

Butte Regional Conservation Plan
Stakeholder Committee Comments Received to
Draft Chapter 5, Conservation Strategy, Version October 6, 2010
[Comments Received Through October 27, 2010]

Comment #	Page #	Section #	Line #	Comment	Commenter	Disposition
1				The logic of the chapter makes good sense and is easy to follow.	Scott G. McNall, CSU	
2				The description of a “systems” level approach described in the document is the approach I believe needs to be taken. However, when Pete described his ideas about what was required it differed from the written document. What is meant by a systems level approach needs to be clarified.	Scott G. McNall, CSU	
3	9	5.2.3.3	Fig.5-1	4 th box down on left should say Table 5.6; 5 th box down on left should say Table5.7	Suellen Rowlison, Woody Elliot, California Native Plant Society, Mount Lassen Chapter	
4	29	5.3.2.2	15,ff	How is number of acres determined?		
5	32	5.3.3	17, 31	Rational for 50%? Why not more or less? Cf. Table 5.7 for rationale.		
6	33	5.3.3	5, 7, 1, 3	Same as above. Also, Protect 1 of 3 plants, & up to 5 plants, Ratonale?		
7	50	5.4.2.6	35	Add “of” between ‘conditions “of” conservation’		

8	65	5.4.4.3	13	Add “certified weed-free” straw		
9	66	5.4.4.4	2	Add “and planting of invasive, non-native plants and trees”		
10	66	5.4.4.4	20b	Add “inform developers, landscapers, homeowners about Urban Wildlife Interface” (pamphlets available from Calif. State Parks)		
11	75	5.7.1	6	Strike ↵		
12	75	5.7.1	Fig. 5-6	In tan Analysis Box on right, strike No and add “Less than”		
13	89	5.7.3.5.3	Table 5.16	Footnote says additional monitoring can be conducted by I.E. as necessary. Add this to text on page 86 and/or 87, i.e., line 12. Eg., Veiny Monardella, etc. may need more frequent monitoring		
14	93	5.8	2	5.4? Should this be I.E.?		
15	100	5.8.5	30-32	Cf. comment #11 with this statement about Applied Research of rare plants		
14	101	5.8.6	28	Strike Science and put “System”		