

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
UPPER MOKELUMNE RIVER WATERSHED			
Blue Lakes Planning Unit			
Add "Overview" bullet as follows: • <i>"Source water supply for Amador and Calaveras Counties, Jackson Irrigation District, Amador Water Agency, North San Joaquin Water Conservation District, Woodbridge Irrigation District, and senior appropriators."</i>	EBMUD	Yes	As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), of which water resources is not specifically included. However, this sentence was added to the Existing Conditions to provide context.
Include <i>"protecting water quality and supplies"</i> as part of the Recommended Concept Objective.	EBMUD	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), of which water resources is not specifically included. Water resources protection was considered in the development of potential measures.
Include <i>"Develop a Water Resources Management Plan for the planning unit."</i>	EBMUD	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), of which water resources is not specifically included. Water resources protection was considered in the development of potential measures.
Revise "Open Space Objective" to read, <i>"Objective: Preserve open space in order to protect natural and cultural resources, viewsheds, water quality and supply, the recreation setting, and the adjacent wilderness character."</i>	EBMUD	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), of which water resources is not specifically included. Water resources protection was considered in the development of potential measures.
Revise to read: <i>"Support future Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority efforts and include preserving drinking water quality, protecting water supplies, and identifying locations where restoration or protection projects are most critical as management priorities in this planning unit."</i>	EBMUD	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), of which water resources is not specifically included. Water resources protection was considered in the development of potential measures.

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Revise to read: <i>"Support future Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority efforts and include preserving drinking water quality, protecting water supplies, and identifying locations where restoration or protection projects are most critical as management priorities in this planning unit."</i></p>	EBMUD	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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), of which water resources is not specifically included. Water resources protection was considered in the development of potential measures.</p>
<p>Water resources should be identified as a separate BPV or a priority management issue and addressed in each planning unit that has hydrologic connection with a water supply system.</p>	EBMUD	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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), of which water resources is not specifically included. Water resources protection was considered in the development of potential measures.</p>
<p>Because the watershed lands are almost entirely surrounded by National Forest lands, the Forest Service is the obvious recipient.</p>	John K Moore, Sierra Club	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>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>More details of how both retained and donated lands adjacent to Wilderness would be managed to “complement wilderness values” should be given. Limiting salvage logging on the retained lands to felling of human hazard trees would best complement wilderness values. Vehicles should be excluded from the retained lands, except as necessary to functioning of the hydroelectric system.</p>	<p>John K Moore, Sierra Club</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that managing areas bordering the Mokelumne Wilderness: "would include managing recreation as primitive, not allowing motor vehicle use, protecting cultural resources, maintaining a visual quality of preservation (e.g., any trails and other related improvements should be designed to be as obscure as possible), maintaining natural condition of timber stands, and generally preserving the wilderness character of the land."</p>
<p>Support all the site-specific measures: unauthorized OHV trails should be closed; non-motorized trails between the lakes a good idea.</p>	<p>John K Moore, Sierra Club</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The history and effects of past management activity on watershed lands outside the FERC boundary and adjacent to wilderness should be thoroughly documented to assist in future evaluation of these lands as possible additions to the Wilderness.</p>	<p>John K Moore, Sierra Club</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Determinations regarding which potential measures move forward into implementation will occur during the development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p>
<p>The timber-growing potential of the watershed lands and forest lands in the area is very low. Past Forest Service timber sales in the vicinity of this planning unit had limited, if any, benefits. Preparation of detailed timber management plans is not justified.</p>	<p>John K Moore, Sierra Club</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a forest management plan as a tool for developing a long-term, sustainable vision for the forest resources within the 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>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>As to the Blue lakes map. You need to define the PG&E Boundary, add private ownership adjacent and show FERC boundary where different than the PG&E boundary. This needs to be done at a scale where the map can be understood. You have a "day use area" shown at the east end of Lower Blue Lake, this is in fact a boat launch area and is not to be used as "day use".</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>PG&E lands are shown in grey, private lands are shown in a light tan color, and the FERC boundary is shown as an orange/peach line. In addition to this visual representation, the report states that: "Private lands border this planning unit to the southeast of Lower Blue Lake." Detailed parcel level maps will be developed as part of the disposition process. The southeastern Lower Blue Lake shows both a boat launch as well as a day use area as described in the Final FERC License Order for the Mokelumne River Project (p. 114), which describes, "Lower Blue Lake Dam Boat Launch and Picnic Area (east end of dam). The Licensee shall provide a surfaced parking area for five vehicles with boat trailers and five single vehicles...The Licensee shall provide a loop road and partial ramp to allow launching of car-top and light trailered boats...The Licensee shall provide: (a) a single-unit accessible toilet; (b) a garbage bin; and (c) two to three picnic units, each with a table and cooking grill at this location. The Licensee shall provide access from the parking area to the picnic units." The March 2002 Recreation Implementation Plan (p. 5) likewise describes a boat launch and picnic area at the east end of Lower Blue Lake Dam.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>As to the statements shown on the map as to closure or limiting OHV use. Having dealt with this issue over the years, we feel that you have no authority to close anything. Most all of the roads were in place prior to PG&E taking over ownership also there is the matter of ongoing public use which creates "prescriptive right." This would in fact be a bad idea in that if roads were closed, this would concentrate the OHV use on remaining roads or trails and lead to increased resource damage. Under the stipulation and settlement agreement, Section 2.4.3, it requires that the LCP "Preserve or enhance public access." If you limit access, how are the handicapped going to be able to use the area? Alpine County needs to be included in any road related issues as they may be fact be the owner or regulator for the roads. Any closure may have an affect on County Search and Rescue which is a big issue in this area.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to formalize or close unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources, not access roads or authorized OHV trails. If it is determined that formalizing these trails is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of closing them. 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 as well as natural habitat and historic values. Potential measures are only related to formalizing or closing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures. These unauthorized trails were mapped by U.S. Forest Service (USFS) on their "Route Inventory Map" and are located on PG&E land south of Lower Blue Lake.</p>
<p>In the Twin Lake area, you have indicated a need to keep vehicles off the lake bed, which we agree, however, you need to retain the boat launch area because of the existing use.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not developed a potential measure to remove the boat launch.</p>
<p>OK, these are our comments, as you are aware, we have submitted a list of questions as relates to the area, which you did not want to address as part of this process, but which we would like response so that we can better understand the project, which will allow us to support or oppose parts thereto. This area is known for hunting, fishing, camping, hiking and jeeping or off-road use. (don't forget that PG&E has a duty to the area for the use of the waters and have in our opinion done a very good job). Your proposals are required to "preserve and enhance" these uses, not restrict or eliminate uses.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not developed potential measures to eliminate any uses, only to formalize or restrict uses which are either unauthorized or occurring in inappropriate areas. Restriction of use would still allow that use to continue, though in appropriate areas. No restrictions to legal/authorized hunting, fishing, camping, or hiking have been suggested.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>One of the long outstanding uses of this area is motorized use and being generally unlimited except to stay on trails or roads and meet vehicle laws. This should not change as this area is a place where people go to do this sort of thing and have for a 100 years or more.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has not developed a potential measure to discontinue motorized vehicle use. The Stewardship Council has only recommended measures to address unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. The Stewardship Council is charged with protection of the six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) identified in the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation including natural habitat of fish, wildlife, and plant and preservation of historic values, in addition to 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.</p>
<p>The area is sparsely patrolled by the County or USFS due to lack of funds. Also this is a very remote area and as such does not need additional reasons for visitation. This will cause the County and the USFS additional resource costs of which they have limited monies. The Stewardship Council needs to address or provide for additional funding for police, fire, rescue and medical service if the level of use is to be increased.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed several potential measures to enhance recreation. These enhancements are considered to be additional amenities for existing users and are not intended to draw new visitors to the area (thus increasing use). Details of appropriate recreational enhancements will be developed in close coordination with stakeholders as part of the disposition process (Volume III).</p>
<p>The Blue Lakes area (Basin) is under FERC license and in that license, the basin use is limited to 1000 people per day, currently, this capacity is near or exceeded on a busy day. How can you increase use at any level and remain within the license?</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council has developed several potential measures to enhance recreation. These enhancements are considered to be additional amenities for existing users and are not intended to draw new visitors to the area (thus increasing use). Details of appropriate recreational enhancements will be developed in close coordination with stakeholders as part of the disposition process (Volume III).</p>
<p>The PG&E cabins at Lower Blue Lake are used by PG&E crews on a regular basis for repair, upkeep and maintenance. We have on-going discussion with PG&E as relates to our common property line in that some of the PG&E facilities are located on our property. Any change in ownership within this area may affect available use and disposition of the in-question facilities.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>You have a mining area show near the upper end of Upper Blue Lake, there has been no mining in this area to our knowledge, and we have been involved in the area for the past 67 years and make a point of finding and researching the areas history.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Additional information on the history and exact location of past mining activities would need to be determined before interpretive signage is designed. Mining in this area was noted by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) in their divestiture evaluation: "Some evidence of mining is apparent on lands near Upper Blue Lake where several old glory holes and tailing piles exist. No known hazardous materials or claims are associated with these old mines."</p>
<p>You have indicated a potential "day use area" at Upper Blue Lake. This appears to be a very bad idea. If you were to add a "Day Use Area", you would need to go through the existing camping area to get to the site. This would completely destroy the nature of the camping area due to the through traffic. Who will control the traffic and parking and who will care for the maintenance of the site?</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The exact location for a day use area at Upper Blue Lake would be evaluated further before (and if) a specific location is selected. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations describes that prior to implementation, studies would need to be completed to evaluate the need for such a facility as well as determine if a suitable location exists. The report also describes that studies would need to determine if associated parking needs would be able to be accommodated in this area.</p>
<p>You have proposed a trail between the lakes. What is the affect of parking, use (number of people) and who will care for and maintain said trail? What about sanitation? What about litter?</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Specific management responsibilities in relation to the trail would be developed during the disposition process. The trail is not designed to bring additional recreation users to the area, but rather to act as an access for existing recreationists to get from one lake to another without driving.</p>
<p>You have suggested that you want to manage the areas adjacent to the wilderness. Under the definitions used for the wilderness, an adjacent property cannot in affect create a buffer in that this is now creating a extension of the wilderness, which is not allowed under the wilderness act.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council is not proposing to extend the Wilderness Boundary. The Wilderness Act of 1964 was reviewed and additional information from the commenter would be needed to further respond to this comment.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

<p>You list an area as Yellow Legged Frog Habitat, we assume you got that from the USFS map. This designation has not been formalized and in our opinion not verified as there is no proof other than wishful thinking on the part of the USFS in their attempt to close areas. We are not aware of any documentation to verify this designation and we have challenged the USFS on this point.</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Text revised to read, "The area <u>may</u> also provide habitat for special status species such as... mountain yellow-legged frog..."</p> <p>The source for this information is from a variety of sources such as Stewardship Council public meetings but is primarily from the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), which has numerous listings for the mountain yellow-legged frog (MYLF) throughout the area. The first CNDDDB location for the MYLF is within an unnamed tributary to Deer Creek. It was first recorded in 1992 by George Elliott, who apparently surveyed for amphibians throughout the area. The site was revisited by Elliott in 1994. Both tadpoles and adults were observed (1st visit May 30th and 2nd July 29).</p> <p>A more recent documented occurrence includes a location within an Upper Blue Lake PG&E parcel, which describes the habitat as a meadow site with small ponds and a meandering stream located between Upper Blue Lake and Lower Blue Lake about 0.5 mile southwest of Middle Creek Campground. One MYLF adult was observed in a larger pond on July 23, 2001 and 3 MYLF adults and 18 larvae observed in the meadow on Sept. 18, 2001 (the ponds had dried up). These sightings were recorded by Alvarez and Myers from Jones + Stokes. Both these occurrences were thought to be on public, rather than private lands. It was also mentioned in U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Divestiture Evaluation that MYLF are located in the area.</p>
<p>You stated that you wanted to formalize dispersed recreation use. What does this mean? Do you want to limit or do you want for create things such as formalized restricted parking? Does the restriction meet the goals of "Preserve or enhance public access"?</p>	<p>Lawrence L. Bowers for Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Further investigation is needed as to the most appropriate and effective means of either formalizing or restricting recreation use by Deer Creek. Restricting recreation use would continue to allow public access, but limit access to locations where sensitive resources would not be adversely affected.</p>

Public Comments and
Response to Comments on LCP Volume II

<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Install interpretive signage about the history of hydropower, local rare species, and prehistoric uses of the area. Questions: Was a survey done on the congestion that already exists in this area? What will the results be in adding more vehicles and people to a congested area? What other sites were considered? Will the new signage conflict with the important directional existing signage?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Existing day use areas or areas of specific resources were identified as potential locations to install interpretive signage; however, the exact location would be evaluated further before a specific location is selected. The installation of interpretive signage is not intended to bring additional recreationists to the Blue Lakes area, but is rather intended as an amenity for existing recreationists to enhance their experience and knowledge of the area and important history and resources. New interpretive signage is not meant to conflict with existing directional signage, but is intended to enhance stewardship and appreciation for the unique resources and history of this area.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. You do not have private property listed on your map ledger. Will you color code private property in the future?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Private property is assumed to be the property that is not color coded as owned by another entity.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. You have a day use area listed at the southeast end of Lower Blue Lake. Questions: Why is this listed as a day use area? How many picnic tables are there? Will you be directing the public to use this area as a day use area? Do you know what this area is designated for?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>According to the October 2001 New License 4(e) conditions, the: "Lower Blue Lake Dam Boat Launch and Picnic Area (east end of dam). The Licensee shall provide a surfaced parking area for five vehicles with boat trailers and five single vehicles (the Licensee shall select the surfacing material). The Licensee shall provide a loop road and partial ramp to allow launching of car-top and light trailered boats. The partial ramp shall not be surfaced. The Licensee shall provide: (a) a single-unit accessible toilet; (b) a garbage bin; and (c) two to three picnic units, each with a table and cooking grill at this location. The Licensee shall provide access from the parking area to the picnic units." The symbol on the LCP maps indicates that this area on the southeastern end of Lower Blue Lake is both a boat launch as well as a picnic area (therefore the day use area symbol was used). The Stewardship Council has not developed a potential measure to modify or specifically encourage use at this particular area, with the exception of adding interpretive signage to educate recreationists on the unique resources and history of this area.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

<p>Condensed from letter. Feature: PG&E Caretaker and Crew Cabin. Questions: Does the Stewardship Council plan on taking control of either of these cabins? Did the Stewardship Council research property lines and restrictive easements in the area? Will adjoining property owners be notified of any proposed changes of use on PG&E land?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>PG&E currently uses these cabins and likely will use them in the future for project maintenance. The Stewardship Council will not own land or property related to the Watershed Lands. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, the Stewardship Council is required to notice the Board of Supervisors of the affected county, each affected city, town, and water supply entity, each affected Tribe and/or co-licensee, and each landowner located within one mile of the exterior boundary of the parcel prior to making a decision regarding the disposition of any individual parcel.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Formalize or close unauthorized OHV trails. Questions: What OHV trail in Indian Valley do you want to formalize or close? By what authority can you close an existing use trail? By what definition is it unauthorized? Does this action decrease existing motorized access?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to formalize or close unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources. If it is determined that formalizing these trails is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of closing them. 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 as well as natural habitat and historic values. Potential measures are only related to formalizing or closing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures. These unauthorized trails were mapped by U.S. Forest Service (USFS) on their "Route Inventory Map" and are located on PG&E land south of Lower Blue Lake.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Formalize or close unauthorized OHV trails. Questions: Under the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Section 2.4.3 it requires that the LCP preserve or enhance public access. How does this recommendation enhance public access? How will the handicapped access the area? Why do you wish to formalize or close the OHV Trail below Lower Blue Lake? Did anyone research this area?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to formalize or close unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources. If it is determined that formalizing these trails is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of closing them. Potential measures are only related to formalizing or closing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures, and as such there would be no decrease in authorized access in this area.</p>

<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Formalize or close unauthorized OHV trails. Questions: How will this closure enhance public access under the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement? What agency has legal authority for road and trail closers in the area? Did you seek any input from the residents in the area on these proposed closures?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure to formalize or close unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources. If it is determined that formalizing these trails is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of closing them. Potential measures are only related to formalizing or closing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that unauthorized OHV trails in this planning unit often cross from PG&E to U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands and therefore, decisions to either formalize or close these trails should be made jointly. The Stewardship Council recommends coordination with the USFS on any OHV route decisions to create consistency in management.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Formalize or close unauthorized OHV trails. Questions: Was Alpine County contacted on the possible closer of this trail? What is the history of this trail? How long has this trail existed? How will search and rescue and emergency medical aid be affected by the possible closure?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council developed a potential measure to formalize or close unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources. If it is determined that formalizing these trails is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of closing them. Potential measures are only related to formalizing or closing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations states that unauthorized OHV trails on this planning unit often cross from PG&E to U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands and therefore, decisions to either formalize or close these trails should be made jointly. The Stewardship Council recommends coordination with the USFS on any OHV route decisions to create consistency in management.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

<p>Condensed from letter. You have yellow-legged frog habitat listed on your map. Who documented the sightings? How many sightings have there been? When was this documented? Time and date?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. Text revised to read, "The area <u>may</u> also provide habitat for special status species such as... mountain yellow-legged frog..."</p> <p>The source for this information is from a variety of sources such as Stewardship Council public meetings but is primarily from the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), which has numerous listings for the mountain yellow-legged frog (MYLF) throughout the area. The first CNDDDB location for the MYLF is within an unnamed tributary to Deer Creek. It was first recorded in 1992 by George Elliott, who apparently surveyed for amphibians throughout the area. The site was revisited by Elliott in 1994. Both tadpoles and adults were observed (1st visit May 30th and 2nd July 29).</p> <p>A more recent documented occurrence includes a location within an Upper Blue Lake PG&E parcel, which describes the habitat as a meadow site with small ponds and a meandering stream located between Upper Blue Lake and Lower Blue Lake about 0.5 mile southwest of Middle Creek Campground. One MYLF adult was observed in a larger pond on July 23, 2001 and 3 MYLF adults and 18 larvae observed in the meadow on Sept. 18, 2001 (the ponds had dried up). These sightings were recorded by Alvarez and Myers from Jones + Stokes. Both these occurrences were thought to be on public, rather than private lands. It was also mentioned in U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Divestiture Evaluation that MYLF are located in the area.</p>
--	---------------------------	-----------	---

<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Restrict or formalize dispersed recreation use. Questions: Why would you want to restrict dispersed recreation in this area? This area is one of the few places that can take some of the congestion away from the Blue Lakes Basin. Why would you want to limit existing parking and informal trailheads? Did someone from the Stewardship Council visit this area? Did anyone research the area to see how long this dispersed recreation area has been used? How will this restriction enhance public access under the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement (Section 2.4.3)?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to restrict or formalize dispersed and unauthorized recreation uses in the area in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources. If it is determined that formalizing these uses is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of restricting uses. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), of which recreation is included. However, protection of cultural and biological resources is also required. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Install interpretive signage about history of mining. Questions: What mine? What did they mine? What is the grade and elevation of this mining area you have listed? How will people access the site?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. Additional information on the history and exact location of past mining activities would need to be determined before interpretive signage is designed. Mining in this area was noted by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) in their divestiture evaluation: "Some evidence of mining is apparent on lands near Upper Blue Lake where several old glory holes and tailing piles exist. No known hazardous materials or claims are associated with these old mines." Signage is intended to be located within an already developed site and not at the mine site.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Evaluate adding a new day use at Upper Blue Lake. Questions: Has anyone in the Stewardship Council visited Upper Blue Lake on a weekend? Was anyone aware of the parking issues in Blue Lakes before this was suggested? How will an added day use effect Alpine County in regards to law enforcement and emergency medical? How will an added day use effect the existing camping experience in regards to noise pollution and trespass issues through occupied campsites? How will the extra vehicles effect existing parking? Will there be illegal parking in the campgrounds? What will the increase in visitation to the Blue Lakes Basin be with your proposed improvement?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The exact location for a day use area at Upper Blue Lake would be evaluated further before a specific location is selected. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations describes that prior to implementation, studies would need to be completed to evaluate the need for such a facility as well as determine if a suitable location exists. The Supporting Analysis for Recommendations also describes that studies would need to determine if associated parking needs would be able to be accommodated in this area. The addition of a day use area at Upper Blue Lake is not intended to attract additional recreationists to the area, but rather to provide day use amenities to existing recreationists who use the area. There are currently no day use facilities at Upper Blue Lake.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Add trail access between the four lakes. Questions: Will a new trail increase visitation to the Blue Lakes Basin? Will the increase exceed the amount allowed in the Basin? Where will the parking be for a trailhead? Will this effect the existing parking? How will sanitation (bathroom) issues be handled so close to the shoreline? Who will be in charge of trail maintenance and litter removal?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The addition of a trail connecting the four lakes is not intended to attract additional recreationists to the area, but rather to provide trail access to recreationists who already use the area. There is currently no trail connecting the four lakes which necessitates people to either walk along the road or drive from lake to lake. It is assumed that trail users would use existing parking and restrooms located by Upper and Lower Blue Lakes and Twin Lake. The donee would be responsible for maintenance of the proposed trail.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Manage areas bordering Mokelumne Wilderness. Questions: Has the Stewardship Council ever read the Wilderness Act? Are you aware you are not to impose wilderness standards on non-wilderness lands as a buffer? Has the Stewardship staff ever researched how many acres are under wilderness restrictions compared to the amount of acres where motorized travel is allowed?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>There is currently no motorized travel allowed on PG&E lands bordering the Mokelumne Wilderness, so this potential measure would not decrease the amount of acres where motorized travel is allow (motorized access is currently not allowed by Meadow Lake or on the western side of Upper Blue Lake). The Stewardship Council is not proposing to extend the Wilderness Boundary. The Wilderness Act of 1964 was reviewed and additional information from the commenter would be needed to further respond to this comment.</p>

<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Manage areas bordering Mokelumne Wilderness. Questions: Has the Stewardship Council ever done any research on the Blue Lakes Basin as to what type of recreation it was known for? Do they know why the majority of the visitors came in the past? Why is the Stewardship Council so opposed to the historic use of motorized vehicles in the Blue Lakes area?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is not opposed to motorized vehicle use. The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to enhance public access for recreation, including motorized vehicle use, where appropriate. The Stewardship Council is not recommending restricting motorized travel to Blue Lakes. Recommendations are only related to restricting or formalizing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures. There is currently no motorized travel allowed on the PG&E lands bordering the Mokelumne Wilderness, so this potential measure would not decrease the amount of acres where motorized travel is allow (motorized access is currently not allowed by Meadow Lake or on the western side of Upper Blue Lake).</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Manage areas bordering Mokelumne Wilderness. Questions: Have you ever done a survey to see what activities are bringing visitors to this area? How many are coming to experience OHV use? How many are coming for fishing and hunting? How many are coming just for a day hike? How under the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement (Section 2.4.3) are you preserving and enhancing public access for OHV? Did you speak to any of the past or present residents in the area about historic use?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The measures are intended to be illustrative in nature, not prescriptive. The Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to restrict or formalize dispersed and unauthorized recreation uses in the area in order to protect sensitive cultural and biological resources. If it is determined that formalizing these uses is appropriate, that direction will be taken instead of restricting uses. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs), of which recreation is included. However, protection of cultural and biological resources is also mandated. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Action: Protect shoreline from vehicle access. Questions: Boat launching has been available for over 75 years at Twin Lake. Is the Stewardship Council planning on banning boats from launching at this day use area? The same boat launching facilities are available at both Upper and Lower Blue Lakes. Why would it not be allowed at Twin Lake? If you boulder the boat launch area how will emergency personnel launch a boat? Have you researched how many times a boat has been used on Twin to access across the lake for fire personnel?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council has not recommended bouldering the boat launch or banning boat launching at Twin Lake. The intent of the potential measure is to stop vehicles from parking on the shoreline, particularly near the day use area.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

<p>Condensed from letter. Why is there nothing in your proposal to increase and enhance motor vehicle access?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. The FERC Report on Recreation Resources (March 1990) describes this area as having relatively fragile vegetation and soils. Adjacent U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands also provide motorized recreation opportunities. Therefore, based on existing motorized recreation opportunities on adjacent USFS land and the presence of sensitive resources within the planning unit, no additional motor vehicle access was recommended.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. Off road travel has historically been a big draw for the Blue Lakes area. Why was this not mentioned in your plan?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<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 preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. The Stewardship Council has made every effort to identify opportunities to enhance multiple BPVs in each planning unit without adversely impacting others. Off-highway vehicle (OHV) use already occurs in this area and is noted as an existing use in the Existing Conditions description of the Blue Lakes Planning Unit. The FERC Report on Recreation Resources (March 1990) describes this area as having relatively fragile vegetation and soils. No additional motor vehicle access was recommended. However, if determined to be an appropriate use, the Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to formalize existing unauthorized OHV trails.</p>
<p>Condensed from letter. If you restrict motorized travel in area's what accommodations will you make for the elderly and handicapped that also want to experience the area?</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Stewardship Council is not recommending restricting motorized travel to Blue Lakes. Potential measures are only related to restricting or formalizing motorized use of unauthorized spur trails. Main access trails are not included within the Stewardship Council's potential measures.</p>

<p>Condensed from letter. Thank-you for your time. I will look forward to your reply and the answers to my questions. I am very disappointed the Stewardship Council has such an anti access attitude toward motorized travel. Blue Lakes Basin area has always been a favorite area for OHVs since the 1920s. I should remind you this is not a city park. It is a very rugged area with access less than 5 months out of the year. The terrain can be brutal if you are a novice hiker and you make a wrong turn. One of our members has actively enjoyed the area for over 70 years. It would be a shame for you to limit her experiences of the area because you have an agenda to make it a non-motorized area. I hope you remember motorized users have as much right to enjoy the area as anti access visitors.</p>	<p>Melanie-Sue Bowers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is not opposed to motorized vehicle use. The Stewardship Council has developed potential measures to enhance public access, including motorized vehicle use, where appropriate.</p>
--	-------------------------------	-----------	---