



Meeting Summary

Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

September 17, 2009, 8:30 am – 1:00 pm

**Location: City of West Sacramento City Hall
1110 West Capitol Avenue
West Sacramento, California 95691
Room 157**

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP SCOPE DEFINITION (ESSD) WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Kelly Briggs	Department of Water Resources - Flood Management	Member
John Cain	American Rivers	Member
Scott Clemons	California Riparian Habitat Joint Venture	Member
Ken Cumming	National Marine Fisheries Service	Member
Eric M. Ginney	Philip Williams & Associates	Member
Tom Griggs	River Partners	Member
John Hopkins	Institute for Ecological Health; Northern California Conservation Planning Partners	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Clarence Korhonen	City of Elk Grove	Member
Stefan Lorenzato	Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Member
Michael Picker	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Geoff Rabone	Merced Irrigation District	Member
Monty Schmitt	Natural Resources Defense Council	Member
Pia Sevelius	Butte County Resource Conservation District	Member
Alex Stehl	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Member
Susan Tatayon	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Tanis Toland	United States Army Corps of Engineers	Member
Mark Tompkins	Trout Unlimited	Member
Julia Cox	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Alternate
Chris Hammersmark	CBEC, Inc.	Alternate
Jennifer Hobbs	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Alternate
Leon Rofé	California Indian Heritage Council	Alternate
Nat Seavy	Point Reyes Bird Observatory	Alternate
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting Group	CVFMP* Executive Sponsor
Ted Frink	California Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group
Meeting #2

Name	Organization	Status
Marc Hoshovsky	California Department of Water Resources	DWR Lead***
Elizabeth Hubert	California Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Michele Ng	California Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Michael Perrone	California Department of Water Resources	DES****
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH	Consultant Program Manager
Matt Young	MWH	Team
Debra Bishop	EDAW/AECOM	Technical Lead
Lynn Hermanson	EDAW/AECOM	Team
Eric Poncelet	Kearns & West	Facilitator
Ben Gettleman	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

**Central Valley Flood Management Planning (CVFMP)

**Central Valley Flood Planning Office (CVFPO)

***California Department of Water Resources (DWR)

****Department of Environmental Services

Absent:

Lewis Bair	Reclamation District No. 108, Sacramento River West Side Levee District, Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	Member
Chris Bowles	CBEC, Inc.	Member
Peter Buck	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Ellie Cohen	Point Reyes Bird Observatory	Member
Michael DeSpain	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Member
Dan Ray	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Member
Jesse Roseman	Tuolumne River Trust	Member
Chris Unkel	Ducks Unlimited	Member
Doug Weinrich	United States Fish and Wildlife Service	Member
Carl Wilcox	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Randy Yonemura	California Indian Heritage Council	Member

Observer:

Mary Matella	UC Berkeley
--------------	-------------

WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS

1. Send additional text on challenges, opportunities, principles and goals to Ben Gettleman (bgettleman@kearnswest.com) by COB Monday, September 21.
2. Select work group members (see page 10 below) to review select draft meeting #3 meeting materials by COB, September 24, 2009.

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

3. Review Meeting #2 Summary, and provide comments to Marc Hoshovsky (mhoshovs@water.ca.gov) by September 28, 2009.

ACTION ITEMS: PROGRAM TEAM

1. Incorporate comments made at meeting #2 and additional text from work group members on challenges, opportunities, principles and goals, and create a revised draft for each deliverable. Send revised versions to work group members by COB Monday, September 28th.
2. Prepare draft document on measures of success for handout at Meeting #3.
3. Facilitation team to send Meeting #2 Summary to work group members for review.

MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of Meeting #2 of the Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition (ESSD) Work Group was to continue the group's discussion of "challenges" and "opportunities"; to review draft "principles"; and to begin identifying "environmental stewardship goals."

MEETING GOALS

1. Discuss and confirm synthesized "challenges" and "opportunities" identified at Meeting #1
2. Review and discuss draft "principles" for guiding the development, integration and implementation of environmental stewardship features of the CVFPP
3. Identify major "environmental stewardship goals" that should be included in the CVFPP
4. Outline discussion topics for ESSD Work Group Meeting #3

SUMMARY

Meeting #1 Orientation

Prior to the commencement of Meeting #2, members of the Program Team provided a brief orientation for work group members who were unable to attend Meeting #1. The orientation included a PowerPoint presentation on FloodSAFE and the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Process, and an overview of the information that was discussed during Meeting #1.

Welcome and Greetings

Meeting facilitator Eric Poncelet welcomed the meeting participants. He then reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting goals.

Q: What is the status of including additional perspectives into the ESSD work group?

A: We followed up on those suggestions, and we will be introducing new members of the group.

Eric Poncelet then introduced Ashley Indrieri from the Family Water Alliance. Ben Gettleman reviewed the contacts the team has contacted for additional perspectives:

1. California Department of Boating and Waterways, Steve Watanabe – will review interim ESSD documents and submit comments
2. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Greg Vaughn – will review interim ESSD documents and submit comments

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

3. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Conservation Services, Diane Holcomb – program team has contacted and is still waiting to hear back

Eric Poncelet referred to the PowerPoint slide of the work group timeline, reminding the group of its current place in the four-meeting process. He reminded the group that the final meeting (Meeting #4) is intended to finalize the work and documents that were produced in the first three meetings. Ken Kirby CVFMP Executive Sponsor, added that the main charge of the ESSD work group is to provide content for the CVFPP. Mr. Kirby added that when a draft of the regional conditions summary report was ready, the program team would distribute the report to work group members for review.

Yung-Hsin Sun, MWH Program Manager, asked the group if they wanted to review the draft version of the CVFPP. Several work groups members responded yes.

Synthesized “Challenges” and “Opportunities” – Group Discussion

Challenges

Eric Poncelet informed the group that the two main goals of the discussion on challenges were to: 1) clarify items that were marked with an asterisk in the synthesis of challenges document, and 2) review the synthesis document and ask the group for input. Marc Hoshovsky indicated that the focus on challenges would be on those challenges found in category “I”. Work group members acknowledged that the items listed in categories II and III focused on other elements of the work groups deliberations (e.g., opportunities and goals) and would be incorporated into those sections.

Key work group comments on the challenges document included the following:

- 1) We are diving into a focused level of detail that is missing the bigger picture. Environmental stewardship should be creating the framework with which to base policies on (i.e., stewardship should balance economics, environmental, and land use). If we are using riparian areas, what is the function we are trying to preserve? We should be doing stewardship on a fundamental level, not just mitigation.
- 2) There is a need to characterize the state of the whole system; for example, we don't know what we mean by “Riparian.” The National Resource Council came up with a definition for Riparian, RIJIV has adopted a similar definition. There is a definite need for mapping, considering we don't know where these elements are within the flood system.
- 3) We need to adjust the phrasing so that each item sounds like a challenge--i.e., for Category III challenges, change “Create” to “Creating”.
- 4) Challenges I.A.2 and I.A.3
 - a. These two challenges turn rivers into water conveyance facilities which:
 - i. Disrupts biological processes and results in “fighting the river”
 - ii. Creates an imbalance in both physical and biological processes and changes the ecosystem processes
 - iii. Creates instability in managing the infrastructure
 - iv. Prevents managing the system as a system
- 5) I.A.4 – Impaired water quality.
 - a. When we don't manage the floodplain, it affects water quality.
 - b. Impaired water quality is an additional stressor to the system.
 - c. Temperature is a habitat constraint.
 - d. Drawdowns of reservoirs and water transfers affects water quality and temperatures.
 - e. Flooding of agriculture lands can contribute to impaired water quality.
 - i. Manure, pesticides, fuels, etc.
 - f. We are doing a disservice by trying to lump elements together; we have an opportunity to discuss and tease out the overlap (i.e. flooding is good; flooding is bad).

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

- 6) Legislation is setting up competing planning objectives – how to avoid getting swept aside as we focus on this narrow task.
 - a. SB 375 and other legislation exacerbate urban development in floodplains.
 - b. We need to acknowledge this other legislation in the text of the plan.
- 7) Public safety is the primary goal of the plan – this hasn't been talked about in the meeting.
 - a. What we are developing are associated goals?
- 8) The flood control system is out of balance, especially in relation to the ecosystem that the river supports.
- 9) There are many other challenges that we are trying to balance (i.e. planning, earthquake, etc.); we may be ignoring some of these larger forces. We should try to acknowledge them in this process.
- 10) I recognize that we are defining these as part of DWR's objective, but the legislature is at odds with a number of issues here (i.e., forcing people out of the woodlands and into the floodplain). We often put aside larger forces that are driving a number of other issues, although it is recognized that these are out of our control in a lot of respects.
(Response: Legislation is a driver and a conflict. The Upper Sacramento RCWG is recognizing and identifying conflicting laws.)
- 11) I.A.12 – How is it a constraint?
- 12) New Challenge: Climate Change – increased flood risk, increased extremes in water supply, affecting ecosystem, agriculture and other land uses; connects to I.A.6.
- 13) 1.B.5. – “Balancing” instead of “conflicts”
- 14) 1.B.6 – Land tenure, property rights, willing sellers
- 15) 1.B.13 – This is difficult to do.
- 16) Challenge from Principles Discussion – Challenge of integrated planning from local perspective (no authority to go outside boundary); how do we look at the system holistically? We are constrained as a local entity; also how to pay for these new approaches. Can state or federal assistance be available?

Opportunities

Marc Hoshovsky indicated that the focus on opportunities would be on those found in category “I” of the document. Work group members acknowledged that the items listed in category II focused more on goals and would be incorporated into the work group's discussions on that topic.

Key work group comments on the opportunities include the following:

- 1) 1.A.1. Reservoir reoperation – what are the criteria or considerations? There are conflicting objectives.
(Response: The legislature has asked DWR to look at reservoir reoperation throughout their system.)
- 2) Planning and partnerships help achieve multiple benefits. Partnership with agriculture is not always reflected, and special districts (Resource Conservation Districts) are not always called out.
- 3) New Opportunity – Not many land use planning agencies are here to the extent that they are driven by CEQA; this is an opportunity to give them further guidance. They are not informed about this process, and they should be from an environmental perspective. DWR should be very clear as to what these entities need to do in the future (i.e., SB5).
(Response: We are starting a briefing series with all local governments and planning and public works entities.)
- 4) 1.B.12 – State parks would like to be included in the list; they can manage habitat mitigation projects.
- 5) 1.B.13 – Central Valley Joint Venture has developed a plan for wetland riparian habitat for the whole Central Valley and identified areas where habitat should be restored. We should incorporate this into the opportunities.

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

- 6) 1.B.13 – Add the opportunity of sharing flood responsibility w/ USACE, local districts, and local governments. Local governments should have a role in planning efforts.
- 7) 1.B.13. – Add State Parks Central Valley Vision Document.
- 8) 1.B.13 – Add Caltrans blueprint plans and transportation plans.
- 9) Planning creates an opportunity for cooperative responsibility for maintaining the system.
- 10) 1.B.9 – Revise COE operations and maintenance; won't this be covered by the O&M group?
(Response: Yes, we are just trying to get different perspectives at this point in the process.)
- 11) There is an opportunity to provide clearer environmental stewardship guidance to local governments.

Draft Principles – Group Discussion

Work group members discussed the draft principles guiding the development, integration and implementation of environmental stewardship features of the CVFPP, including their relationships to key concerns. Key work group comments include the following:

- 1) Title: Insert “2012-Focused” Draft Principles
- 2) Principle on “Early Environmental Planning”:
 - a. The draft misses the point that we should approach this from an ecosystem perspective. The draft would benefit from insertion of text to the effect of: “will be part of a larger project vision that allows a functioning ecosystem.” There is a need for a broad view of ecosystem integrity for the Central Valley; not all areas are suitable for all habitat types (i.e., not every project is in the right location to create floodplain habitat). We need to be smarter about the goals for particular projects and how each project fits into the larger vision.
 - b. Insert the word “integrated” – early and integrated environmental planning is needed (i.e., to start with all objectives on the table) with interdisciplinary teams. Land-use planning is not equivalent to environmental planning.
 - c. Integrate projects and their goals (i.e., Merced River and Friant Dam – goal of increasing habitat by 150 acres; series of projects how many acres does each project contribute?)
 - d. There is a need for a grand scheme for each watershed and for the system to avoid looking at things from a project by project basis.
(Response: There is no detailed accounting within the 2012 plan, but we are hoping to lay the foundation for this step.)
 - e. Craft this principle more positively; this is how CVFPP helps project managers achieve their goals while achieving other goals; long-term success
 - f. Instead of “accommodate”, use a more neutral term like “incorporate.”
 - g. “Flood projects will...” isn't consistent with what Ken said.
- 3) We need a system approach, but we also need to look at things on the project level. When you look at work on the ground, hundreds of different staff will be called to implement these principles. Also about process, we'll want to see that the principles actually get implemented and we need to address how they are implemented.
(Response: This leads into measures of success)
- 4) Principle on “Broader Cost Benefit Analysis” – Include “value of ecosystem services in the cost benefit analysis.” Use of economic models: incorporate hydropower and recreation into the CBA (e.g. functional wetlands could have assisted New Orleans during Katrina).
- 5) Principle on “Added Habitat Values” – should net habitat be linked to mitigation? Or not? What can we do to improve in the future? There should be net habitat improvement, not just mitigation.
- 6) Principle on “Long-Term Sustainability” – environmental stewardship should address principles of sustainability from a triple bottom line (social, ecosystem, and economic perspective) with respect to a changing climate.
- 7) Principle on Multi-Disciplined Approach:
 - a. Engineering is not done in a vacuum anymore; it is a multi-disciplined approach.

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

- b. While there are interdisciplinary teams, we tend to default to structural approaches; the principles should not do this. It should be interdisciplinary, and non-structural approaches should be considered.
- 8) Add New Principle – Land use planning needs to come early in the process; we need to integrate flood planning with other statewide planning. First, we need to know what the system looks like (i.e., what conditions that are out there), whether it is an ecosystem, flood project, transportation etc. The land is subject to the same processes; what is the fundamental system that we are looking at? Consider pressures/drivers/constraints.
 - a. We need to understand the physical and ecological functions and processes and design the system to match them so we are not coming up with a project that is antagonistic to these processes.
- 9) Add New Principle: Environmental monitoring is important to understand the flood project effects and the status of the ecosystem.
- 10) Add New Principle: The science will be changing; we need to be able to bring in and incorporate new information as it arises, and we need to plan to be flexible.
- 11) Add New Principle: Preservation of the floodplain and preservation of agriculture along with flood safety is a false choice. We need to acknowledge the conflict/nexus and that these need to be completed under a unified approach.
- 12) Challenge of integrated planning from local perspective (no authority to go outside boundary): How do we look at the system holistically? We are constrained as a local entity; also how will these new approaches be paid for? Can state or federal assistance be made available? (**this was also added to the challenges note summary*)
- 13) We need to acknowledge that habitat can impede flood flows – environmental restoration and habitat restoration. There are trade-offs between flood conveyance and habitat.
- 14) It is not the goal of this group to re-invent CEQA – there should be consistency with land management plans, environmental resources, etc. There seems to be a collective agreement that the environment is not being considered effectively.
- 15) We need agency-coordinated planning at the visioning level and before a project is started to make sure that plans are aligned.
- 16) Land-use planning: Local or state recreation providers need to be brought to the table.
- 17) Add New Principle to address the “Scaling” aspect of our framing (statewide, federal, local). What we are doing in terms of principles needs to be articulated in terms of large scale, intermediary, and local scale. This is not currently integrated in the draft.
(Response: This would also be a good measure of success.)
- 18) A measure of success for 2012 is that have we incorporated environmental stewardship into this document.
- 19) Add New Principle: A principle on permitting should be included. Even well-intentioned levee setbacks (etc.) are constrained by ESA (etc.) to do something comprehensive; i.e. not mitigating at a 1:1 perhaps at one location, but more so at another location. Mitigation should not just occur at a project location.
- 20) The draft principles are only what we are putting on the table for 2012. Projects should look out to 2050; every project should also be specific.
- 21) Message for project sponsors: There are increasingly more demands from the environmental community; more work to do before public safety can be achieved. How can we craft something positive and guiding for them – as opposed to being an obstacle for engineers, etc. – while also helping the State to achieve its goals?
- 22) Get out of the cycle of seeing ecosystem and the flood protection as separate entities.
- 23) Engineers and regulatory agencies often have seen environmental concerns only from the perspective of mitigation. The engineer and team put together mitigation; projects often focus on those that have the least mitigation associated with them. We should take a broader view of environmental stewardship.
- 24) We need a holistic approach to mitigation for smaller projects to tie into. We need funding to address this and creativity and flexibility in the overall framework so small projects can meet holistic needs.
- 25) Regulatory agencies need flexibility in terms of mitigation approaches.

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

26) DWR will get the buy-in if guidance and solutions are provided; not just identifying problems.

Environmental Stewardship Goals – Group Discussion

Work group members discussed both the draft “outcome” goals and “process” goals. The results of the group discussion on environmental stewardship goals that should appear in the CVFPP follow:

- 1) General comments:
 - a. The draft goals need to be synthesized; there is too much detail.
 - b. Principle with a triple bottom line:
 - i. We need goals that have that reflect a triple bottom line. We need to do that to achieve the smaller set of goals.
 - ii. These goals are set up with a more programmatic and traditional approach to management; we need a more systematic approach.
 - iii. The plan should contain a process to have major environmental criteria explained along the river system A balance between community and ecological needs should be reflected in the goals as we move forward.
 - c. If the “triple bottom line” is a principle, we don’t need to re-state it, but the goals should reflect that. Balance should be reflected in the goals.
 - i. We are looking to restore the system with the ecosystem goals.
 - ii. The goals could be more generic with conceptual model and desired outcomes for a reach of a river; add “the plan should contain a process that results in having environmental criteria for each major reach of the river.”
 - d. Public Safety/Flooding:
 - i. We are the ESSD work group – we need to be aware of flood management aspects. The number one thing the flood management plan needs to do is to protect flood safety; that has to be number one. That said, because we are the ESSD work group, we need to be able to figure out a way to achieve both the environmental objectives along with the flood safety effort. We should not be aiming to balance the two.
 - ii. I don’t agree with the pre-eminence of public safety over environment.
 - iii. We need to be overt about public safety being part of the objective. This is a recently defined term; it often refers to property values as opposed to people’s health. Community protection should encompass the protection of cultural heritage and property.
 1. Private property is defined in the legislature, but often this isn’t used. We may need to be extra careful about the words we use. Add this to the glossary.
 2. Consider community protection (health of people, protection of property and cultural heritage).
 - iv. Consider using the phrase “community protection” rather than “public safety”.
 - e. Restoration is used in many of these goals; it can improve ecological conditions. Use “rehabilitation” instead of “restoration.”
 - f. A river is an organism – we don’t yet understand it. Use the tools we have to understand where habitat should be put. We need a new paradigm for addressing conflicts between people and habitat.
 - g. Flood and drought – the system needs to be recoverable from both. There is a need for resiliency (economic, social and ecological).
 - h. Provide direction, information, resources and tools to be consistent with the Central Valley flood protection goals. This should be implemented as a programmatic approach and be useful for people implementing projects and easing barriers. The goals should not be viewed as obstacles. Give direction to local sponsors and make it easy to incorporate goals at the local level.
 - i. Include an overarching goal statement: ensure sufficient capacity (make the system big enough) in the flood system to both protect public safety and restore ecosystem services to sustain natural and public communities through the future.

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

- i. Need to add “resiliency” and “adaptability”
 - ii. Capacity? May not be the right word
 - j. Synthesizing the draft goals may lose some information
 - i. (Response: Goals and sub-goals – group can shoot for appropriate synthesis)
 - ii. (Response: We can enhance the meaning of short statement goals with descriptions in the narrative document.)
 - k. Focus of ESSD Work Group Goals – ecosystem stewardship isn’t the only thing a lot of us do; we have goals on agriculture, climate change, and O&M. Is there a way to leave those recommendations to those other work groups?
 - i. (Response: we want to keep all perspectives; pretend we are the only group)
 - ii. We are trying to outline the goals work group members would want to represent to the rest of the planning team.
 - iii. On Climate Change and O&M – each of these groups is talking about environmental stewardship.
 - iv. We need to get down to environmental stewardship goals.
- 2) Comments on biological goals
 - a. B-1, B-4 and B-6 these could be combined into one statement; B-1 is somewhat worthless i.e., how do you capture that. B-4 may be too specific (i.e., it doesn’t capture non-listed species).
 - i. Seek to meet the needs of the species; we should identify the nexus between this process and the process of identifying special-status species.
 - b. B-5 – This goal is more specific. Looking at setback levees wherever possible, can we say specifically where this is? They are looking at things from an ecosystem perspective; we need to look at what can be in the system. This would be a big help, where appropriate. We need to identify where there are opportunities for these improvements.
 - c. B-5 – This is a problem from an agriculture perspective. Habitat should not be benefited(e.g., with setback levees) if this means a corresponding loss for agriculture. There are places where this makes sense, but this shouldn’t be a blanket policy.
 - d. B-1/B-2
 - i. Something that gets lost is that to increase ecological function is to improve the connectivity of river channels with their floodplain habitats (i.e. Yolo bypass and its benefit to endangered fish species), but in actuality that connectivity isn’t that good. This would incorporate goal B-2 the natural process B-1 and B-2.
 - 1. Add another bullet
 - a. Restore a system that has processes and functions
 - b. Look for food web inputs that are lacking
 - 2. Condense biological and physical processes into ecosystem processes. If it is not in the glossary, we need to define to make sure it is.
 - 3. “Ecosystem services”, as a term, covers a lot; it might be the one to go with.
 - 4. Articulate the goals – five goals of the Flood Safe plan
 - e. B1/B2 – Connectivity. We have flood flows that are interim base flows and flood flows. How do you make that connection? For lands that are flooded on an interim basis, how do we address that?
 - f. B-1, B-5, and B-6 – Biological goals could be consolidated into B-4 to make it more generic and avoid conflicting interests.
 - g. B-6 where do opportunities exist for this? We need to identify this.
- 3) Comments on Agriculture goals
 - a. Recognize the valuable ecological services that agricultural lands provide; recognize that and market it. Agriculture provides open space, public values, BMPs and minimizing adverse affects. This costs money and is a negative from an agriculture perspective. We should rewrite the agriculture goals to bring forward the positives and the environmental services brought by agriculture while still protecting this valuable resource.

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

- i. (Response: Wherever we see the method embedded in the goal; this will be taken out)
 - ii. Enhance agricultural services as an environmental benefit
 - iii. “Conserve, enhance, and encourage mutual goals of wildlife habitat within agriculture”
 - b. A-3 – This goal is missing the notion of cultural sustainability; under working landscapes, add “minimize adverse affects on communal areas, sacred sites, native burial sites, native gathering.”
 - c. A-3 – There is a conflict between private property and property rights and the goals of restoration. This conflict is a “challenge”.
 - d. A-3 – A balance is needed between water supply and flood control needs, especially related to flood management on private lands. These lands will be crippled by lack of water supply or by flooding. We need a goal from a stewardship perspective – flood protection combination to provide both supply and management of flooding.
- 4) Comments on Operations and Management goals
 - a. O&M – meet flow and freeboard objectives. Looking at the system as a whole, what does the flood system need to look like to preserve flow, freeboard, and the ecosystem?
 - b. Add new O&M goal on topic of reservoir operations. There is only so much water available; we are getting better at modeling etc; but people don’t want to build more surface storage.
 - i. Look for opportunities to operate the system to maximize the ability to have water available for habitat purposes.
 - c. Consider multiple geographic and topographic scales.
 - d. Pursue a variety of structural and non-structural solutions.
- 5) Comment on recreation goals: Increase public access – add first nations here. Incorporate native practices into this (i.e. gatherings, etc.).
- 6) Comments on financial goals: Relieve maintenance costs by passing these on to another agency (F-1).
- 7) Combine the educational and recreational goals; foster environmental stewardship through recreation and education.
- 8) Comment on Climate Change goal. The concepts of resiliency and adaptability need to incorporate here. Climate change is uncertain; we need to adapt.
- 9) Comments on Process Goals:
 - a. Combine P-1 and P-5
 - b. P-2 – How is the process interfacing with native communities? Measure the efficacy of how you are interfacing.
 - c. P-4 – In some areas, a lot of land is protected by NRCS. We don’t want those types of lands forgotten. Insert easements, other private lands.

Deliverable Topic Groups

Eric Poncelet invited work group members to join program staff review teams in developing revised drafts of the four deliverables (challenges, opportunities, principles, goals). The following work group members volunteered to participate:

- Challenges
 - John Cain
- Opportunities
 - Alex Stehl
- Principles
 - Ken Cumming
- Environmental Stewardship Goals
 - John Cain

Meeting Summary: Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Meeting #2

Mid-course check in

Eric Poncelet invited work group members to provide feedback on what has worked well during the first two meetings, and how they could be improved. Feedback from the work group included the following:

- Receiving meeting documents earlier would be helpful.
- Larger group conversation is better than break-out groups.
- It's difficult to share information with other organizational representatives since we are still brainstorming. Hopefully, there will be room to inform others later in the process when documents have been refined (Ken Kirby responded that the program team will continue to incorporate comments after Meeting #4, and that documents will continue to evolve).
- It is difficult to understand what is being requested of the work group. We are being asked to compartmentalize and focus on a specific task. It is important to continue articulating what our charge is, where we're plugging into the larger planning document, what the group function is, and where we are in the process.

Final Comments and Questions

Ken Kirby thanked the work group members for their participation in the group.