E and therefore, suggested text regarding the UC Cooperative Extension was not added.</p>
<p>on page PM-12, under Agricultural Uses - The 10,000 AUM/year goal has not been met (Larry Forerro, UC Davis Cooperative Extension Shasta County) in many recent years due to lack of rainfall and/or flooding due to levee breaches...AUM levels are set for each fenced unit according to wildlife habitat goals and measured responses, such as residual matter, height and density of growth. Grazers currently follow the Grazing Management Plan developed in 2000 by the UC Davis Cooperative Extension for the original McArthur Swamp Management Plan which encompasses both the FERC and Non-FERC lands.</p>	<p>Robert Capriola</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Sentence has been changed to indicate that 10,000 is the maximum number of animal unit months (AUMs) possible, however, it is not always the number achieved.</p>
<p>on page PM-13, in section on Recommendations for Fish, plant, and Wildlife Habitat: It is important to mention that PG&E, in cooperation with local partners, is moving ahead with many habitat improvements to the WHIP field, Rat Farm Pond, and interior ditches, and management of these areas for wildlife (includes use of grazing, burning, mowing, flooding) must be integrated with plans made by the Stewardship Council for lands outside the FERC boundary.</p>	<p>Robert Capriola</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The last sentence in the Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat recommendation has been changed to indicate that planning should be considered in conjunction with onsite improvements that PG&E will be undertaking as part of the McArthur Swamp Management Plan (MSMP).</p>

Pit-McCloud River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Under the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, page PM-7...A Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan for the entire McArthur Swamp was developed by PG&E and a great diversity of stakeholders in 2000. It integrates enhancements and protections for wildlife, public use, agriculture, and cultural resources on lands both within and outside the FERC boundary...It is important to state that ongoing improvements, protections and management will have to be coordinated between these two land areas. Habitat improvements, noxious weed control, and grazing management are all dependent on flexible use of all lands within the Swamp. Many of the potential measures, such as installing docks, signage, and tables take place within the FERC boundary and will remain the responsibility of PG&E to maintain. Overall, these documents provide a fair picture of the McArthur Swamp and its potential, but tend not to favor the interests of the largest number of traditional users of the Swamp (grazers, hunters and fishermen).</p>	<p>Robert Capriola</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has included potential measures to preserve and enhance the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) at McArthur Swamp. One potential measure is to develop a wildlife and habitat management plan for lands outside the FERC boundary. As the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states: "The plan should be developed to be complementary and not in conflict with the existing McArthur Swamp Management Plan (MSMP)," which recommends enhancements for lands within the FERC boundary. The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures for McArthur Swamp that are intended to enhance and preserve the BPVs in a manner consistent with the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement. 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>[Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat: Conduct surveys of the planning unit to identify biological resources and enable their protection.] The potential measure does not provide sufficient detail for the reviewer to understand the scope of the potential measure. The surveys recommended by this measure could be simple surveys for species presence, or can be detailed surveys to determine distribution and habitat usage species. In either case there is no indication of how much the surveys would cost or who would fund the surveys. Shasta County recommends that all baseline condition and inventory surveys be funded by the Stewardship Council and completed prior to the development of specific resource measures for the Swamp.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is anticipated that baseline surveys will be completed prior to the transfer of fee title and conveyance of conservation easements. Conservation easements, including the overall objectives of management plans, will be developed during the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support to donees to cover a portion of the costs of implementing the LCP. This support will be determined on a case-by-case basis, and will be highly dependent on available funds, but could include funds for management, stewardship, or monitoring. Specific details regarding implementation will be determined during the disposition process.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat: Develop a wildlife and habitat management plan for lands outside the FERC boundary that balances agricultural use with protection and enhancement of habitat.] The potential measure appears to put an emphasis on raptors and migrating birds and assumes that the MSMP provides for waterfowl management. If the plan is to be a comprehensive management plan it must address the best use of the habitats available; allow cattle grazing at levels consistent with past uses; and be coordinated with other resource management plans. If the area is best suited for management for waterfowl, the goals and objectives should focus on waterfowl and other species will benefit as a result. We are in agreement that the development and implementation of the management plan needs to be coordinated with PG&E's plans developed to comply with its Pit 1 Project license. However, the uncertainty over who will be financially responsible for obtaining baseline condition information and development of management plan details and cost estimates is problematic. We therefore recommend that required surveys be conducted and management plan implementation costs estimates be developed prior to transferring title and conservation easement.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is anticipated that baseline surveys will be completed prior to the transfer of fee title and conveyance of conservation easements. Conservation easements, including the overall objectives of management plans, will be developed during the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support to donees to cover a portion of the costs of implementing the LCP. This support will be determined on a case-by-case basis, and will be highly dependent on available funds, but could include funds for management, stewardship, or monitoring. Specific details regarding implementation will be determined during the disposition process.</p>
<p>[Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat: Extend the Noxious Weed Management Program developed with the FERC Technical Review Team under the 2003 McArthur Swamp Management Plan to the entire planning unit.] As with habitat management, control and management of noxious weeds needs to be coordinated with PG&E and its plans. It should be noted that Shasta County's recommendations provide for the establishment of an advisory committee that includes the Pit River Tribe, Fall River Resource Conservation District, and PG&E.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The potential measure suggests extending the Noxious Weed Management Program developed with the FERC Technical Review Team under the 2003 McArthur Swamp Management Plan (MSMP) to the entire planning unit. Since the potential measure is an extension of a FERC license required plan, it will be consistent with existing PG&E plans.</p>

Pit-McCloud River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat: Assemble a management team to deal with the Eurasian watermilfoil infestations; At both boar launches, install interpretive signage regarding Eurasian watermilfoil.] It is important to note that the Tule and Fall Rivers are within the FERC project boundary and the levee system is also part of the Pit 1 Project license. These two waterways are separated from McArthur Swamp by the levee. The presence of Eurasian watermilfoil in the Tule and Fall Rivers has been and will continue to be a problem. The management team must consist of people that have expertise in the management and control of the species and with people capable of providing the funding necessary to implement any control plan. Management and control of Eurasian watermilfoil is complicated by the presence of a state threatened species of sculpin, endangered Shasta crayfish, a world class trout fishery, and the use of these rivers for irrigation and domestic purposes.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. The FERC project boundary is indicated on Figures PM-3 and PM-4 in Volume II. Capabilities of the proposed management team to deal with Eurasian watermilfoil infestations will be addressed as part of the disposition process. A sentence has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendation to say that the many uses and species present in the planning unit would be taken into account by the management team when dealing with Eurasian watermilfoil infestations.</p>
<p>[Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat: Assess the potential for restoration of Bowman ditch to enhance habitat and connectivity.] It should be noted that the Bowman ditch is not part of McArthur Swamp and that it may be a historic feature eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. It should also be noted that the FERC denied PG&E's request to remove the area from the FERC license. The cost of any feasibility study and evaluations should remain with the Stewardship Council.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>It is noted in the main Volume II that the planning unit also includes a small linear piece of land located off of the Little Tule River [Bowman Ditch]. It is not stated that Bowman Ditch is a part of McArthur Swamp, but rather that it serves to collect spring water and funnel it into the Little Tule River. It is stated in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations that PG&E has stated that the ditch is no longer needed for Project operations and has proposed that it be removed from the FERC boundary. A statement has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendation to indicate that FERC denied PG&E's request.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Habitat: Support recovery efforts for Shasta crayfish.] It should be noted that the Shasta crayfish does not exist nor does any suitable habitat exist within the boundaries of McArthur Swamp. It should also be noted that the use of barriers to prevent further invasion of signal crayfish are experimental and have not been proven effective. Crayfish removal techniques have been costly and labor intensive. It is unclear who will pay the cost of installing crayfish barriers and/or the removal of the invasive signal crayfish.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>It is noted in the main Volume II that the endangered Shasta crayfish is found in the lava substrate and springs within the area, particularly in Big Lake, Ja-She Creek, and along the Tule River Levee System. The review of potential locations for barriers that would stop signal crayfish from invading population of Shasta crayfish is being conducted as part of FERC license requirements and the Stewardship Council does not have jurisdiction to comment on the effectiveness of this technique. The Stewardship Council has recommended supporting recovery efforts consistent with efforts being conducted as part of the new License. Any cost associated with installation of barriers would be borne by PG&E as the licensee.</p>
<p>[Open Space: Apply permanent conservation easement to ensure a higher level of open space protection.] Shasta County supports the Stewardship Council's recommendation regarding open space. However, we recommend that rather than identifying all permitted and prohibited uses, the conservation easement or Land Conservation Plan identify only the permitted uses and that all other uses are prohibited unless prior approval is obtained. This will remove the ambiguity of what is permitted and what is prohibited.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. The easements will describe all prohibited uses to maintain open space values, including the level of uses allowed.</p>
<p>[Outdoor Recreation: Assess the potential for developing a wildlife viewing platform, boardwalk, and viewing blind with interpretive signage regarding wildlife stewardship at the Rat Farm Pond area.] There are several problems with putting a boardwalk and wildlife viewing platform in the area of the Rat Farm Pond. These types of facilities are generally located at places where there is an active presence by management personnel or close enough populations where activities can be observed. Since the Rat Farm area is in a remote unsupervised location it will likely become an attractive nuisance for unauthorized activities such as a party location for local youth. Also, the area is open to hunting, and wildlife viewing and hunting are not compatible uses of the same area at the same time. To implement this potential measure would require the presence of a full time attendant to assure that unauthorized and incompatible uses are not occurring.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The potential measure is to assess the potential for developing these facilities. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that it would need to be determined if these facilities are feasible before they are constructed. It is also noted that the long-term management, maintenance, and monitoring of use of the facilities would need to be considered.</p>

Pit-McCloud River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
[Outdoor Recreation: Install interpretive signage regarding wildlife stewardship along the levee tops and at both public access areas.] We support the use of interpretive signs as a means of educating the public about the McArthur Swamp and the surrounding area as long as the signs are designed properly to minimize vandalism.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	No	Comment noted.
[Outdoor Recreation: Install interpretive signage at the Rat Farm building describing the history of the muskrat farm; Install interpretive signage regarding levee history, hydropower generation, Native American heritage in the area, traditional plants, and noxious weeds to the levee tops.] It should be noted that the Rat Farm building is located on a significant archaeological sites and therefore installations of sign posts may be an issue with the Pit River Tribe.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	No	Comment noted. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that development of signage should be coordinated with the Pit River Tribe.
[Outdoor Recreation: Install a dock at the Big Lake Access Boat Launch.] There are no boating speed restrictions on Big Lake, Little Tule River, Tule River, or Fall River below the confluence with Tule River. Also, trailered boats are frequently launched at the Rat Farm Boat Launch and it is not restricted to car top launching only. Installation of a boat dock and improvement of the launching facilities will only serve to attract more large trailered boats. The use of high speed boats on these waterways should be discouraged to reduce wave erosion on the already sensitive levee system.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	No	Comment noted. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that the boating speed limit is five miles per hour on Big Lake. The lack of a speed limit cannot be verified, nor can the types of boats that use the boat launch.
[Outdoor Recreation: Install table and shade structures at Big Lake Access.] As stated above regarding the installation of a wildlife viewing platform, this area is subjected to significant unauthorized use and installation of additional facilities will likely become an attractive nuisance and increase management costs.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	Yes	Comment noted. A sentence has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations that says that it would need to be determined if such facilities could be reasonably maintained given the area's history of unauthorized use.
[Outdoor Recreation: Assess the potential for youth program opportunities.] We agree that there is potential for the development of youth education programs within the McArthur Swamp that are compatible with the other uses. We do not agree that tables and shade structures at the Rat Farm are necessary for this purpose. The Intermountain Fairgrounds is located in the town of McArthur and adjacent to McArthur Swamp and can serve as a gathering location for youth programs that utilize the Swamp for educational purposes.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	No	Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Additional detail and specific measures to be implemented will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages. The Stewardship Council is committed to identifying opportunities for synergies between the Land Conservation Program and the Youth Investment Program. The specifics of how this is done will be determined on a planning unit by planning unit basis as to what is appropriate in each case.

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Outdoor Recreation: Assess the potential for developing hunting blinds within the land portion of the planning unit.] Absent a means of controlling the numbers of hunters in the field at one time and the means to enforce hunting rules, hunting blinds will be a source of conflict between hunters; encourage pre-season opening day camping at the location of the blinds causing resource damages, and increase operation costs. To implement the management controls necessary for a managed hunting area would require installation of check stations, parking lots with trash receptacles, and a means of controlling hunter access from Big Lake, Little Tule River, Tule River, and Fall River. In order to offset the cost of these management controls a hunter fee would be needed.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Additional detail and specific measures to be implemented will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages. The potential measure is to assess the potential for developing hunting blinds to determine their compatibility with grazing as well as appropriate locations and construction. A sentence in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations has been revised to say: "The Stewardship Council recommends assessing the potential for developing hunting blinds within the planning unit to determine their compatibility with grazing, <u>identify management controls that would be required for implementation</u>, as well as to identify appropriate locations and construction."</p>
<p>[Agricultural Uses: Develop baseline conditions report that describes current agricultural, physical, and overall biological conditions of the areas, including current uses and state of improvement.] There is an error in the number of ranchers that hold grazing licenses from PG&E. Currently there are 11 grazing licenses.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>PG&E currently provides access on property to 9 livestock owners with grazing licenses for spring and summer forage and are renewable on an annual basis. (McArthur Swamp Land Transfer Mitigated Negative Declaration, January 24, 2002). PG&E's lease inventory also only records 9 livestock owners with grazing licenses at McArthur Swamp. It is possible that one person has multiple grazing licenses; however this is the most recent information obtained by the Stewardship Council from PG&E.</p>

Pit-McCloud River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Agricultural Uses: Develop a rangeland management plan for grazing use...] We refer you to the conservation easement recommendations and management concepts prepared by the McArthur Swamp Collaborative Group for consideration by the Stewardship Council. We believe that these recommendations are a good starting point for discussions regarding the future integrated management of McArthur Swamp. It would be helpful if you could provide a copy of the Stewardship Council policy for agricultural uses of watershed lands.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. The easements will describe all prohibited uses, including the level of uses allowed. Management plan objectives will likely be identified in concert with the development of the conservation easement, while the specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction, including specific requirements regarding monitoring and evaluation. 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>[Preservation of Historic Values: Conduct surveys outside the FERC Project APE and beyond 50 meters from the inland toe of levees to identify cultural resources and enable their protection; Coordinate with Native American entities when conducting cultural resource measures.] We agree that this survey needs to be performed. However, the responsibility for performing and funding this work is not defined. Since, this type of survey can be quite costly and have a significant impact on the future McArthur Swamp management cost, it seems appropriate that these studies be completed prior to transferring title and conservation easement.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is anticipated that baseline surveys will be completed prior to the transfer of fee title and conveyance of conservation easements. Conservation easements, including the overall objectives of management plans, will be developed during the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support to donees to cover a portion of the costs of implementing the LCP. This support will be determined on a case-by-case basis, and will be highly dependent on available funds, but could include funds for management, stewardship, or monitoring. Specific details regarding implementation will be determined during the disposition process.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Preservation of Historic Values: Conduct an ethnographic study of lands outside the FERC Project APE to identify traditional use areas; Coordinate with Native American entities when conducting cultural resource measures.] We agree that this survey needs to be performed. However, the responsibility for performing and funding this work is not defined. Since, this type of survey can be quite costly and have a significant impact on the future McArthur Swamp management cost, it seems appropriate that these studies be completed prior to transferring title and conservation easement.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is anticipated that baseline surveys will be completed prior to the transfer of fee title and conveyance of conservation easements. Conservation easements, including the overall objectives of management plans, will be developed during the disposition process. Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. The Stewardship Council intends to provide financial support to donees to cover a portion of the costs of implementing the LCP. This support will be determined on a case-by-case basis, and will be highly dependent on available funds, but could include funds for management, stewardship, or monitoring. Specific details regarding implementation will be determined during the disposition process.</p>
<p>[Preservation of Historic Values: Develop a cultural resources management plan for lands outside of the FERC Project APE consistent with the Pit 1 Project Programmatic Agreement; Coordinate with Native American entities when conducting cultural resource measures.] We refer you to the conservation easement recommendations and management concepts prepared by the McArthur Swamp Collaborative Group for consideration by the Stewardship Council. We believe that these recommendations are a good starting point for discussions regarding the future integrated management of McArthur Swamp.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conservation easements will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages. The easements will describe all prohibited uses, including the level of uses allowed. Management plan objectives will likely be identified in concert with the development of the conservation easement, while the specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction, including specific requirements regarding monitoring and evaluation. 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>