

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
UPPER MOKELUMNE RIVER WATERSHED			
North Fork Mokelumne River Planning Unit			
<p>[Condensed from letter] Finally, the recreational component in the Land Conservation Plan recommends establishment of a trail around Lake Tabeaud. The Agency supports that concept and would request that any recreational enhancement to a resource that is a source water drinking supply include provisions to maintain the high source water quality of the existing lake.</p>	<p>Amador Water Agency</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council understands that the trail must not alter water quality. In the description of the trail measure in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations, it is stated that the trail would be located sufficiently away from Lake Tabeaud to minimize erosion or other water quality concerns to this drinking water reservoir.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>I and my family own property on the North Fork Mokelumne River Planning Unit in Amador and Calaveras Counties. The parcels we own are 036-210-026-000 and 036-190-053-000. In reading the LCP I am concerned with the PG&E property that is going to be donated/sold to other entities and their uses that will affect our agriculture uses that we are currently practicing. My great grandmother sold to PG&E the property from the middle of the river to the extreme height water mark plus 10 feet. She did this during the depression. The agreements were recorded in the Amador County Recorders Office Recorder No. 19654B Dated April 2, 1931. We retained the right to access the water (for agriculture use). Because the usage was historically this way, we believe we should have the same access rights to the water. I am concerned about personal property rights. We have had problems in the past with people shooting our cows, wounding and/or killing them, destroying property, stealing fencing and gates, leaving personal trash, starting fires, tearing up the ground with motorcycles, and general destruction of the property. With the possibility of a walking, bike, or horse trail near the property is a major concern to us. I have called the Sheriff's office in the past for trespassing problems and they make an appointment with me for the next week. This is not a high priority with them. Currently my liability insurance company says not to let anyone on the property. With a trail next to us, is asking for trouble for me. Currently my liability insurance company says not to let anyone on the property. With a trail next to us, is asking for trouble for me. MORE PEOPLE, MORE PROBLEMS. Again owning property next to a possible public trail or road is a large liability for us and we are concerned with the possible problems they might cause and the liability it presents. It would seem to use that a governmental agency would have the recourse's to build, maintain, manage and enforce violators concerning the trail or road.</p>	<p>Carole Marz</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Comment noted. Water delivery is discussed in Volume I, section 2.4.1. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, conservation easements must honor existing agreements for economic uses, including consumptive water deliveries. In regards to the trail, the Stewardship Council developed a potential measure to support any future efforts [by other entities] to restore the historic Standard Canal Trail, but the description of the trail measure in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations also states that safety, feasibility, as well as potential vandalism to sensitive operational features <u>and adjacent properties</u> (new text added) would need to be addressed.</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
Add Overview bullet: • <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	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>“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, and agricultural land uses.”</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.

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>Condensed from letter. Enclosed are some random copies of my files, including some letters and notes on my correspondence with PG&E for approximately the last 50 years, pertaining to the sale of surplus land. Each time some obstacle held up these transactions, even though some properties have been declared surplus and ready for sale. Some of the obstacles we faced were waiting for FERC re-licensing, intervention by Santa Clara Co., and PG&E bankruptcy. Roaring Camp has over the past years maintained our part of the unspoiled canyon so that it has attracted people from all over the world. We run day gold panning and adventure tours into the canyon as well as BBQ dinner trips. We have camp cabins and tent sites where people stay a week or longer. Thousands of people visit Roaring Camp annually. While studying the California gold rush, 4th graders take field trips to Roaring Camp to learn about history and experience gold panning and nature in the Mokelumne Canyon. Having built a road some 40 years ago, we have the only access into this part of the canyon. The majority of this property is fenced for our livestock which is raised for our visitors to enjoy. These small isolated PG&E parcels are very important to our success at Roaring Camp. The future usage of these parcels will directly affect our business. We hope PG&E will honor its past commitments to sell us these parcels. The steep terrain and isolation of these properties make them unusable to anyone else.</p>	E.V. Rodman	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>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>Friends of the River recommends that PG&E parcels available for disposal in this planning unit be transferred to the Eldorado National Forest and the BLM to expand existing public lands and enhance public recreation access on the segments of the North Fork Mokelumne River recommended for Wild & Scenic protection.</p>	<p>Friends of the River</p>	<p>No</p>	<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>
<p>In its final Sierra Resource Management Plan (May 2007), the BLM recommended 22.2 miles of the North Fork Mokelumne from Tiger Creek Afterbay to Highway 49 for National Wild & Scenic River protection.</p>	<p>Friends of the River</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This information has been added to the Existing Conditions. Page 2-67 of the final Sierra Proposed Resource Management Plan (May 2007) states that the following river segments would be recommended to Congress as suitable for wild and scenic river designation: "...North Fork/main Mokelumne (20 miles; wild, scenic, and recreational)."</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>On behalf of the Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail, I would like to commend the Stewardship Council for a job well done on this far-reaching project. You have accomplished quite a lot in a short time. We feel that our Vision and Values echo that of the Planning Unit's Objectives of Preservation, Protection and Enhancement. (LCP Vol II, UM-27, figure UM-3)</p> <p>Regarding the North Fork Mokelumne River Planning Unit; although a designated route for the Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail has yet to be formally presented, the support of the Stewardship Council for this project and the assistance offered if the trail should cross PG&E lands along the Mokelumne River will be invaluable to our effort. We have been actively scouting the route from Highway 49 east to Tiger Creek Reservoir, and, while much of it will likely be higher up the hillsides or on ridge tops, we have identified a section - Hwy. 49 to Ponderosa Bridge on the Calaveras County side - that will initially cross four parcels owned by three different people before accessing BLM and PG&E land. We would welcome your offered assistance in dealing with landowners to obtain easements through property that leads to PG&E lands.</p> <p>One concern: on your map (LCP vol II, pg. UM-20) there are many parcels labeled "Preliminarily Designated for Disposition." Several of these are located where the Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail is likely to be routed, especially the Electra to Lake Tabeaud, Ponderosa Bridge and Tiger Creek Reservoir areas. We hope that, if disposed of, that a permanent conservation easement would be included. We also welcome and support your recommendation of Restriction of OHV Use from Tiger Creek. (Vol.II, UM-24) Thank you for an insightful Land Conservation Plan and for investing in the youth of California.</p>	Jean Tarabek	No	<p>Comment noted. As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&E must protect all of the parcels contained within the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to be held by third parties. 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>We'd like to comment on the recommendations proposed for the North Fork Mokelumne River Planning Unit by the Stewardship Council. As a property owner with almost 1/3 mile of property line bordering on Lake Tabeaud we have a great interest in what happens around the Lake. We agree with your assessment that the fire danger around Lake Tabeaud is [COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>	Randy & Kim Berg	Yes	<p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council understands that fuels are an issue, particularly around Lake Tabeaud as is stated in the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations. 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</p>

Upper Mokelumne River Watershed

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE.]</p> <p>severe. The development of a Fuels Management Plan and the reduction of fire hazard in the area would be very welcome. The Draft mentions "coordination with adjacent landowners" and we'd be happy to cooperate in that endeavor. A few years ago the fuel under the power transmission lines was removed and we'd encourage the maintenance of that fire break. We'd also like to see NO SMOKING signage at all access points to the proposed trail around the lake. We see all too many cigarette butts and signs of bonfires in our wanderings around the lake. We DO support the trail but have great fear of the potential fire hazard inherent in the increase in the number of people visiting the lake because of the new trail. In short, our greatest concern is FIRE and anything that is done to reduce that threat is appreciated. Our second greatest concern is security. The park is closed at night but from our home we can see people driving across the dam every night. Just last night I saw someone parked on the dam at midnight and another car driving across at 2 AM. Bill Tomei of PG&E has asked us to call the sheriff whenever we see someone park on the dam after dark. I sometimes fear the sheriffs' office gets tired of hearing from us. There is a security patrol on weekend nights but we'd like to see it increased to 7 nights a week. We'd also like to see more "CLOSED AT DUSK" signs placed at entrances to the park and parking areas and "NO CAMPING" signs at trail heads. I suppose it would be too much to install locking gates and perhaps even one way, tire shredding devices at the entrances to the park, but I thought I'd at least bring it up. The valve chamber for the tunnel that feeds the lake is on our property and I've had to install barbed wire on our gate to discourage people from climbing over the gate to get near it....They were bending up our gate! We'd like to see a security camera or something installed on the valve chamber to discourage vandalism and other mischief. We'd also like to have the day use only policy enforced 7 nights a week down at the Electra area. We heard on our police scanner that some idiot had a bonfire down there way after dark in early July...The steepness of that</p> <p>[COMMENT CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]</p>			<p>management plans will likely be developed post transaction. Text has been added to the Lake Tabeaud trail measure to specify that fuels management as well as security will need to be taken into consideration if this trail is developed.</p> <p>In regard to the Standard Canal Trail, text has been added to address fire concerns. The Stewardship Council understands that illegal uses, such as the ones described in the comment, are an issue at several locations throughout this planning unit. In regard to illegal activities and security, the Stewardship Council has developed a potential measure to: "Identify and disclose unauthorized uses and develop strategies to address future management and/or eradication."</p> <p>Regarding star thistle, a FERC license required Noxious Weed Management Plan addresses management of noxious weeds on PG&E lands adjacent to Forest Service lands and the Stewardship Council has recommended a potential measure to develop a noxious weed management plan for areas not included within the FERC license required plan.</p>

Comment	Commenter	Edit to Vol II Made	Response
<p>[COMMENT CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE. RESPONSE TO COMMENT PROVIDED ON PREVIOUS PAGES.]</p> <p>canyon would bring any fire straight up the slope to Lake Tabeaud. For the same reason we would not support the opening of the Standard Canal Trail to the public. It's just too hard to fight a fire along that steep canyon wall. The other two things that are proposed that we whole heartedly support are the interpretive signage to enhance peoples' knowledge of the history of the area and the development of a noxious weeds management plan. Just above the pumps at Lake Tabeaud is a large patch of Star Thistle. We'd like to see that eliminated. In summary, We support the trail around Lake Tabeaud but would like to see fuel and noxious weed reduction, beefed up security, and signage to educate and manage the visitors to the lake. We Do Not support opening the Standard Canal Trail.</p>			