

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<b>STANISLAUS RIVER WATERSHED</b>			
<b>Middle Fork Stanislaus River Planning Unit</b>			
<p>There is a lot of mention of Native American culture in the document, but virtually no mention of other very important habitants of this land. The Rushing is lined with ditches originally created by the '49ers. The pioneers traversed the emigrant trail when coming to California in the 1800's. Nomadic shepherders once roamed the entire area. The original homesteaders of the county used to have weeklong cattle drives into and out of the area in the early 1900's and probably earlier than that. The Sugar Pine Railway ran right through the area, but the all the respect it gets is allowing hikers to walk on the old track. All of the early American history ignored but there are lots of mentions about potential habitat for animals that have never actually been found there.</p> <p>There is an extraordinary opportunity for the youth to learn about the history of this county and the role it played before California was a state. Instead more politically correct things are mentioned like endangered species and wildlife habitat. Please specifically list out that the cultural heritage of the area from the time of the pioneers and forward should be a part of the youth education.</p> <p>Along with the neglect of "immigrant" American history using the term 'grazing', like it is a large commercial enterprise is turning a convenient blind eye to this counties heritage. It is real easy to listen to people who don't like cattle talk about how they are destroying the environment, but a little harder to ask them to prove it, especially when you take into account how long cattle, horses, and sheep have been grazing the high country for over 150 years in some areas. Studies done on the effects of cattle grazing should take into consideration things like why there are no Yosemite Toads in Yosemite, but they happily exist in many spots that cattle exist. Local historical organizations should be consulted along with Native Americans when choosing what to do with the land. Traditions like cattle grazing should have efforts made to PROTECT it as a local heritage rather than terminating it, and children should be able to hear the history of the land and the state that they live in.</p>	Cody Ritts	No	<p>Comment noted. Volume II Existing Conditions text for this planning unit describes not only cultural resources, but also a description of historic hydroelectric facilities and historic remnants such as prospect pits, roadways, and campsites. Text in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states: "The Stewardship Council also recommends installing interpretive signage at the existing footbridge that crosses the Middle Fork Stanislaus River (MFSR) to increase public awareness, appreciation, and stewardship of historic resources, including the historic tramway and metal shop. The history of flooding in the Stanislaus River Canyon would also be featured on interpretive signs including photos illustrating the canyon's environment prior to flooding." Text has not been added to describe pioneer use of the area because information was not verifiable. Discussion of the Sugar Pine Railway trail and associated interpretive signage is discussed in the Lyons Reservoir Planning Unit. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to evaluate the potential for grazing opportunities within the planning unit, in coordination with adjacent U.S. Forest Service (USFS) grazing allotments. 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 Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>

Stanislaus River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] The current parcels being identified for potential dispersal are six parcels at the east end of the Middle Fork Stanislaus River below Beardsley Lake and three parcels near the confluence with the main-stem Stanislaus River near the Stanislaus Forebay. It is our Center's perspective that management of the hydroelectric system is directly tied to the lands in question. We do not believe that there is any justification for PG&amp;E conveying these lands to any other entity. We generally support the recommendations contained within the LCP Volume II planning document.</p>	<p>John Buckley, Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Lands (parcels) that are considered necessary for current and future project operations will not be transferred to a new landowner, but will be encumbered with a conservation easement. The specifics regarding transfer of ownership, parcel splits, and easement restrictions will be developed during the disposition process.</p>
<p>[Condensed from letter] The single most controversial, most difficult part of the planning unit is located at the Stanislaus Forebay, where without constant law enforcement presence and fire prevention monitoring, the area is unsafe and risky for recreational use. The steep rise and fall of the reservoir during hydro operation, combined with the periodic drawdown of the entire reservoir to clean out the grate/penstock entrance at the west end of the reservoir, both make the reservoir less than optimal for stocking with fish and managing for recreation. The fire risk during the summer and fall periods is so extreme at the Forebay site that complete closures (to access) are often required by the Forest Service during dry years. As someone who actually patrolled the site for three years while with the Forest Service, I also know that transients, homeless people, and other risky people often make use of the area for extended periods, making visits by families unsafe, at best. Our Center respectfully suggests that any long-term investment in recreation and educational opportunities be aimed at areas that are not so remote (and no accessed by such bad dirt roads).</p>	<p>John Buckley, Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is aware that this area has had problems with illegal uses, access, and safety. The overarching measure to: "Assess public recreation demand and preferences to identify what types of recreation facilities are desired/needed" seeks to identify recreation needs as well as discount areas that may not be suitable for additional or continued use. A sentence was added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations stating that ongoing illegal uses, safety issues, monitoring challenges, and difficult access would be taken into account when considering enhancement measures and ongoing management would be necessary for maintenance and potential patrol of any new facilities. As mentioned in your comment, the more specific enhancement measures are all qualified with a sentence stating the access and the area's history of vandalism would need to be considered prior to making any enhancements. 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 objectives for this planning unit. The measure regarding off-highway vehicle (OHV) use in this area also states that ongoing management would be necessary for maintenance and potential patrol of new facilities.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[Condensed from letter] We do not support "identify potential grazing opportunities..." with a goal of developing grazing on the lands. First livestock grazing on adjacent Forest Service lands is already controversial and numerous residents in the Mt. Knight to Avery Ranch area complain of trespass of cattle onto their private property. Second, livestock trespass already occurs onto some portion of the PG&amp;E lands. Third, much of the western three parcels is considered to be winter deer range for local deer, and livestock browse/grazing diminishes forage value. Fourth, livestock grazing is truly not a valid, long-term economically feasible practice on such steep terrain. Access for permittee herding or collection of strays is extremely difficult, and on some portions of the parcels, impossible. CSERC urges that the Stewardship Council cancel any potential efforts to bring cows onto these lands.</p>	<p>John Buckley, Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to evaluate the potential for grazing opportunities in terms of coordination with adjacent grazing allotments. If trespass grazing is already occurring, a grazing opportunities evaluation could recommend formalizing such use or recommend against grazing. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states: "Consideration would need to be taken to avoid any conflicts between grazing, hydroelectric operations, recreation uses, and sensitive biological and cultural resources." Additionally, evaluating grazing potential would also encompass physical and economic feasibility. If grazing were found to be infeasible, then it would not be recommended.</p>
<p>The PG&amp;E properties, especially on the Middle Fork of the Stanislaus above and below Beardsley Reservoir, have been historically underutilized by the public, in part due to restricted access and lack of facilities. I applaud recommendations to improve access and facilities in these areas.</p>	<p>John Mason</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>a. Opportunities for generating revenues to make this unit sustainable appear limited. Many of the potential measures acknowledge the expense of achieving them and suggest the market for increased usage is unknown or limited (i.e. the potential for timber production is questionable due to fire suppression that has resulted in suboptimal forest conditions..." (p. SR-17, LCP Volume II).</p>	<p>Teri Murrison</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>