

WORK TEAM MEETING NOTES

Thursday April 15, 2010 Meeting

Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan Meeting

A collaborative strategy for optimizing management of the river corridor

Meeting Agenda (Handout A)

Started at 9:05 am

- Introductions
 - Discuss “new” Purpose Statement (printed above).
 - Goals and Objectives
- March 18th Minutes Review & Last Meeting Results
 - Actions taken as a result of last meeting.
 - Web site development and items to put on web site.
 - Hydraulic Modeling
- Phase I Consultant Deliverables –
 - Review Tasks and discussions on what is planned for consultant work.
 - Future Phase deliverables discussion.
- Significant Stakeholders and Interested Parties
 - Discussion on who these stakeholders are and how we involve them in the CMP development.
- Break
- Other Studies and Data Identified
 - Identify what data & documentation exist & what needs to be developed for the CMP
 - Existing Agreements, MOU’s, and other
- Section 7 Relationship with Habitat Conservation Planning
 - Yuba / Sutter Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)
- Funding Source and Sustainability Question
- What Next?
 - Identify agenda topics for next meeting (May 13th or 20th dates)
 - Site Reconnaissance – Plan future field visits to the Lower Feather River.
 - Field visit discussion on goal of visit, benefits, time length, and desired outcome. (Week of May 17th?)
- Adjourn at 11:55 am

Introductions

Discuss “new” Purpose Statement

- The Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan (CMP) Work Group (Group) reviewed the revised Purpose Statement. The Group consensus was that the revised Purpose Statement is good as written and needs no changes.

Goals and Objectives (Handout B)

- Terri Gaines – The Goals are too long and detailed. They should be more concise.
- Marti Kie – The Goals should be refined, they sound more like objectives
- Keith Swanson – Read the Goals and Objectives carefully and determine if they contain the main concepts and directions for the CMP.
- Paul Brunner – The objectives should be measureable units. The timing for any actions should be in a quick manner and should set achievable targets.

- Earl Nelson – DWR’s target is 18 months to complete the CMP, and broken into three phases over three state fiscal years.
- Paul Brunner – Will actions be held in abeyance or moved forward, even if we can justify the need and importance before the CMP is completed.
- Earl Nelson – Actions can move forward if they fit closely to the Goals and Objectives.
- Keith Swanson – The Abbott Lake work is a good example of moving forward with a project that fits well within our goals and objectives.
- Earl Nelson – Objective #2 we are not reopening “OCAP” (Operations Criteria and Plan)
- Keith Swanson- Are we thinking beyond the scope area? We need focus in on the 20 miles and not look beyond this area.
- Steve Fordice– How about using the term recommendations or suggestions? We are not a policy making Group, but we do make recommendations or suggestions.
- Keith Swanson – We are the Group making these objectives and we are agreeing as a group what things will be done. DWR should not be alone on these objectives. We are a collaborative group and an entire group effort is needed to get enough momentum to get things accomplished.

Integration Discussion - Keith Swanson

- Any integrated project needs everyone’s concerns and needs addressed. All of us in this Group can collectively find solutions. Then we are the only feasible group to get the work done to accomplish those solutions. If we disagree and fight among ourselves and then go to court over issues, we are giving the decision process to the courts. I do not believe the courts can make an educated decision any better than the people in this Group. If the knowledge base in this Group can’t figure it out, how do we expect a judge to make a better decision? We represent the experts and collectively the most knowledgeable people on Feather River issues. We can define what is needed to restore and maintain the Feather River ecosystem.
 - Terri Gaines – Objective #3, can we really address the ecosystem on both vitality and diversity.
 - Gary Hobgood – Restoration is our key, diversity if achievable, is also a desired objective.
 - Jennifer Hobbs – I feel the better term should be “Ecosystem function.”
 - Gary Hobgood – True ecosystem function is a desired, but may not be achievable.
 - **Action Items:** Earl Nelson – We will add “Function” to the definition.
 - Paul Brunner – Back to Objective #2, should include the “Keith Swanson statement” in regards to the three goal items = Water supply, ecosystem, and public safety? We need to clarify this terminology and assure there is understanding on these terms.
 - Keith Swanson – Maintenance is a key item that needs to be included in all three elements. Knowing the environmental baseline, expanding the species diversity, and the maintenance of these three goals is very important.
 - Keith Swanson – I suggest we boil down the Goals and Objectives to concise statements and assure these statements sync with how we accomplish these objectives. We need to work together in a collaborative manner, because “NO one moves forward if we don’t all move forward together.”
 - Earl Nelson – Objective #4 is everyone okay with this objective dealing with making environmental clearance and permitting more efficient?
 - Keith Swanson – The Endangered Species Act Section 10 process is a group activity. The Permits will be how we memorialize our agreements.
 - Earl Nelson – We will need additional site specific MOU’s, agreements, or permits based on the site specific situation. This CMP will not cover everything that might occur in the future

(such as new species added to the endangered list), and can be added to or modified at a later date.

- Earl Nelson – Objective #5 – In regards to the Safe Harbor discussion, we are looking for the ability to establish a baseline before restoration, and to remove habitat for maintenance so long as the amount of habitat stays above baseline. Usually the amount of habitat removed for maintenance will be small in relation to the amount created during restoration. If the ability to remove habitat is not in a MOU then a mitigation crediting process could be used for new projects that may not have been anticipated when the MOU was crafted.
- **Action Items:** Jennifer Hobbs – I will reword this objective and send you suggested new language.
- **Action Items:** Earl Nelson – Well, it looks like we have some changes to make to the Goals and Objectives. Tony and I will redefine these based on your input. We will provide these to you for further review.
- Jeff Twitchell – Are we considering future levee construction in the corridor?
- Earl Nelson – We are mostly talking about maintenance on existing levees within the CMP. [Opportunities for additional setback levees will be discussed at the July meeting.]
- Keith Swanson – We know that there is work to be done on levees within the Sutter Basin, especially work on Seepage berms. Maybe in Feather River corridor we maybe need to increase depth of the river. There must be other examples of things we might do if the engineering is done right.
- Earl Nelson – Restoration activities in this corridor could be used to create mitigation credits to be applied to projects outside the scope of the CMP for the Feather River corridor.
- Gary Hobgood – Advance mitigation credits should help other players in this program. The Small Erosion Repair Program (SERP) has concerns with their efforts staying small and still requiring individual permits. Perhaps we could look at defining SERP to allow for programmatic permitting. The overriding issue here is to work on a beneficial process or project that can be utilized by others in the future.
- Keith Swanson – How do we fund future work? We can look to the future and we work together for others interest if it is beneficial to the three key issues. Does the future work benefit those efforts to the overall vision?
- Earl Nelson – I feel that mitigation credits are useful tools for maintenance restoration work.
- Gary Hobgood – I recommend that we need to be flexible in our efforts and use both kinds of processes. Maybe all of our Agreements need to be put into a MOU for future clarification among those people doing maintenance and restoration work. How about an HCP to formalize our agreements? Would this be a better way to get our agreements formalized?

Section 7 Relationship with Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) - Yuba / Sutter HCP

- Mike Thomas, USFWS led discussion.
- The Yuba-Sutter NCCP/HCP (Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan) is a cooperative planning effort initiated by Yuba and Sutter counties in connection with improvements to Highways 99 and 70 and future development in the area surrounding those highways. The HCP has expanded to include more area in the Sacramento Valley than originally planned.
- HCP Applicants are Sutter and Yuba Counties, local cities. DFG, USFWS, and Jones & Stokes are coordinating with applicants. Jones & Stokes are writing the document.
- The focus of this HCP effort began in a smaller area to get more from our economic investment.
- The Goals of the group when they started was: continue economic growth and community development; retain the economic vitality of our agricultural community; maintain recreation,

hunting, fishing, and other public uses of our open space; simplify and expedite land use and conservation planning in the plan area; protect threatened and endangered species; and preserve plant and wildlife communities.

- The Group's application was submitted to get water projects and levee repair work done, but has expanded over time.
- The Group's HCP application has no say over the area involved.
- It was the HCP applicants' decision to include more issues or organizations including DWR.
- The application will not be done within the original 18 months timeline.
- The Goal is to improve planning on a local basis. Local planning is being updated now and needs to be done soon.
- Gary Hobgood – It is a Federal action but the local levee district should be involved in process. The ones needing to be at the table and participate should include DWR. I understand this will be a short process and there are pluses and minuses to being involved.
- Mitigation measures are involved for the applicant under this plan. There is the programmatic level involved in this plan. Discussion on housing subdivision details need to be reviewed. These issues may be outside the HCP scope.
- The No Surprises policy is a policy of the FWS, which allows an applicant for an incidental take permit under Section 10 of the ESA to negotiate for long term assurances that no additional mitigation of impacts to protected species will be required for actions covered by the permit regardless of changing circumstances.
- The HCP will allow the No Surprise policy with a few exceptions. The HCP should address all the participants' permitting needs. This HCP will not address transportation, ethics, and a few other issues of concern.
- The Corps, EPA, and water quality issues are being included in the HCP for the first time. It will save the USFWS a lot of time to do planning in this way in the future.
- No Surprises does not cover other non federal agencies actions.
- Keith Swanson - The State needs something like a HCP to cover our habitat issues. Maybe not what these counties are doing. If we were tied to the Yuba / Sutter counties HCP, we may have more issues than our CMP effort is currently trying to resolve.
- The Yuba / Sutter counties application can only cover their issues, they cannot look at issues on levees they have no control over.
- Gary Hobgood – Since DWR has no profit motive in their efforts and don't think they want to be tied to the counties' HCP, I don't think that DWR needs to go through a large HCP effort. I think a corridor HCP may be the right level of effort.
- Mike Thomas – I am not sure right now if doing two HCP's on similar area's is the best way to go. A HCP should not have over lapping purposes and plans. Having overlapping plans will have some of the same people working on two different plans. I have seen some examples of overlapping plans that did not work out well. I think overlapping HCP's are possible, but not very desirable and the coordination effort would be very hard.
- Earl Nelson – Again, what are the southern boundaries?
- Mike Thomas – The HCP is bigger than this CMP, it includes some of the urban area of Sacramento City. The FWS Website for the HCP has not been updated for awhile so the information and map are somewhat outdated.
- Terri Gaines – What is the value for this CMP to overlay the HCP? I am concerned with the project area not being the same as the development of the Feather CMP.
- Mike Thomas – I agree, I think that would overlapping would not be a good idea.
- **Action Items:** Paul Brunner – I will take the lead and work with the counties on this HCP development. It may be a separate effort in Yuba County. I will get some answers to your questions and get back to the CMP at the next meeting. The HCP could be a forum for all environmental actions and there could be a benefit for the CMP in the future.

- **Action Items:** Mike Thomas will get the current HCP map and project description to the Group.
- **Action Items:** Mike Thomas will also supply the Group a list of individuals in the HCP.

- **March 18th Minutes Review & Last Meeting Results**

- Actions taken as a result of last meeting and discussion of minutes from last meeting. Tony Danna asked for feedback, and reviewed action items list.
- A web site is being developed and discussion focused on what items to be put on web site. The meeting agenda and minutes for LFRCMP has been posted on the following Website: <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/fmo/msb/>
- **Action Items:** Hydraulic Modeling - Will be given to a subgroup for further discussion.

- **Phase I Consultant Deliverables – (Handout D)**

A review of the tasks and a discussion on what is planned for consultant work on the CMP occurred.

- Terri Gaines – A strategy on getting maintenance permits done in a more efficient manner needs to be a key to the deliverables.
- Earl Nelson – This strategy or process will be included in Phase II of the AECOM task orders.
- Matt Wacker – We need to look at the bigger project scale. An eighteen month timeframe is actually too short to get everything described by the Group done. We can get the process started and then get a process planned to get the programmatic permits. The actual acquiring permits may take a longer time. A process on how do get these items done to get a programmatic agreements. The phase 1 task order deliverables will be done in four months.
- Jeff Twitchell - What are the actual CEQA requirements and the CEQA/NEPA documents? Are these really necessary?
- Earl Nelson – The Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB/Board) approval of the Lower Feather River CMP will be required, and that is a discretionary decision requiring environmental review documents. Also, for USACE permitting, NEPA documents may be required.
- Jeff Twitchell – The Yuba River will be looking to repair levees and will want a programmatic permitting process too. Is the CMP a project?
- Earl Nelson – Since the CVFPB is going to adopt this CMP, it will cover maintenance permitting also, and yes, the CMP is a project under CEQA.
- Gary Hobgood – I really don't think that will happen.
- Earl Nelson – Folks on the Board have expressed interest in our efforts and said they want to adopt this proposal. All projects by the Corps do require NEPA analysis.
- Terri Gaines – I am unclear on what level of maintenance projects need to be covered by a programmatic agreement.
- Earl Nelson – I believe that if there is a Board approval to accept the proposed actions in the CMP, there must be CEQA analysis. If there is a nexus to a federal action then NEPA will be required.
- **ACTION Item:** Clarify the legal and CEQA requirements for the CVFPB to approve the CMP proposed actions.
- Gary Hobgood – The recent DFG wildlife area vegetation restoration MOU's did not need the Board blessing, but the Board did approve an application for the encroachment permit.
- Ryan Larson – The Board needs to be advised of all actions within the flood plain too. I believe that the Board should be a part of this action item.
- Jeff Twitchell – The Corps Vegetation Variance needs to get accreditation on the new levees and future maintenance issues.

- Steve Fordice– The standards continually change and we need to stay current on these changes.
- Earl Nelson – Vegetation Framework Group was not clear in their role on future maintenance agreements.
- Gary Hobgood – The sediment removal issue continues to be a state versus federal issue. This should be resolved so that we can streamline the river maintenance permitting process.
- Helen Swagerty – There is some confusion on your PowerPoint slide. Is the Geomorphic study part of the CMP development and will that occur in Phase II of the Task Orders with AECOM?
- Earl Nelson – You are right. The reverse order should be on the PowerPoint slide with Phase II being CMP - Development and Production and Phase III should read Programmatic Maintenance Permitting.

Significant Stakeholders and Interested Parties.

- Gary Hobgood – The list of stakeholders from the Lower Sacramento River regional working group on FloodSAFE is a good place to start. The agricultural subgroup interest should be the same in Yuba and Sutter Counties as with FloodSAFE list.
- **ACTION ITEM** - Steve Fordice – I will send contact suggestions to the Group.
- Scott Rice – We should include Tribal interest and issues of concern to our Interest Groups.
- Jeff Twitchell - Enterprise Rancheria is a good contact for most tribal interest in the region, but it may be a good idea to touch base with SHPO also.
- Paul Brunner – The Enterprise Rancheria has a high interest to any issues in this area.
- Scott Rice – We should make the outreach effort now and answer their questions of what we are doing and why. Best to incorporate their interest early and also addressed any other cultural issues in our environmental analysis documents.
- Paul Brunner – There is a South Yuba Reclamation Council, they are a group that may have some interest in our efforts.
- **ACTION ITEM** Scott Rice – I will send some suggested contact information for this Group.

• What Other Studies or Data can be Identified for Baseline Data

- Earl Nelson - FERC relicensing process for Oroville Dam should have additional baseline information.
- Jeff Twitchell – Sacramento River planning effort likely has information that is pertinent to our effort.
- Terri Gaines - FESSRO – is gathering information right now, and should be able to assist us.
- Steve Fordice – East side studies on DWR effort. Topographic
- Jeff Twitchell
 - Central Valley Floodplain Evaluation and Delineation (CVFED) by Wood Rodgers on Feather River – LiDAR Topographic Data and Mapping
 - CVFED LiDAR topographic Data and mapping by CH2Hill on Sutter Bypass.
 - URS - prime DWR Contractor for Urban Levee Evaluations (including total coverage of West Feather River Levees levees btwn. Sutter Bypass and Thermalito

• Existing Agreements, MOU's, and other

- We will have to discuss at a later meeting after AECOM helps us identify a list.

• Funding Source and Sustainability Question

- Earl Nelson – According to Keith Swanson, there will always be funding for maintenance work on the Feather River, but this is a 20 mile length of river so DWR has to prioritize areas to be addressed in any given year.

- Steve Fordice– There are other levee districts in addition to LD1 & R784 working in this area. Even with several funding sources there is never adequate funding. DWR should cover more area and on a quicker response cycle. The other two Levee Districts are MA 3 and RD1001.
- Paul Brunner – Maintenance funding may get some emphasis but never enough. The needed maintenance work needs that we currently foresee will need this groups influence to attain the required additional funding. New projects seem to get the additional funding, but not the maintenance. We need to find a maintenance funding proponent. Maintenance is essential to a future functioning flood protection program. Perhaps a future requirement for new projects will be an endowment to cover needed maintenance. The CMP should develop a process to assure that required maintenance has the needed future funding.
- Discussion – We need to define who has the existing maintenance responsibilities on the Feather River and will that maintenance continue into the future. Flood maintenance on Abbott Lake is done by DWR, but DFG will complete the restoration effort with River Partners over the next three years. Who is going to do levee maintenance and channel maintenance work in the future on each segment of the Feather River? DWR does the maintenance work for DFG at DWR expense. Channel maintenance is done on a shares basis by different organizations with Corps approval.
- **Action Item.** We need to form a subgroup to look into the legal questions on maintenance responsibilities and who currently has levee, channel, and other maintenance responsibilities.
- Earl Nelson – Another question is what is the future funding set aside for maintenance and who is being funded to do the maintenance?
- Marti Kie – Any sort of endowment cannot be held by the State. Is there another way to resolve this issue? Perhaps a third party?
- Earl Nelson – Utilizing a third party could help to resolve that and give us a way to ensure that maintenance continues in the future.
- Paul Brunner – We should carve-out the funding from Proposition 1e to cover maintenance.
- Earl Nelson – The bond funding from Proposition 1E is not for endowment programs. Other bond acts such as Proposition 13 and Proposition 84 allow endowments for certain authorized programs if the authorization is specifically granted in the bond act.
- Paul Brunner – Endowment may not be the right word we should be using; let's refer this to the subgroup to solve. It has to be done in some way. How can be determined by a subgroup recommendation.
- Charles Rabamad – Prop 1e can be used for long term capital investment projects.
- Jennifer Hobbs – Has DWR figured out any long term solution to channel maintenance issue?
- Gary Hobgood – Not an issue from DFG. DWR always seems to do what is necessary.
- Paul Brunner – I have heard from many people during various meetings, and lack of river channel maintenance appears to be an issue among many outside interest groups.
- Steve Fordice– Two or three year deferred maintenance work is not being done and that concerns all interest groups. If DFG may be covered but not the local maintenance districts' interests.
- Gary Hobgood – I do not feel that funding by DFG will resolve this issue, because DFG does not have funds for this.
- Paul Brunner – I will still push for subgroup to look into fleshing out this issue.
- Earl Nelson – State funding continues to go up and down. The DWR staff went down significantly during the Gray Davis administration. The General Fund is no longer DWR's primary source of funds, now the Bond funding is the big issue.
- **ACTION Item** - Paul Brunner (Chair), will chair the subgroup. Suggested participants include: DFG (Andy Atkinson, Tim Williamson, or Armand Gonzales – Gary Hobgood will get back to the Work Group), Jeff Twitchell, Keith Swanson or representative, DWR Legal representative.

- Paul Brunner – We could use a baseline understanding on how DWR covers the projects that have to be done. DWR Flood Maintenance Office needs to define their priority areas, and their goals for recurring maintenance actions.
 - Helen Swagerty – DWR does do maintenance work on an every other year cycle, but the cycle is based on significant or priority areas.
 - Paul Brunner – Trying to make this work as a private interest, maybe I'm the only one. Is there an issue here, does the Group feel more information is needed? Mixed response to that question, but Group felt that an effort by a subgroup is needed.
 - Terri Gaines – The flood maintenance system is not sustainable with the way it is done now. The goal is to reduce the O&M cost in the long run and get more maintenance work done.
 - Paul Brunner – Adequate maintenance work is the real question on how you define “adequate.”
 - Terri Gaines – Based on how we are currently funded, we will not get adequate funding for the long run. There are just not enough funds to get adequate funding level for the identified needs.
- **What Next?**
 - Next meeting (May 20th)
 - Site Reconnaissance – Field visit to the Lower Feather River.
 - Field visit logistics discussion and how we obtain the Group vision of the future Lower Feather River corridor is needed.

**Next Meeting = Field Meeting on Thursday May 20th –
Time and Location to be determined.**

Attachement B

Thursday April 15, 2010
Work Group Meeting
JOC DWR LL-20

ATTENDANCE SHEET

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone #
1.	Keith Swanson	Flood Management Office DWR	916-574-1302
2.	Earl Nelson	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-1244
3.	Tony Danna	FMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-0383
4.	Paul Brunner	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	530-749-5679
5.	Erin Brehmer	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2236
6.	Steve Fordice	River District 784	530-742-0520
7.	Terri Gaines	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-653-6520
8.	Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	916-414-6541
9.	Gary Hobgood	Department of Fish & Game	916-983-6920
10.	Marti Kie	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-0381
11.	John Langston	FPEIP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2880
12.	Ryan Larson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	916-557-7568
13.	Charles Rabamad	Department of Water Resources	916-574-2982
14.	Scott Rice	Department of Water Resources	916-837-6415
15.	Helen Swagerty	River Partners	530-894-5401 x227
16.	Mike Thomas	US FWS	916-414-6680
17.	Jeffrey E. Twitchell	Levee District 1	916-631-4555
18.	Matt Wacker	AECOM	916-266-4907
	On Telephone		
19.	Nancy Finch	Department of Water Resources	
20.	Ward Tabor	Department of Water Resources	

Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan

Thursday, April 15, 2010 (Handout B)

Goals:

1. To assess the existing channel habitat and geomorphology (sediment transport and river meander) to identify how the channel and related flood plain can be better managed.
2. To review existing hydraulic and habitat function models and decision support systems and modify or supplement as needed to inform and direct plans for appropriate habitat and river channel capacity designs.
3. To conduct a three-prong opportunity and constraint analysis addressing flood operations and flood maintenance, ecosystem enhancement, and other multi-objective land use considerations.
4. To develop a long-term Lower Feather River corridor management plan that provides for a functioning corridor where all three of the above concerns are integrated and optimized.
5. To facilitate the necessary permitting for maintenance work to preserve design flow and levee integrity while enhancing environmental resources, through coordination, collaboration and cooperative working relationships with all stakeholders and interested parties.

Objectives to Achieve the Goals include:

1. DWR will establish and facilitate a working group to assist in determining the sequence and priority of necessary actions to achieve these goals.
2. DWR with the help of the working group will develop a long-term, integrated operational model for the management of flood control projects.
3. DWR, with guidance from the working group, will continue to meet public safety operation and maintenance obligations in a manner that not only preserves, but enhances the ecosystem vitality and diversity.
4. DWR will identify where environmental clearance and permitting processes can be made more efficient while still meeting state and federal safety standards and following state and federal environmental protection procedures.

DWR and collaborative agencies will work to establish ecosystem restoration projects that improve habitat conditions above baseline so flood facility maintenance can occur without additional mitigation in accordance with safe harbor principles. Advance mitigation projects with deductible credits may also be part of the planned strategy for programmatic permitting for these maintenance and new project construction activities.

Action Items from March 18th Meeting (Handout C)

	Action Items:	Who		Due Date
		Requested	Responsible	
1)	Coordinate with the FERC relicensing of the Oroville Dam. Follow-up: Cassandra Enos (Water Project Office, DWR), the Oroville FERC relicense settlement team to join us. She could not be at April 15 meeting.	Gary Hobgood	Len Marino	Done
2)	<u>Work Group membership and representation:</u> Include a recreation component in the CMP; need Yuba and Sutter land use people; local agriculture representation. Follow-up: The current group members can represent the other interest groups.	Jeff Twitchell, Gary Hobgood	Paul Brunner	As needed
3)	Revise the language to the Purpose & Need to reflect the difference in the “Vision” & the CMP. Follow-up: New language inserted to purpose and need.	Terri Gaines	Terri Gaines	Done
4)	An ESA or NEPA process may be needed, what types of legal challenges are foreseen? Follow-up: Ask for permit clarification on all permits.	Earl Nelson	AECOM	Phase II
5)	Define “Funding” and get agreement on what this term means to the team. Follow-up: Future Work Group discussion. Include as future Agenda item	Jeff Twitchell John Carlon	Tony Danna	June 30, 2010
6)	Include Safe Harbors conditions in the CMP. Follow-up: AECOM will include in CMP.	Jeff Twitchell	AECOM	Draft Document
7)	Develop a land ownership map in the CMP. Follow-up: Included in Deliverables list in Task Order.	Jeff Twitchell	AECOM	June 30, 2010
8)	Include economic and social impacts analysis in CMP prior to decisions. Follow-up: Include in Deliverables list in future Task Orders.	Steve Fordice	AECOM	Draft Document
9)	Hydraulic modeling needs to be added in the CMP Follow-up: Added to a future Task Order deliverables. “Request a Subgroup discussion?” Present a hydraulic modeling discussion at a later meeting.	Paul Brunner & Group Discussion	Sub group & AECOM	Phase II
10)	Improve meetings management by having clear objectives to meet deadlines. Follow-up: Move Agenda closer to Task Order deliverables.	Debra Bishop	Tony Danna	Next Meeting
11)	Define what you want to list in the round table, Corps – Vegetation Framework Agreement. Follow-up: More Stakeholders involvement in defining list.	Gary Hobgood	Earl Nelson	June 30, 2010
12)	We should consider phasing in the contracting. Follow-up: Three phased Task Order will adopted over the next 18 months.	Marti Kie	Earl Nelson	Done
13)	Have any HCP or State NCCP been done in the region? Follow-up: AECOM analysis needed.	Group Discussion	AECOM	Phase II
14)	Draft MOU references to former agreements or MOU’s. Follow-up: Include a list of MOU’s and agreements for area on website.	Andy Atkinson	AECOM & Tony Danna	June 2010
15)	Put items into a website, that will include all past data & MOU’s, agreements, relicensing (project 2100), and other items currently available. Follow-up: Working with Anna Fong to develop web site.	Andy Atkinson Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	May 1, 2010