



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

September 21, 2010, 8:30 am – 12:30 pm

**Location: Mendocino National Forest Supervisor's Office
825 N. Humboldt Ave.
Willows, CA 95988**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Lewis Bair	RD 108, Sacramento River West Side Levee District, Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	Member
Patricia Bratcher	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	Member
Stuart Edell	Butte County Public Works	Member
Tom Ellis	Sacramento West Side Levee District, Land owners in the Colusa Basin, Member of the Board of Directors of Colusa County Farm Bureau.	Member
Pete Ghelfi	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Member
Eric Ginney	PWA, Ltd.	Alternate
Steve Greco	UC Davis	Member
Tom Karvonen	USACE	Member
Eric Larsen	UC Davis Department of Environmental Design	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	Member
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCFVCA	Member
Oscar Serrano	Colusa Indian Community Council	Member
James Strong	Farming, BSAGU	Member
Gregg Werner	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Jeremy Arrich	CA Department of Water Resources	Chief, CVFPO*
Keith Swanson	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Executive Sponsor
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO Lead
Scott Rice	CA Department of Water Resources (consultant)	Regional Coordinator
Natasha Nelson	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc.	Team
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Support
Dorian Fougères	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Ariel Ambruster	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support / Notetaker

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

Absent:

Les Heringer	Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	Member
John Linhart	Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency	Member
Kelly Moroney	USFWS - Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge Complex	Member
Mark Tompkins*	Newfields	Member

*Alternate attended in their place

Observer:

Amber Leininger	Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy
-----------------	----------------------------------

ACTION ITEMS:

- Team to provide Regional Applicability of Management Actions worksheet in Microsoft Word document form to Work Group members and e-mail Action Items by September 22.
- Work Group members have until **Thursday, September 30** to provide input on management actions, Draft Management Actions Report Outline, and Regional Applicability of Management Actions worksheet.
- Work Group members are invited to provide advice to Team on how to most effectively involve them and capture their input.
- Work Group members can e-mail their short lists of areas and projects to protect, and/or ideas for objectives, to the subcommittee and team members by **Tuesday, September 28**, for subcommittee consideration. The subcommittee would use these ideas to develop overarching objectives for the region. It would be helpful if the ideas include information about place and/or the geographic scope of benefits (i.e., regional or systemwide). The regional objectives will be aimed at reducing flood risk management, -- that is, reduce the chance of flood, and damages once flooding occurs, and improve public safety, preparedness, and emergency response.
- Team to provide draft documents for Work Group input prior to Meeting #3: revised management action evaluation forms, draft Management Actions Report, and draft IPS #2. A separate email will be sent out with additional details regarding the review of these documents.
- Team to contact Lewis Bair and Tom Ellis about possible subcommittee participation

To ask questions or comment about content, contact Roger Putty at roger.putty@mwhglobal.com. To provide comments or ask questions about logistical issues, contact Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

Meeting #3

Date: November 17
Place: Colusa Industrial Park, Colusa

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

The purpose for Meeting #2 was to address regional applicability of management actions for the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

1. Review outcomes of Management Actions Workshops and process for revising Management Actions
2. Introduce the processing logic for building solution sets
3. Discuss regional applicability of Management Actions
4. Initiate discussion of "regional objectives," and organize subcommittees to continue development of regional objectives

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Executive Sponsor Keith Swanson and CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich welcomed the meeting participants. Facilitator Dorian Fougeres led introductions and reviewed the day's agenda.

Opening Remarks

Executive Sponsor Keith Swanson encouraged work group members' continued participation in the process, and said it is important to keep an open mind, as the existing system has many problems, new paradigms have emerged, and the state is affected by FEMA and Army Corps of Engineers policies. It will be necessary to look for policies that work for all, water supply, public safety and the environment.

There were no questions.

Outcomes of Phase 2 Management Actions Workshops and Roadmap for Phase 2

CVFPO Lead Michele Ng, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, reviewed Phase 2 work to date, including the management actions development process through Round 1 and Round 2 workshops. During the management actions development process, the group will discuss place-based actions, which are those with physical and geographical applications. The conversation will not be about site-specific projects, but more about categories of actions and which are appropriate to the Upper Sacramento region. The group will also have an opportunity to discuss the systemwide management actions that address issues such as permitting, policy and institutional matters. A revised management action list is also in the packet. It is not final, as the Team is continuing to review and incorporate the more than 800 comments received during the workshops. She noted that the desired outcome of Phase 2 is a Management Actions Report, and an outline of the report is in the day's packet. Also produced during this phase will be the Interim Progress Report 2, which will provide a snapshot of the process. Revised management action evaluation forms will also be produced.

CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich said the Flood Control System Status Report is scheduled to be released in December, but that date may slip as it will be reviewed by the Governor's Office and the administration will be changing. If that occurs, efforts will be made to provide some of the information from the report to Work Group Members.

Q: When will the historical document be released?

A: A historian is working on it, and it is expected by the end of the year. In addition, the final descriptive document report is scheduled to be released in October.

Meeting participants reviewed the draft Management Actions Report outline.

Q: Will the report be region-specific or general?

A: It will be more general. Appendix B – Application and Integration Products will include discussion of applications to different communities, some integration, and some regional perspective.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

Process and Logic for Building Regional and Systemwide Solution Sets

Roger Putty of MWH, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the puzzle piece graphic handout, discussed the formulation of systemwide solution sets. He noted that there are three buckets for grouping the management actions: systemwide, such as permitting and finance; place-based; and management actions that are not quite within the CVFPP scope, but may apply to other programs.

Facilitator Dorian Fougères said members may be wondering when the discussion will focus on solutions. The aim of Phase 2 is to get shared meaning on how to evaluate management actions and determining which ones are regionally applicable, in order to prepare for Phase 3, when the focus will be on regional solutions.

Roger Putty said the solution sets are various combinations of management actions. Four solution sets have been created:

- **Restore SPFC Design Approach**, in which the focus is on deficiencies of the State Plan of Flood Control facilities identified in the Flood Control System Status Report to restore SPFC facilities to original design standards;
- **Critical Public Safety Approach**, which has the focus of reducing flood risk to protect public health and safety;
- **Floodplain Management Approach**, which emphasizes managing flood risk primarily through non-structural approaches; and
- **Multi-Benefit Approach**, which is the most comprehensive, and seeks to address the conflict between environmental values and the historical way flood operations have been carried out.

The approaches are very conceptual at this point.

Q: Why is Floodplain Management called "nonstructural" when it includes structural approaches?

A: The title is designed to capture the overall emphasis.

Comment: I would recommend you clarify the wording to emphasize that non-structural is the predominant, but not exclusive, approach.

Comment: I also agree that should be clarified.

Q: Do all four solution set approaches cost the same?

A: The height of the bars gives an idea of what the rough cost might be, conceptually. There will be more information about costs in Phase 3. The width of the bars indicates the time to implement the approach and the number of actions encompassed. This is a way of trying to show the contrast between the different approaches -- one might need a different financial instrument than another.

Comment: It would be helpful to explain on the chart that the height of the bar equals the relative cost.

Q: For the first one, what is the projected level of protection?

A: The goal would be the original operations and maintenance manual of the State Plan of Flood Control. The original had no level of protection. The legislation asks us to analyze this option.

Q: Would you assess the original designs?

A: That might be a good idea.

Comment: I am concerned that this polarizes us, setting the stage for conclusions about right versus wrong. It looks like the choice has been predetermined. How can you communicate the complexity of the different approaches without communicating judgments about them, and appearing to favor one over the others?

Response: I think an example might help. For example, at TRLIA (Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority in Yuba County), the second approach would have a low initial investment, but might result in higher long-term maintenance costs. The third approach: if we setback levees, we create a floodplain and reduce mitigation costs because there is no channel clearing. But there is an initial investment to obtain

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

land. Under the fourth approach, we would build a brand-new levee to modern standards with proper easements; it would be the best solution. There would be a high initial cost, but lower operations and maintenance costs.

Comment: The written Solution Sets Descriptions is good, so maybe you should use that, rather than the graphics. As far as the value of each approach, maybe this group should determine that value.

Response: This is conceptual. The multi-benefit bar is wider because we are trying to accomplish more, it takes a longer time, and the costs are higher. You bring up a good point about the perception of predetermination. Do you have suggestions on how we can avoid that? People sometimes prefer a graphic -- maybe we could provide several graphics. Suggestions are welcome.

Comment: I resonate with those comments. My suggestion is to make all bars the same size. Maybe your rating is accurate, but you'd have more buy-in if we help you.

Comment: Are we confusing value and cost? You can't change the cost. The question is what is your goal? Is your goal to spend as little as possible? It could be good or bad, depending on your outlook. I don't think we are trying to value the approaches -- to me, this is an objective-based evaluation based on cost.

Comment: I thought the example was very good. You could take some project and run through the different scenarios. It helps put it on the ground for us, to ground the concepts.

Comment: I'm confused on the first and last set of bar. If the first is 100-year protection and the last is 200-year protection, I don't understand how the costs of the first option are so high -- the first option costs more than the last option.

Response: The concept is that mitigation costs are very high. Also, long-term O&M costs could be different, as erosion issues would need constant attention. Also, the first does not correspond to any level of protection -- it is the original design capacity.

Response: This is very conceptual, as far as the height of the bars. We are not saying that we know. We have to run the cost estimates of the management actions in the solution sets. But we are floating the concepts to help us get the discussion going. Nothing is predetermined. For our short-term actions in the next five years, we would be looking at actions that would span across the four approaches.

Comment: The key is how you characterize these. Your comments helped. These are examples of what might be, not expectations or projections, designed to show how things can vary.

Response: We want to throw out a range of different options and solutions, and put information out to the decision-makers to help guide us. Also, the entire financial side is not shown here, as there are different federal, state and local funding share options, as well as bonds. We will continue to refine the approaches -- we may not fully resolve them for 2012.

Comment: This group should feel empowered. I think the width of the bar results from the level of cooperation. What usually determines the costs is the time spent on figuring it all out. I'd like to emphasize the value of this group.

Response: To follow on that, part of the discussion in the Round 2 workshops was that one management action might have financial or physical challenges that could be overcome if it was implemented in combination with another management action. You would achieve a more desired outcome. That information is being brought forward.

Response: We want to encourage collaboration, and that would potentially change the shape of the bars. This is an excellent suggestion. We are trying to provide people with a construct of the thinking process and how each approach compares with goals, instruments, and possible financial structures.

Response: Are you feeling any better? Our intent is not to imply that we have everything figured out. This is the group that has to figure it out. It has to work for the region, or it won't get implemented.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

The Team clarified that the definition of "common elements" is items common to all four solution sets. These common elements will be part of a set of actions that would be strongly recommended to the board for their adoption (Central Valley Flood Protection Board).

Comment: Calling the fourth approach "multi-benefit" implies that the other approaches are not. What I believe you really need is to improve the system level of protection. You might find another way to word that. The object is to make all of them multi-benefit.

Response: Your point is well taken. Is the word "balanced" better? We are not trying to say the others are not balanced, but it's sort of a combo of the others. A comprehensive approach? Integrated?

Comment: The bars would get bigger and wider the more funding we have. Why are we applying the original design that we all feel is inadequate?

Response: The legislation requires us to do so. It would also provide a valid reference point. There are some points of the system where we may do that, but at other points, we might do a multi-benefit or a critical public safety approach.

Comment: This is splitting the group. Maybe a better metaphor would be a tree. There is a foundation, a base that you build upon. Then there is the low hanging fruit. You go up higher on the tree, there might be less fruit, or more you want to grasp for. We are more interested in the features than the names. People may want to go on certain branches. People can decide what they want.

Response: that's a nice metaphor. I think we can work with that concept.

Comment: The basic criteria are our goals. The description does not communicate. Why carry forward alternatives that don't meet the goals?

Response: Each of these will address the primary and supporting goals, just at different levels.

Response: "Balance" is a judgment. The floodplain management approach is more passive. The "multi-benefit" approach is more active. They all address the goal, but have different accomplishments. The long-term financial structure and cost is going to be very different. We want everyone to have that contextual information, because we are trying to have a sustainable system, both socioeconomically and environmentally.

Discuss Regional Applicability of Management Actions

Roger Putty and Dorian Fougères referred the group to the worksheet on applicability of management actions to the Upper Sacramento region. The group is now to review these place-based management actions and determine if they apply or do not apply to the region, and discuss why or why not, by discussing constraints and compatibilities.

Q: What is the definition of "compatibilities" -- constraints that can be overcome?

A: Yes, or that can help with flood issues. Constraints are something in the region that is physically or institutionally unique that would constrain. An example of compatibility would be, for limited channel capacity, additional reservoir storage could address it.

Q: Why were these chosen and why were others left off?

A: These are the place-based actions.

Comment: A lot have been left off -- someone made that choice. I am feeling like decisions were made before I got here.

Response: The others are considered to be systemwide. For example, regulatory, permitting reform. I had some of the same concerns, initially. It's not like anything we developed before went away, but this is where they felt they needed more information from the groups. The other information will be brought along.

Q: What is the definition of floodproofing?

A: Elevate structures, masonry walls, little ring levees. It's more applicable to sheet flow.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

Facilitator Dorian Fougères asked the group to begin by raising any management action category/subcategory that they feel does not apply to the region. Work Group Members made the following points:

Ring Levees

- We would totally oppose ring levees in our county, because they encourage building in the floodplain. I don't think it applies in our region.
- Ring levees could be good or bad. It implies you may detract from the proper maintenance of existing levees.

Transitory Storage

- What a problem it will be for you to sell that in our area. Try to sell it to our landowners, and you will run into a stone wall. South of Colusa, the river is perched, on high ground. The Sutter and Colusa basins on each side are bowls. The river used to inundate vast tracts of land, and the system is still the same. We would have problems if we don't maintain our bypass system. Any flooding has to be pumped out, it can't escape otherwise. I guess it might be okay north of Colusa.
- I look at it differently. If we could build 3B's to its proper elevation, in our end of the world, it would work, and it would give us more storage capacity.
- (First speaker) I totally sympathize with that issue.
- People don't understand the investment that has been made in agricultural lands. The challenge with transitory storage is that it is different when talking about a small piece versus 72,000 acres. In our area, there is no way to isolate a small area.
- One aspect is frequency: every five years versus every 200 years.
- Agriculture wants increased storage capacity. It depends on purpose, size and frequency. The basins could be ideal -- for example, Sites Reservoir will create a lot of storage available for agriculture.
- Sites Reservoir is off-stream storage and is not transitory storage as defined for the CVFPP.
- (First speaker) I totally agree, Sites Reservoir is totally different
- Perhaps we need a clear definition of "transitory storage."
- There are three separate areas: Verona to Colusa; Colusa to the project levee system; and Ord Ferry north, which is private land and no levees. Some will work in some areas and some not.
- Yes -- we can't answer today whether it applies or not. It's more complicated.
- This is a very touchy topic, and it deserves its own time.
- Transitory storage would have connections to other things -- are there emergency services? A recovery plan?
- In the Colusa basin, we have areas within and outside the federal/state levee. I have areas that, if they were within the levee system, I could do a lot with. I could do transitory storage. It's not within the system, but it is still in the basin.
- Our storage basins are outside the system, too -- the benefits to the system would be huge.
- Actions outside of the system that provide benefits to the system will be considered.

In response, Team members said it appears that there are certain flood protection zones within the region, with boundaries between them. Ring levees may not apply in one protection zone, but might apply in others. Hearing these comments is very valuable to help the Team formulate future discussions. In addition, it was suggested that it would be beneficial to have a discussion on possible compensation from the armoring of urban areas. Urban areas are likely to develop and there currently isn't enough money to protect the rural areas.

In regards to basins outside the flood system, the management actions may not necessarily need to be within a given area, if they contribute to flood protection in the system. Large-scale temporary detention outside the green area (the Systemwide Planning Area) of the map could contribute to that area. Projects such as these would be part of the scope of this process. These are good examples of local and systemwide benefits that will be discussed in Phase 3.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

Setback Levees

- While it may apply in certain areas, in other areas, it does not, because of the cost and they would be physically prohibitive. The river is a high point. You would have to build 50 foot rather than 25 foot levees in some areas.
- In my ranch, the river is 15 feet higher. The Comp Study wanted to move the levees 1 mile out. The land drops 12-15 feet in that 1 mile. You would have to build levees with equal protection, and for every foot higher, you have to increase the base 5 feet. It would have to be 150 feet wide and 35 feet high. In addition, you will have equal sand strata and sand lenses 1 mile away.
- Also, when you move out, you will get ponding around the levees that would drain into the groundwater, with possible impacts to groundwater quality
- At Deer Creek, we are in favor of levee setbacks. They would provide extra storage and help fish and the environment. Again, it depends -- it's site-specific. For 30 years, I defended the existing levee, and now I see that setbacks are not all bad.

Meeting participants were then asked to name management action categories or subcategories that would very much apply to the Upper Sacramento region, and that they might want to emphasize. In addition, are there unique characteristics to the region, both compatibilities or constraints?

- Bypasses. Maintain the ability to move our flood flow; we have lots of water to move. In our area, the Sutter basin handles 180-210,000 cfs, while the main stem has 30,000. That system, its capacity and the weirs connecting the bypass with the main stem, need to be maintained.
- Creating additional distributary channels could increase the capacity of the bypass system. There might need to be multiple channels rather than bigger ones.
- Ecosystem Restoration. The name of "ecosystem restoration" was changed to "promote ecosystem functions." Ring Levee is one small category, while Promote Ecosystem Functions is an entire set. At some places, all are applicable. I can provide a report to DWR.

Other Issues

- One thing I don't see is responsible development. There is constant pressure to build up to the stream bank.
- Management Action 78, to develop mandatory flood insurance: that is FEMA's job, not our county's. We don't want to be the bearer of that bad news.
- Management Action 38, on revising O&M manuals: our Board of Supervisors has to sign off on a revised manual.
- One thing that is problematic is "remove unnatural hard points within channels." I disagree. There are unnatural hard points that are necessary to protect infrastructure. For example, Les Heringer's facility. This needs to be reworded.
- "Unnatural hard points" may need to be better defined. There are hard points that tens of millions of dollars are spent on: fish screens and pumping plants.
- Perhaps put "selected" hard points. I do work for the Army Corps of Engineers and some hard points are unnecessary.
- I support "selected" hard points such as bridges and roads.
- I don't think anyone is advocating removing them all. Clearly we need to remove some, and we need to keep others.
- The worksheet uses the language "uncontrolled tributaries." I think there is a need for uncontrolled tributaries.

Jeremy Arrich asked the group for suggestions for how to most effectively get their input into protection areas. For example, would it be helpful to have a six-hour meeting one week afterwards to go over some of these specifics?

Comment: it is challenging to talk in generalities. I've sat around the table with these people for 15 years having these conversations. The key is if we can talk about specifics. There are good ideas, such as the setbacks on Deer Creek. When we talk about generalities, we don't get to the good information.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

Response: We want this plan to be broadly supported.

Comment: To get broad based support, you need to use very general language. While we were working on the broad issues, we could try to advance pieces that have common support. There are big policy issues around FEMA and land use. Are we going to let EIP Phase 2 go forward, or stop everything, until everything is nailed down?

Comment: Where is the guidance? It may be too early, but project-specific things help us move through the process. Specifics you can vet out, and think through, how will this project work?

Response: It would be in between, for example, "in this region, there would be X miles of setback levees."

Comment: We saw the Comp Study roll out and not be implemented. What went wrong is it is hard to make everyone happy. In this process, there is no way to negotiate a compromise. That's what happened with the Comp Study: there was no way for folks who would be affected regionally to have a negotiation on how they would be affected. How do you make a deal?

Response: I think discussions have to get basin-specific, how we'd rank specific actions. A particular basin might have five environmental sites, 3 acres of seepage, a hard point that has to be protected, etc. The discussion would be on what collectively is our first priority? There could be funding from water supply or environment because it meets their needs. You're going to have a plan that is updated every five years. We want to be moving in the right direction.

Comment: I'll throw out this idea: as we get better engineering information as modeling gets underway, it might make sense to take a reach and look at where DWR and the Army Corps see the problems. There is consensus among stakeholders, we understand the issues -- we need to get an understanding on where you see the issues and bring it back.

Response: That is where we are headed. The Flood Control System Status Report will be more reach-by-reach.

Comment: As far as our comments, you say you have received it, but we don't know how you're incorporating it. It would be helpful to me to know what is being done with my input.

Comment: Reviewing drafts will be important.

Response: You will get a chance to review drafts. If there is a specific item you raise to us, we will address it.

Comment: Michele did a great job of responding to one specific item I raised with her.

Developing "Regional Objectives" and Subcommittee Meeting Approach

Roger Putty, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, reviewed objectives developed in Phase 1 and discussed the need to develop regional objectives to provide more specificity on how to achieve CVFPP goals within this region. The focus today will be on developing regional objectives. With regard to the primary CVFPP goal of improving flood risk management, what is critical to protect in your region as far as people, property and infrastructure? The group will begin the discussion today, and the subcommittee will meet one to two times before Meeting #3 to complete the process. He reviewed three examples of regional objectives.

Q: Are the regional objectives to be achieved in 2012, 2017, or longer-term?

A: They don't need to be constrained by a timeframe.

Comment: For management actions, if you break the region into specific geographic areas, you can identify which management actions may apply within each area. For our anadromous fish project, we developed a spreadsheet to track different objectives and how they are being addressed. I can share this with the Team.

In discussing regional objectives, Work Group Members raised the following points:

- I would address critical flow bottlenecks, such as the confluence between Sutter and Yolo counties at the Feather, American and Sacramento rivers. That's going to be the Katrina of tomorrow -- it is so underdeveloped, all the way up to Yuba City and Marysville. A second bottleneck is at Colusa, where there is a critical flow split.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

- I would agree.
- We could develop a map that breaks the region into 3-4 subregions.
- Woodson Bridge
- Each of us could identify critical issues and develop a paragraph to help the subcommittee, and e-mail it out.
- There is a theme of subregions and regional issues. Flood management is a regional issue.
- I know four projects in Butte County, but it would take me a long time to talk about them.
Response: The key information we need is for you to identify what problems they would address.
- There is a huge misunderstanding about who is responsible for emergency response. We clarified this in our county with a Board of Supervisors resolution.

Q: When will we talk about the other solutions sets?

A: At Meeting #3. You could discuss the primary supporting goal today. We are trying to understand what is to be accomplished so that the goal can be achieved. How do we measure how well the solution sets are working? You could develop regional objectives for the primary goal of improving flood risk management.

Facilitator Dorian Fougères asked members if the geographic boundaries of the different subbasins are commonly understood and obvious, as one piece of work the group could do today is to define those boundaries. Work group members indicated that that would not be a simple and quick discussion.

Recruitment of Subcommittee Members

Dorian Fougères and Roger Putty said the subcommittee would meet one to two times in October before Meeting #3 to identify critical items to protect in the Upper Sacramento region. The subcommittee will have access to staff and facilitation support and can set its own schedule and meeting locations, including conference calling options. They asked for volunteers.

The following members volunteered:

- Stuart Edell
- Gene Massa
- Keith Swanson
- Pete Ghelfi, if the meeting is held through conference calls
- Steve Greco
- Mark Tompkins (via handwritten note)
- Max Sakato suggested Lewis Bair or Tom Ellis might serve. The Team will follow up with them.

Next Meetings, Action Item Review, Meeting Recap

Ariel Ambruster, Facilitation Support, reviewed the day's action items and provided date, time and place information for Meeting #3 on November 17. The objectives for that meeting include a presentation by the subcommittee on its recommended regional objectives; full group discussion and development of regional objectives; and an introduction to Phase 3, developing regional solution sets. Work group members are encouraged to participate in Phase 3, when the discussion will turn to which management actions to pursue in the region.

To ask questions or comment about content, contact Roger Putty at roger.putty@mwhglobal.com. To provide comments or ask questions about logistical issues, contact Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com

Follow-up for absentee members:

- Stuart Edell will contact Les Heringer

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #2

- Ariel Ambruster will contact Ashley Indrieri
- Stuart Edell will contact Jason Larrabee
- Ariel Ambruster will contact John Linhart
- Patricia Bratcher will contact Kelly Moroney
- The Team will provide meeting materials to the above absent members

Executive Sponsor Keith Swanson thanked work group members for their efforts and time that day. He asked members to think of system objectives, and ways to bring money from urban areas to rural areas.