

Draft Summary

Russian River Water Forum Planning Group Meeting #1

Ukiah Valley Conference Center and via Zoom

May 17, 2023, 10:00 am to 3:00 pm

Executive Summary

The Russian River Water Forum Planning Group held its first meeting on May 17, 2023 in Ukiah, CA and via Zoom. The meeting was facilitated by Kearns & West, a neutral third party. Presentation slides and a recording of the meeting are available on the project [website](#) at the following links:

- [Slides](#)
- [Recording](#)

The meeting objectives outlined in the agenda were as follows:

- Provide an overview of the Planning Group purpose and charter; confirm common understanding and commitment to charter guidelines and principles.
- Discuss Planning Group members' interests concerning the Potter Valley Project decommissioning process.
- Provide an overview of the role and focus areas of the Planning Group Steering Committee and Working Groups and discuss membership.
- Provide an opportunity for public comment.

The meeting agenda can be found in Appendix A. The kick-off meeting was attended by 27 Planning Group members, 25 alternates, and 76 members of the public. The list of meeting attendees can be found in Appendix B.

The next section provides a summary of the Planning Group's deliberations during the meeting, including action items identified and agreements reached, and comments provided during public comment. Key take-aways from the meeting included:

- In general, the Planning Group achieved the objectives identified for the meeting.
- Planning Group members shared their hopes for the Planning Group and their interests related to the Potter Valley Project decommissioning process. These interests will be important reference points throughout the Planning Group's process; the intent as outlined in the charter is to satisfy as many interests as possible when crafting potential solutions.
- It was acknowledged that the process is complex and it will take some time to achieve a common understanding across the group. There is also a sense of urgency to identify potential solutions quickly to be within PG&E's planning decommissioning schedule.

- There was agreement that the Planning Group’s intended role is important for both the Russian River and Eel River basins.
- The Planning Group was largely supportive of the draft charter with some recommended clarifications that will be made regarding the External Communications section and how the Planning Group will make decisions.
- The Planning Group agreed to add the Lake Pillsbury Alliance as a member. It will consider Save California Salmon’s request to be added to the Planning Group at the next meeting.
- There was significant interest in convening the Russian River Resilience Subcommittee sooner than was initially planned (2024). Additional resources will likely need to be identified to make that happen.

Meeting Summary

Opening Remarks

Ben Gettleman, facilitator from Kearns & West (K&W), welcomed Planning Group members, alternates, and other attendees to the meeting and introduced the K&W facilitation team. Then, Ben introduced Mendocino County Supervisor Maureen Mulheren to give opening remarks.

Supervisor Mulheren welcomed everyone to the meeting and to the City of Ukiah, shared venue logistics, then turned the microphone back over to Ben Gettleman, who introduced Sonoma County Supervisor James Gore.

Over Zoom, Supervisor Gore began by sharing gratitude for everyone attending the meeting. He acknowledged the history of work in the Two Basin Ad Hoc and Two Basin Solution, and noted that the reason for the meeting is because the Russian River is not a system in and of itself but gets water from the Eel River through the Potter Valley Project and delivers water as far south as Marin County, and that the future of water supply in the region is pressing and directly in front of the group. He then acknowledged the history of different interests and priorities in the room and the need to work together at this moment toward a solution, as well as for Russian River communities to continue bolstering resiliency in other ways, including conservation and on-farm recharge. He thanked the Department of Water Resources for making the Water Forum possible with grant funding, thanked all participants once again and encouraged the group: "We’re the ones we’ve been waiting for."

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Ben welcomed elected officials in the room and reviewed the guidelines for in-person and remote participation. Ben also welcomed other elected officials in attendance, including Lake County Supervisor Eddie Crandell, Mendocino County Supervisor Glenn McGourty, Yokayo Tribe Sergeant-at-Arms Tyrone Mitchell, Wiyot Tribe Chairman Ted Hernandez, and representatives from Congressman Jared Huffman’s office.

Ben shared the meeting objectives and meeting agenda. Planning Group members introduced themselves, beginning with those in-person, followed by those on Zoom. In their introductions, members shared their name, organization, interest category (e.g., Eel River Environmental NGO), and answered the question: What are your hopes for this process? Answers are summarized below:

Bert Whitaker, Sonoma County Regional Parks: good conversation and collaboration.

Charlie Schneider, California Trout (CalTrout): get both dams out of the river as soon as possible.

Don McEnhill, Russian Riverkeeper: solutions that benefit both the Eel and Russian Rivers.

Meghan Quinn, American Rivers: get both dams out of the river while maintaining services for the water users.

John Mack, Permit Sonoma: find a solution that is good for the rivers and good for the people.

Supervisor Glenn McGourty, Mendocino County: design a resilient system that works for the next century both economically and environmentally.

Sergeant-at-Arms Tyrone Mitchell, Yokayo Tribe of Indians: interest in water regulations and water rights negotiated.

Cathy Monroe, Mendocino County Resource Conservation District (RCD): interest in both Eel River and Russian River systems being well-stewarded.

Chairman Ted Hernandez, Wiyot Tribe: bringing back the health of the Eel River and figuring out how we will do this together.

Bree Klotter, Redwood Valley County Water District (CWD): finding a secure, reliable source for water supply and fire suppression.

Janet Pauli, Mendocino Inland Water & Power Commission (IWPC) and Potter Valley Irrigation District: inclusion of people on the Russian River who are dependent on this water supply, an open and transparent process, collaboration for maintaining the health of both of our rivers and water supply.

Sean White, City of Ukiah: solution that meets the needs of our communities.

Vivian Helliwell, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA) and Institute for Fisheries Resources (IFR): solution that works the best for the most people possible.

Jennifer Burke, City of Santa Rosa: share ideas and understand where each of us is coming from.

Craig Tucker, Humboldt County consultant: solution that meets Russian River needs, restores Eel River fisheries, and ensures water supply for Humboldt County communities.

Tony Williams, North Marin Water District (NMWD): solution that satisfies interests in both watersheds.

Matt Clifford, Trout Unlimited: full removal of both dams; focus on common interest of continued diversion alongside removal of those dams.

Terri McCartney, Pinoleville Pomo Nation: collaborative solution that ensures water equity in both watersheds.

Beth Salomone, Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District (RRFCD): build healthy relationships, speak and listen across interests to come to a solution that improves the health of both watersheds.

Mike Shaver, Potter Valley Tribe: working collaboratively on instream and watershed health improvement across both watersheds.

Terry Crowley, City of Healdsburg: better understand people's concerns in both watersheds and trying to define a path forward.

Brandon Axell, Mendocino Farm Bureau: work together respectfully to secure water reliability and security for the coming decades.

John Nagle, Sonoma RCD: a statement of how interests in the two watersheds will move forward with a shared vision and no or minimal conflict.

Allan Nelson, Sonoma agriculture: need to secure water reliability in order to grow food; we can talk about this or we can get this done.

Mike Thompson, Sonoma Water: appreciation for everyone coming to the table, recognizing this will take time, learning, and listening; solution that benefits both basins' water supply, fisheries, and economic equity; collaborative approach is successful; build stronger bonds across basins beyond the Potter Valley Project

Denny Murphy, Sonoma RCD: long-term viability of natural resources and agriculture in the county.

Alicia Hamann, Friends of the Eel River: removal of both dams as quickly as possible.

Wyatt Smith, Round Valley Indian Tribes: full volitional fish passage and support for the two-basin solution.

Gary Helfrich, Camp Meeker Recreation & Park District: equitable solution and allocation of water resources in both watersheds that also supports the fisheries and other resources across both basins.

Shannon Cotulla, Town of Windsor: solution that is beneficial to both watersheds.

Supervisor Eddie Crandell, Lake County: begin discussions and get on the same page to understand each other respectfully; empathy for respective interests and no hard feelings for different interests; note that the water originates in Lake County.

Planning Group Purpose and Charter

Ben reviewed the charter, beginning by offering background information. He noted that input throughout the Planning Group formation process – including from an Interim Steering Committee – informed the development of the charter.

Jim Downing, K&W, presented the findings from interviews with interested parties and discussions with tribal representatives.

- (Q) (Chairman Ted Hernandez): Which tribes were selected to interview? Was it all or just some?
 - (R) (Jim): Invitations went out to all tribes in the region.
 - (R) (Ben): These conversations are ongoing. Also, any tribe that is interested is welcome to participate in the Planning Group as a member.

Ben reviewed the purpose of the Russian River Water Forum and Planning Group and its structure (pictured on [slide 25](#)). Ben reviewed the function of each body, which is explained in more detail in the draft charter and on slide 26.

- (Q) (Vivian Helliwell): What do you mean by ‘governance’?
 - (R) (Ben): This working group is being formed to examine the structure and participation of a potential regional entity formed to operate the diversion.

Ben then presented the purpose, charge, and guiding principles of the Planning Group. Ben reviewed the recommendation and decision-making authority of the Planning Group, underlining its primary focus on deliberation, not decision-making, and the goal of consensus. This formation was in response to what the Kearns & West team heard during its engagement process. When striving for consensus, the facilitation team will ask the group what members “can live with,” and if not, ask why to understand the interests behind stated positions and work toward a cross-interest solution. In situations where there are diverging opinions, majority and minority views would be documented.

- Comment (C) (Charlie Schneider): I hope we can discuss the majority determining decisions. Looking around the room, there are far fewer Eel River interests. The project, as it exists, creates impacts to the Eel River and benefits to the Russian River. The majority rule set up this way minimizes our role in being here, and that’s a problem. In the Two-Basin proceedings, we have had similar difficult discussions, and we would like to have those here. From the Eel River perspective, we want to have a say in what happens to our river.

Ben presented on caucusing, which allows for alternates and those represented in interest groups to have a voice in the room. The expectation is for members to actively involve their caucus and represent the views not only of their organization but also of the caucus as a whole.

- (Q) (Mike Shaver): You are describing reaching out to members outside the Planning Group. How does this impact Brown Act considerations around the number of elected officials in each meeting?
 - (R) (Ben): There may be implications for those meetings. An **action** for the facilitation team is to get more guidance around the Brown Act for the group. It is not required for the Planning Group since it’s not a decision-making body, but there may be implications for caucusing and other parts of the organizational chart.

Ben then reviewed the Planning Group roster. Ben noted that the facilitation team received a letter from the Lake County Board of Supervisors requesting to add the Lake Pillsbury Alliance as an Upper Eel River recreation seat at the Planning Group. Ben then introduced Carol Cinquini of the Lake Pillsbury Alliance to give a statement requesting to join the Planning Group.

- Statement (S) (Carol Cinquini): The Lake Pillsbury Alliance represents a group of stakeholders in the Eel River ecosystem above Scott Dam. Our community and ecosystem are over 100 years old. The lake provides water supply, recreation, tourism, and fire suppression. We stand for finding alternative solutions to removing Scott Dam that allows for the improvement of the Eel River fishery, whether by fish ladder or otherwise. We were not allowed to join the Potter Valley Project (PVP) Ad Hoc committee and Lake County was held out of the Two Basin Solution; so far, we have not been part of the proceedings of this Planning Group. We will be impacted by this

Planning Group and want to take part in it, to collaborate and work with other interests toward a solution.

- (C) (Vivian Helliwell): I am curious that even though a Lake County Supervisor was on the Ad Hoc committee, your group apparently did not feel represented by them. I am not against you joining the Planning Group, but you say you were not allowed, and the Lake County supervisor was at those meetings.
 - (R) (Frank Lynch): I am President of the Lake Pillsbury Alliance. Throughout this entire process, Lake County and Lake Pillsbury have been minimized. If you look around this room, there are many interests from the Eel River, many fishing interests, many interests from the Russian River, and we have an interest in all of that. Lake County has one spot in this group, and had one spot on the Ad Hoc committee. What we are asking for is recognition that there is a community there that deserves a voice because we are going to be the most impacted. We are looking for a win-win for everybody.
 - (R) (Vivian Helliwell): Thank you for that.

Ben asked if there was anyone who had concerns about Lake Pillsbury Alliance joining the Planning Group. No one contested their participation, representing the Planning Group's first consensus decision.

- (Q) (Terri McCartney): Have you contacted tribes in Lake Co.?
 - (R) (Jim): Yes, we have not spoken with the Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake and Robinson Rancheria, but we have made initial contacts through Supervisor Crandell.
 - (R) (Supervisor Crandell): I have been in contact with the EPA department at Robinson Rancheria, who was on a call in the last couple of weeks regarding the Water Forum, as well as the Habematolel, who are also interested. I encouraged them to participate, but as tribal governments, it's up to their discretion.
- (Q) (Craig Tucker): Who is not in the room that would be important? For example, PG&E and state and federal regulatory agencies? What is the status of involving those groups?
 - (R) (Ben): We have had initial discussions with agency staff to make them aware of this process and understand regulatory parameters. They will likely participate in working group discussions and attend some of the Planning Group meetings. PG&E is not at the meeting today. It would be great if we can get them at future meetings.
- (Q) (Nikcole Whipple): I am a member of the Round Valley Indian Tribes and also work with Save California Salmon. How can other NGOs be involved? If Lake Pillsbury Alliance can be added, can others join?
 - (R) (Ben): This is the membership as informed by the Interim Steering Committee. If others are interested, let us know and it will be considered in a similar way to how Lake Pillsbury Alliance presented after sharing a letter of interest.
- (Q) (Chair Hernandez): Have you thought about having tribes meet separately? It might allow more flexibility and comfort for the tribes.
 - (R) (Ben): We are open. What we have heard so far is that tribes want to be at the same table as everyone else. If there is something on the organizational chart that could be added or revised to best serve your interests, we are open to that.
 - (R) (Mike Shaver): Lytton Rancheria hosted a meeting of tribes a week and a half ago to try to establish a "tribal caucus." Brenda and I have been in contact.

Ben asked for questions, comments, and concerns about the charter.

- (C) (Matt Clifford): I have only one issue in the charter, on the last page, regarding proactive outreach to state and federal policy contacts. There are a lot of people here with relationships to state and federal policy contacts. Since these are public meetings, it is not clear to me why those relationships should not continue and be restricted in terms of what we could say about a public meeting. The second issue is that “proactive outreach” is pretty vague. What does that ask of us? I do not want to violate the charter.
 - (R) (Ben): The spirit is similar to the previous point. We acknowledge that as representatives of your own agencies and organizations, you can continue to have relationships and speak on behalf of yourselves. What we want to avoid or be careful of is having one member represent or speak on behalf of the whole group.
 - (R) (Matt): That is fine, but that is not what the charter says.
 - (R) (Ben): The facilitation team can add that clarifying language (**action**).
 - (R) (Mike Shaver): That fourth bullet seems to be addressed by the first bullet, which covers not speaking on behalf of the Planning Group as a whole.
- (Q) (Terri McCartney): What is the process for approval of outreach on behalf of the Planning Group?
 - (R) (Ben): Good question, we do not have that yet, but that could be a role of the Steering Committee.
- (C) (Don McEnhill): I would like to note that we are puzzled by delaying the Russian River Resiliency Subcommittee until 2024. We would like to advocate that that be enacted now alongside the other working groups. We saw in the last drought that issues with the diversion facility, in combination with climate change and the drought itself, brought no water to the Russian River. Delaying working on local solutions makes no sense. With increased droughts and climate change, whatever the future facility will be, there may not be water to transfer. We need to get in front of things and not delay.
 - (R) (Ben): We will take that into consideration, noting that there are resource limitations about what we can and cannot make happen.
- (Q) (Terri): Why is there not a working group for water demand? Would that be included under water rights?
 - (R) (Jim): Those discussions would happen in the Water Supply and Fisheries Working Group and the Water Rights and Water Management Working Group.
- (Q) (Charlie Schneider): Will Sonoma Water or this group be sending information to PG&E without consent of Planning Group? (note: this question was asked at the end of the meeting)
 - (R) (Mike Thompson): I have offered to PG&E to brief them on the effort, but that briefing is sharing about the process.
 - (R) Charlie Schneider: Please allow ER interests to take part in that briefing.
- (Q) (Meghan Quinn): How does briefing work with this charter which we’re all signing onto? No member should communicate on behalf of planning group to outside entities. Do we need to set up a process for agreement around what is appropriate to communicate or not? Otherwise we’re undermining the external communications provisions of the charter.
 - (R) Ben: We’ll need to talk about that before we conduct briefings on behalf of the Planning Group.

Ben asked for final comments, noted the revisions to be made to the External Communications section, and asked: with those changes incorporated, are there any other concerns? Kearns & West will bring those revisions to the next meeting with the goal of confirming the charter, knowing that the membership might change over time. No comments or concerns were raised.

Planning Group Member Interests and Priorities

Ben gave a primer on positions and interests. A position is a stance or preferred solution, while interests are the underlying need, values, or motivation for a position. The value of working from interests is that it creates more options; this is called a mutual gains approach which aims to create a larger pie for the whole group. Ahead of the meeting, Kearns & West asked Planning Group members to prepare interest statements around the planned decommissioning of the Potter Valley Project. Ben then turned it over to Planning Group members to begin sharing their interests, starting with those in-person.¹

Planning Group Member Statements of Interest

Denny Murphy, Sonoma RCD

Our interest is in the long-term viability of agriculture and water supply in Sonoma County and the Alexander Valley. Our goal is to see as many resources and users of water in both systems to come out ahead in terms of recreation, fisheries, and agriculture. We are looking to sustain critical mass of fisheries and agriculture.

Mike Thompson, Sonoma County Water Agency

Our interest is in minimizing impacts to water supply reliability, fisheries, and economic interests in Russian River and Eel River basins. We are also interested in protecting tribal cultural, economic, and other interests in both basins. We are interested in solutions that improve economic health and welfare in both basins. Finally, we are interested in affordable and equitable solutions that have broad support and are acceptable to both FERC and PG&E.

Allan Nelson, Sonoma agriculture

We are interested in seeing how much water we will end up with and how much it will cost.

John Nagle, Sonoma RCD

The RCD sees a future where the natural resources of Sonoma are abundant and available for all people and the economy. The RCD's district extends from San Pablo Bay to the coast to the mountains. What are the integrated systems and needs that are going to need to be implemented across the entire area to ensure long-term water supply, recharging, and sourcing. In addition, we have worked on a voluntary water sharing program, including the management of water rights, governance, and water supply in the Russian River valley. How will this work for the future of the Potter Valley Project?

Brandon Axell, Mendocino Farm Bureau

Since the installation of the Potter Valley Project over 100 years ago, agriculture on the Upper Russian River has thrived largely because of the water coming through the project. Farmers and ranchers have depended on this water supply, with many being granted rights for the use of the water. The future of agriculture, as well as the secondary benefits such as open space, carbon storage, wildlife corridors, and

¹ Note: these initial interest statements represent what was said at the meeting; official written interest statements are being submitted and will be collected for future reference.

groundwater recharge will all be impacted by the loss or continuation of viable year-round water supply. We have a vested interest in having agricultural interests represented in the Water Forum. Conservative estimates say that agriculture contributes well over \$500 million per year to the economy of Mendocino County, and the Potter Valley Project directly affects 700,000 people across three counties. We have the same interests as many groups. Dam removal on the Potter Valley Project has benefits and detriments. In this forum, we will need to understand what the alternatives are and how much water through the diversion will cost.

Terry Crowley, City of Healdsburg

The City of Healdsburg depends on the Russian River for water supply. We have concerns about the health of riparian habitat. We would like to see and find a predictable water supply from year to year. We have communities participating that have a dependency on the water. We need to balance the supply and demand of water. We also need to find ways to maintain the affordability of that water supply for all of us.

Mike Shaver, Potter Valley Tribe

The Potter Valley Tribe has ancestral lands and current ownership in both Eel and Russian River watersheds, on lands under local, state, and federal government control. The Tribe has interests in water conservation, fisheries improvements, drinking water supply and demand, sustainable farming, and watershed management. Gregg Young, the lead member, will expand at a later date.

Beth Salomone, Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District

The District spans a great deal of interests. We align with Sonoma Water on water supply and ecosystem health, as well as the RCDs with watershed health overall. The most important thing is building relationships for long-term durability. I would also like to see the resiliency group come up in the timeline quite a bit. I would love to talk with anyone who is interested in the district. We supply water retailers, agriculture, commerce, and the environment.

Terri McCartney, Pinoleville Pomo Nation

The people who are now called the Pinoleville Pomo Nation originated in the Potter Valley and were forcibly removed by settlers after the gold rush. I will share our mission statement and overall perspective instead of just this project. Pinoleville Pomo Nation affirms and protects tribal sovereignty and maintains government-to-government relations. The Nation is dedicated to developing and maintaining cooperative alliances between the Nation and local communities. The Nation is committed to the preservation of history and culture, economic health, self-sufficiency, and independence. We see the community being healthy spiritually, emotionally, and mentally. We will become independent and self-sufficient through self-government and cultural and traditional values. We will take action to bring our community forward. Pass on knowledge and wisdom of our ancestors from generation to generation to ensure understanding of other communities. Water is life.

Matt Clifford, Trout Unlimited

We are a national nonprofit organization dedicated to environmental conservation. We have invested tens of millions of dollars in ecological restoration in both watersheds, and we are invested in the recovery of both. Our main interest is to secure the removal of both dams. I know that sounds like a position, so what underlies that position is that we have studied fish passage on the Eel River for a very long time and have seen the recovery of ecosystems and fisheries after the removal of dams. We know that removal is compatible with the long-term recovery of salmon on the Eel River. We want a

sustainable solution. We want to be transparent that we will not support a solution that doesn't include dam removal. Our second interest is to find a sustainable solution for the Russian River side, and we believe that a continued diversion without the dams can be part of that solution. There are many legal, technical, and financial things that have to happen to make that work, but we are 100% committed to working to help make that happen, and we hope that can be the focus of this group. Lastly, to echo Russian Riverkeeper, we would like to see the Russian River resiliency group be formed sooner because the issues of drought and climate change are going to get worse before they get better.

Tony Williams, North Marin Water District

We have been active participants in Potter Valley Project Russian River water supply issues since the 1970s. We have been reliant on Russian River water since the 1960s. We support continued diversions of water from the PVP into the Russian River. We generally support the establishment of a regional entity to acquire the components of the Potter Valley Project and requisite water rights. And will continue to work with SW in evaluating what financial contributions make sense that is proportional to the benefit received. At the end of the day, the diversion has to be sustainable for the environments in both watersheds.

Craig Tucker, Humboldt County consultant

The Eel River runs through Humboldt County for 81 miles, supporting numerous communities and farms, and is essential to the culture of several Humboldt County tribal nations, including the Wiyot, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, and the Blue Lake Rancheria. Historically, Eel River salmon was a significant contributor to the commercial fisheries and swordfishing economy in Humboldt County. Today the Eel River is in pretty poor shape and we have had runs of salmon extirpated from the Eel and have other runs of salmon on the endangered species list. Humboldt County appreciates the importance of diversions for Russian River water users. The county has actively participated in the efforts to reach the Two Basin Solution since 2017, and in 2019 voted to pass a resolution supporting the solution reached by the Two Basin Partnership. The county's primary interest is in restoring Eel River fisheries, and the county hopes that the solution can be compatible with water reliability needs on the Russian River.

Jennifer Burke, City of Santa Rosa

The Santa Rosa water department provides water supply to 275,000 residents and is the largest contractor to Sonoma Water. Our interest is in the continued flow of water from the Potter Valley project into the Russian River. We are interested in increasing water supply reliability and have supported this effort financially. We are engaged in restoring Russian River fisheries and are interested in the formation of a regional entity to acquire whatever is needed to maintain the diversion and whatever water rights are needed, so long as the funding we provide is proportional to the benefit received. We would like to have continued opportunities for meaningful input on the Water Forum and participation in any water supply resiliency agreements. The nine largest Sonoma Water contractors are working on a shared interest statement that we will provide at a later time.

Vivian Helliwell, PCFFA/IFR

Our main interest is in restoring Eel River fisheries to support an ocean fishery and the other fisheries that benefit our coastal communities. We have been through six years of these meetings to determine the most affordable solution for both basins. We would like to help the Russian River while noting that there probably will not be any water available from the Eel River, considering climate change, the

obsolete nature of the engineering of Scott Dam, and what it would take to upgrade Cape Horn Dam to make it okay for fisheries. We have had all the agencies at the table for six years and were in all working groups for water supply and fisheries. 50 years ago, our organization opposed the relicensing of the PVP. 100 years ago, Humboldt County vigorously opposed diversions and the applications for these diversions. In 1922, the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors wrote a resolution naming all the harms that would occur to Humboldt County and the Eel River to have this diversion, but it came to pass anyway. All the benefits that the Russian River has received from this water since then have come at a cost to the Eel River and its fisheries. We are going to promote a full-basin restoration in the Eel River and help the Russian River folks to live within their means because no one is going to have enough water for everything that we need. We support the removal of both dams as these years of studies and working groups determined that no one can afford to keep these dams in place or build a ladder to go above Scott Dam. Now we have a seismic issue that has been recognized by PG&E. The Bartlett Springs fault that runs through Lake Pillsbury and Scott Dam is identified on USGS maps as the 'Eastern Arc of the Cascadia Subduction Zone'; the Western fault, that runs along the shelf along the coast, is called by USGS the 'Cascadia Megathrust', The public does not get to see the information on seismic risk due to Homeland Security. I hear a large willingness to help each other, and we want to be part of the ongoing conversation. Not only have fisheries offshore lost fish from the Eel, but because of our very conservative fisheries management that protects the weakest stocks, including those listed under the ESA, we are prevented from fishing from other stocks in the ocean. We now fish from a mixed stock fishery with weak stock protections.

Sean White, City of Ukiah

The City of Ukiah is the oldest and largest municipal water supplier on the upper Russian River. The City has been supplying water as far back as the 1870s, which predates the PVP by several decades. However, the PVP permanently altered the hydrologic landscape of the upper Russian River. We have been part of the conversation around the PVP since 1996 and were part of the Huffman Ad Hoc. We would like to see a collaborative solution that creates a sustainable water supply for our city, agriculture, environment, and fisheries. All of these are what make this area what it is and we want to see all of these receive beneficial outcomes.

Janet Pauli, Mendocino County IWPC; PVID

IWPC is a joint powers authority between the Mendocino County Water Agency, City of Ukiah, Potter Valley Irrigation District, the Redwood Valley County Water District, and Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District. Collectively, we represent all the people who are either completely or partially dependent upon the water from this diversion from the Eel River through the PVP. Since 2019, IWPC has been one of the members of the Two Basin Partnership, which developed shared objectives that would benefit both watersheds, which included relicensing at that point in time. Of course, relicensing is no longer on the table, and the surrender process is underway. We believe that we all need to be engaged in this Water Forum. That is essential to IWPC because we hope that this effort will ultimately lead to the formation of a larger regional entity that will own, operate, and fund continuing diversions from the Eel River while supporting improvements for listed species of fish on the Eel River and the Russian River.

Bree Klotter, Redwood Valley County Water District

Redwood Valley is a small rural community, and the water district was created over 50 years ago. During that time, no reliable, secure source of water has been identified within its boundaries. As a result, our

district has to purchase surplus water from the RRFCDD when it is available. Ensuring a more secure water source is very important to this community. Our family was left homeless in the 2017 Redwood Complex Fire, so it is essential to have a water source for helicopters to use for fighting fires. I have been following IWPC's discussions in the TBS with interest over the last several years and recognize that the challenges facing the Water Forum are many, and the answers are elusive, and I suspect that any solutions will require compromise by all parties. I have been reading the biography of Harry Truman; in one passage, Truman was listening to his cabinet members argue about an intractable problem and said: "Don't argue about it, solve it." I hope that we as a group can move forward with that thought in mind.

Chairman Ted Hernandez, Wiyot Tribe

The Wiyot Tribe has been reliant on the Eel River since time immemorial; that is how long we have been on that water. The water is part of our culture and part of our ceremonies and it also supported our salmon fisheries, which since 1900 are no longer there. Our salmon are dying with nowhere to go. We need to bring back the health of the Eel River, and in order to do that, we need to stop what we are doing and let it come back to health. If the Eel River does not come back to health, no one will have water. The Eel River is dying. In 2014, we could walk across the Eel River at Fortuna; that is how dry it was. Our river is dying; we need to take care of it and bring it back to health so everybody can have water. The Eel River is the main source; if we do not take care of it, none of us are going to have water.

Cathy Monroe, Mendocino County Resource Conservation District

The mission of the RCD is to conserve, protect, and restore wild and working landscapes for Mendocino County's water, soil, and forests. Our service area includes parts of both watersheds. As we consider ourselves to be a nonregulatory and neutral party, our goal is that every interest is recognized and respected in this process. With a 78-year history of partnerships of voluntary stewardship and science-based decision-making, the MCRCD relies on relationships with local landowners, tribes, conservation organizations, and local, state, and federal agencies to plan, fund, and implement conservation programs and projects. We seek to find common goals and provide solutions, especially for those most likely to be severely impacted by the changes at the PVP. We can provide information and resources for water sustainability, including implementing water efficiency, storage, catchment, and resiliency projects.

Sergeant-at-Arms Tyrone Mitchell, Yokayo Tribe of Indians

We have been a tribe in this area since time immemorial and a healthy steward of our lands since settlers came in. We want to maintain and increase tribal rights and gain grants for all of our neighbors to build off of. Tribes can bring a lot to the table in terms of restoring a healthy ecosystem in this valley. We are a resource to this Planning Group.

Supervisor Glenn McGourty, Mendocino County

My district covers the Russian River watershed in Mendocino County, plus some of the Eel River watershed; that is where the water is, where the diversion facilities are, and where the fish are, and we care about all of those things. We are interested in a reliable, resilient, affordable water supply in the Russian River basin for all stakeholders, including communities, agriculture, tribes, fish, and wildlife. As the chair of the Ukiah Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency, I know that we need to store more water in the ground at times of high flow; this will need to be part of the solution for the Russian River Valley and will require significant investment from the state, which we have not gotten. Right now, we can get water from Northern California to Southern California, but we cannot get water from Fort Bragg to Mendocino through a pipe. We are concerned about issues of public trust and riparian restoration in

both basins to make the systems healthy; they are in bad shape. We have to balance protecting public trust resources with other needs. We cannot afford to let species go extinct on our watch. These issues are not mutually exclusive: water supply and fisheries.

John Mack, Permit Sonoma

Sonoma County's economy and environment are inextricably intertwined. Permit Sonoma has broad land use, planning, housing, resiliency, environmental justice responsibilities, permitting, environmental review, natural resources management, aggregate resource management, and water resource management, all of which are related to the county as a whole and the Russian River Watershed in particular. Other county departments are involved as well. The PVP decommissioning process will impact the Russian River and the interests of Sonoma County. We are interested in the economic welfare of the county's residents and the county's resiliency to the effects of climate change, including water supply reliability. The county seeks equitable solutions for everyone in the county, including tribes and residents. The county is committed to finding solutions that meet water supply and fishery, and ecosystem needs in the Eel and Russian River basins.

Meghan Quinn, American Rivers

American Rivers is a national nonprofit that advocates and works for the protection and restoration of all rivers, from small mountain streams to large rivers and urban creeks. Our work includes addressing the challenges that rivers face through river restoration that ensures the services a river provides, and that is through solutions identified by inclusive stakeholder processes. American Rivers' interest is in removing both dams associated with the Potter Valley Project. That said, we have an interest in ensuring a secure water supply for those that benefit from the current diversion. We want to ensure sustainable, efficient solutions in the Russian River basin now, especially given that the swings between drought and deluge will only accelerate. We are interested in identifying a variety of solutions at the forefront and evaluating which will best replace the PVP.

Don McEnhill, Russian Riverkeeper

Russian Riverkeeper has been involved in PVP discussions since 1998 and was a member of the Two Basin Solution Partnership. Our focus is on ensuring that all users of our watershed are good stewards and are using our limited resources efficiently. This includes focusing on solutions available to us that we already utilize, like real-time metering and reporting, better understanding of interconnected streams, expanding recycled water delivery systems, and science-based recharge projects. There is still much we can do to increase our available supply within our own watershed without having to be so reliant on another. We are interested in positive solutions that include closing or modification of the PVP that are agreeable to stakeholders in both basins. We would like to see the health of both watersheds supported, recognizing that this project was established at a time when the cultural and environmental impacts to the Eel River were not fully understood.

Charlie Schneider, CalTrout

CalTrout works to ensure healthy waters and resilient wild fish for California. It is our belief that abundant wild fish indicate healthy waters, and healthy waters benefit all Californians. One of our organization's primary initiatives is the restoration of the Eel River, and our primary interest is to secure unobstructed fish passage into the headwaters of the Eel River and restoration of the river ecosystem. We believe this is best accomplished through the removal of both dams in a timely manner. We worked for a number of years as part of Congressman Huffman's ad hoc and as a member of the Two Basin

Solution Partnership with diverse interests to seek collaborative solutions to those goals. To that extent, we remain willing to work with parties on our shared goals, including a continued diversion and water supply resiliency efforts in both basins. Our secondary interest is to proceed with a sense of urgency, which we believe will be necessary to success.

Bert Whitaker, Sonoma County Regional Parks

Our priority is in expanding public access to outdoor recreation and meeting increasing demands for outdoor recreation. We operate nine regional parks and are working diligently to develop additional river parks and facilities. We are interested in the health and vitality of the river and its ecosystems. We are working to reduce impacts from recreation while sustaining or improving water quality. Finally, we are working collaboratively with partners to restore the main stem of the Russian River as well as throughout the watershed. We want to enhance river function, fish habitat, and drought resiliency.

Alicia Hamann, Friends of the Eel River

Friends of the Eel River was founded in 1994 in large part to address the problems caused by the PVP. Our mission is to work for the recovery of a wild and scenic Eel River, its fisheries, and its communities. We know that the single best action we can take toward recovery is to remove both dams to allow the river's native fish to return to their cold-water habitat in the upper Eel River basin. We support the removal of both dams and we know that it must be done quickly in order to correct the century of injustice by this project. We are participating in this process part to ensure that dam removal is not delayed at any further expense to the Eel River.

Wyatt Smith, Round Valley Indian Tribes

Chairman Britton is dealing with a developing situation; I am not an enrolled member of the Round Valley Indian Tribes, but I do represent the tribes biologically. My statement is meant to articulate the interests of RVIT's tribal community, but I am not speaking for any tribal members in particular. If tribal members are there in person, please recognize that and allow them to express their personal interests and goals as tribal representatives. The Round Valley Reservation and the tribes' ancestral territory are located in the Eel River watershed. For thousands of years, the Eel River has been a source of water, food, and cultural resources for the tribes. The tribes hold senior, federal, reserved water rights in the watershed derived from aboriginal use and occupancy in the creation of the Round Valley Reservation by the United States in 1856. RVIT tribal lands are surrounded by three sides of the Eel River: the North Fork, the Middle Fork, and the mainstem Eel. The tribes today continue to depend on the Eel River for essential aspects of their culture and their way of life. Restoring the Eel River watershed from its degraded condition and reviving a salmon fishery that is near extinction are the primary goals of the tribes. This includes the removal of both dams in the Potter Valley Project, of which Cape Horn Dam and the Van Arsdale diversion facility are part and a principal stressor on the Eel River and our salmonid habitat. Presently, Round Valley Indian Tribes Tribal Council, our legal counsel, and our tribal community recognize that there are two decommissioning options for Cape Horn Dam in which full volitional fish passage and a continued diversion can be achieved. Today we are working with our partners and allies to prepare a long-term, watershed-wide Eel River restoration plan, and we look forward to the cultural and ecological benefits of a free-flowing Eel River.

Supervisor Bruno Sabatier, Lake County

Thank you for inviting us to participate. We have not had a seat at the table previously and so one of our interests has already been met. There is a community that lives on and around Lake Pillsbury, which is an

attraction and destination for tourism. We would like to see that continue, recognizing that the costs of keeping the dam are such that that path will be very difficult to hold onto. Based on PG&E's environmental review, the dam coming down would leave an environmental disaster in the headwaters of the Eel River. If the dam is taken down, every appropriate action must be taken to restore the headwaters, otherwise, there will be no benefit to fish or spawning habitat. Our greatest interest is water rights; otherwise to support the goals of others around the table as much as possible.

Lunch

Ben thanked members for sharing their statements and reminded everyone to submit them in writing or by email. The group adjourned until 12:50.

Presentation: Potter Valley Project Background, PG&E Decommissioning, and Two Basin Efforts to Date

Ben welcomed attendees back from lunch and reminded in-person attendees to submit speaker cards if interested in providing public comment.

Jim gave a presentation on the Potter Valley Project background, PG&E decommissioning process, and the Two Basin Partnership. Jim noted that Tom Johnson, consultant to IWPC, and Charlie Schneider and Redgie Collins, CalTrout, provided support in preparing the presentation. Jim also noted the expertise, experience, and knowledge in the room regarding the content of the presentation. Jim recognized the presence of tribes in both basins since time immemorial. This presentation begins on slide XX and can be found [here](#).

After Jim's presentation, Ben opened the floor to questions and comments, noting that Kearns & West is not the technical expert and requesting that if there are unresolved pieces of information, this is the venue to discuss those.

- (Q) (Allan Nelson): Who were the parties that PG&E shared its plans to decommission both dams with?
 - (R) (Charlie Schneider): CalTrout has discussed decommissioning with PG&E, and other parties have as well and have been told this information is public. **Action:** Kearns & West to reach out to PG&E and ask them to provide that info.
- (C) (Vivian Helliwell): There is a disconnect between the status of the decommissioning plans as shared by PG&E, which will remove project facilities, and the goals of the Planning Group charter to inform that plan.
- (Q) (Mike Shaver): How do you foresee this group interacting with PG&E during the comment period?
 - (R) (Ben): What is most important is that PG&E knows that we are discussing these issues and communicating with PG&E what is coming out of these conversations. There are lots of details to figure out, but it is in everyone's interests to have an open dialogue with them so that our proceedings can inform their plan.
- (C) (Janet Pauli): PG&E had a town hall meeting where they reiterated that plan to remove all facilities unless an entity came forward with a plan to purchase any of those.
- (Q) (Terri McCartney): How do the recent seismic reports on Scott Dam affect all of this?
 - (R) (Jim): The Working Groups will dig into these reports in more detail.
- (Q) (Mike Shaver): How does the FERC process work? Do they accept the comments?

- (R) (Charlie Schneider): There is a 30-day comment period mandated by FERC, which is what we should expect.
- (R) (Beth Salomone): However, PG&E will accept comments before FERC requires its final plan. If anyone else knows differently, it would be a good time to say so.
- (R) (Craig Tucker): FERC also has obligations to consult with tribes upon request, so that is an option for tribes at the table as well. However, those conversations won't be private when an application is before FERC, so other people would be able to observe.
- (Q) (John Mack): What are the estimates of costs for facility removal and diversion operation?
 - (R) (Meghan Quinn): My understanding from the initial studies from the Two Basin Solution is that removal would cost \$30 million.
 - (R) (Charlie Schneider): PG&E is financially responsible until FERC says they are not, so dam removal would be on their dime. The studies Meghan referenced are Phase II feasibility studies that provide four alternatives, which were the latest studies from the Two Basin Partnership and are available online [here](#). **Action:** Kearns & West to add links to the Water Forum website.
 - (R) (Jim): The estimates in the studies are preliminary and error bars are very wide, meaning there could be a wide variance of potential costs.
 - (R) (Ben): The upcoming briefings will lay out what is known and what is unknown.
 - (R) (Mike Thompson): The first goal is for PG&E to be aware of these discussions, which they are, and to influence their decommissioning plan so that it doesn't preclude an ongoing diversion. Dave Manning is Sonoma Water's expert on fish passage and the Two-Basin studies and can answer questions about them.
 - (R) (Craig Tucker): As a point of reference, on the Klamath, they removed four dams in 36 miles at a cost of \$450 million. So, it is likely to be far more expensive than \$30 million. Also, if FERC approves the plan, PG&E will be allowed to recover the cost from ratepayers.
 - (R) (Matt Clifford): I agree with a lot of what has been said. Trout Unlimited wants PG&E to know what we are discussing here, but we do not want to ask PG&E to do something specific, like halting the removal of the diversion. If we are going to them publicly to tell them to stop, Trout Unlimited does not support that. Dam removal and continued diversions are compatible, but we do not want to delay the removal process.
 - (R) (Beth Salomone): RRFCD's hope is that we can go to PG&E with a request to open the door to discussions about allowing the maintenance of a diversion as a possibility moving forward. Maybe there is something we can salvage. At the town hall, my impression was that PG&E invited anyone with an organized solution to come forward, not that they were moving ahead with decommissioning the entire project. My hope is we can move forward with a legal entity to become part of this conversation and recognize the needs and ecosystem health of both watersheds.
 - (R) (Matt Clifford): Do not underestimate the difficulty of coming to solutions with this group. People on the Eel River will not say, "advocate to leave dams in the Eel River, but we can work together to continue the diversion."
 - (R) (Beth Salomone): We will get into the details and figure a solution out together.
 - (R) (Matt Clifford): Any solution that involves leaving a big piece of infrastructure in place is going to be hard.

- (R) (Mike Thompson): With regard to fish passage alternatives, it might be good to hear from Dave Manning what those are and what their status is.
 - (R) (Dave Manning): At the technical briefings, we will walk through the technical studies. Currently, we are looking at three alternatives: the first alternative modifies Cape Horn Dam as it is; the second alternative involves removing most of the concrete of the dam and pumping water to the Van Arsdale diversion facility, to be diverted to the Russian River; the third alternative is full dam removal with the addition of a roughened channel or boulder cascade. This would remove most of the concrete, pump water to Van Arsdale facility through the tunnel sit at a lower elevation, allowing gravity to feed the diversion instead of a pump. Those are the options right now that are being examined in more detail under the DWR grant.
- (R) (Redgie Collins): I agree that PG&E opened the door to additional conversation, but applications will only be considered if interests are met from both basins. It is encouraging given our interest in working together as long as both dams are removed, which is one of PG&E's requirements as well. Four alternatives were funded by CDFW, and you can find these on freetheeel.org, three studies put forward by Sonoma Water. A fish ladder is not an acceptable option for CalTrout, but three other options work for us.
- Vivian Helliwell: Pike Minnow – PG&E needs to take responsibility for addressing this invasive fish that came from their lake and invaded the whole system at low water. They migrate to river mouth in winter and back upstream in summer. NMFS is also concerned about Pike Minnow in the system, since they're predatory to steelhead and salmon. PG&E needs to take responsibility for the outcome when they create their plan, to get the fish back.

Overview of Working Groups and Future Discussion Topics

Jim then provided an overview of the Working Groups, which will include Water Supply & Fisheries, Economics & Finance, Governance, and Water Rights & Water Management. The Working Groups will be open to all Planning Group members, alternates, and technical experts nominated by Planning Group members (they will not be open to the public). Prior to the Working Groups beginning to meet, a series of technical briefings will be convened on each topic to provide a baseline of information. These briefings will be open to the public.

What follows are questions and comments related to the Working Group topics.

Water Supply & Fisheries

- (Q) (Meghan Quinn): Are operations alternatives the only focus of this group? Or do other alternatives count?
 - (R) (Jim): At this point, because there are broader operations implications, yes it will be broader.
- (Q) (John Nagle): Will this group also work on water supply implications in Potter Valley, Lake Mendocino, etc.?
 - (R) (Jim): Yes, we will look at all of that.
 - (R) (Mike): It's not just diversion or RR resiliency options. It's all of the above. We can't only do one. We need them to work together for water supply resiliency.

- (R) (Mike Shaver): Noting you have both leads for water supply and fisheries from Sonoma Water, it would be helpful to also have Eel River representation.

Economics & Finance

- (C) (Vivian Helliwell): There's a possibility this whole assumption might be moot if there's not enough water on the Eel to support diversions. What are the costs to the Eel River? I'm not discussing impact mitigation, I'm talking about there possibly not being enough water to even divert from the Eel in the first place. This is all about moving water that might not be available given the minimum requirements on the Eel.
- (C) (Nikcole Whipple): Wyatt has deferred to me to speak for RVIT. I was recently at California Tribal Water Summit. I'm appreciative of the agency funding this project. We're discussing costs as if they come out of our own pockets. When we talk about costs, we need to consider that the Eel River is one of our most endangered rivers. When discussing diversions, it's offensive to our tribal members who have barely any water. We have 5000 members who barely have drinking water, let alone water in rivers. People in other counties have fines for overuse when we can barely turn on the faucet. There are direct human costs for us that need to be considered. The state recognizes that the costs owed to our tribe have not been paid.
- (Q) (John Nagle): The economics and finance working group is looking at what needs to be spent in order to ensure Eel River drinking systems provide water that's needed. Will that group look at the benefit of increased, vibrant fisheries or will it only look at the cost in Sonoma County to pay for infrastructure changes?
 - (R) (Ben): Some of this is self-determined. As you participate, we'll scope this out together. These slides are only drafts. We'll be somewhere in the middle, and the questions will be more expansive than what's here.
- (C) (Brandon Axell): Development of water supply contracts – there's so much complexity between contracts and rights. Question of what happens to water rights in Lake Mendocino. Lots to look at and figure out.
- (C) (Beth Salomone): It's not "they." It's a "we." K&W is not in charge, they are just facilitating. K&W will respond to feedback and involve all of us. We are doing this together collectively. We can't be in silos or isolation.
- (C) (Mike Thompson): There's a lot of information for water supply and fisheries, but other three are starting from scratch. We'll use the information today to inform how those move forward.
 - (R) (Ben): We're scoping this out and mindful of the urgency.
- (Q) (Charlie Schneider): I have heard a number of people express interest in Russian River water resiliency work. Are there enough folks in the room to start pursuing that group? A number of people could help bring that funding in. I'd like to propose starting that group now as a coalition of the willing.
 - (R) (Ben): We're hearing you don't want to wait and need to move forward. By show of hands, how many people would be interested in participating in the Water Resiliency Work Group? (about 25 people – PG members and members of the public – raised their hands).
 - **Action:** K&W will include the Russian River Water Resiliency Work Group in the participation survey.

- (C) (Jennifer Burke): If we're going to look at Russian River resiliency studies, we need to look at work that's already been done. We have spent a lot of money on numerous efforts already. We need to start with a baseline of what we've done already.
 - (R) (Craig Tucker): Between Two Basin Solution efforts and Planning Group efforts, this is well-plowed ground. A lot of analysis has already been done.
 - (R) (Ben): This could proceed similar to the technical briefings.
- (C) (Nikcole Whipple): I would like to see resiliency recast as self-sufficiency. Take it upon yourselves to support yourselves in a more sustainable way rather than dependent on other watersheds. Our Eel River watershed is barely hanging on but is "resilient."

Governance

- (C) (Vivian Helliwell): One big part of decommissioning on the Klamath was revegetation and restoration of areas that were impacted by heatsinks where reservoirs used to be. Effort to recompense landowners and cities by removal. Include the needs of Lake County to help them adjust to impacts to their economies. Severe setbacks with fisheries going down. Need to take care of everyone involved.
- (Q) (Allan Nelson): How will this get decided upon? What gives this entity the authority to decide? How will that be decided upon?
 - (R) (Ben): These details still need to be discussed and figured out – join the working group if you're interested in helping with this.
- (C) (John Mack): A lot of the slides say the diversion "will" continue instead of "would" continue. We need to recognize the fact that the diversion may not continue and we need to consider all options.
 - (R) (Nikcole Whipple): I appreciate that comment. When we talk about dam removals, we need to also think about more water flowing. Dams are not the only way to keep water. When Eel River dams come down, we need to understand how much diversion is really needed.

Water Rights & Water Management

- (C) (Vivian Helliwell): There are lots of illegal diversions on the Eel River, not just by cannabis. Let's not make cannabis the scapegoat for all illegal diversions.
- (C) (Chairman Hernandez): I keep hearing about water rights. The tribes on the Eel River are not giving up our water rights, and we never have. Water was given to us by our creator to continue our life. It's offensive to even consider.
- (Q) (Meghan Quinn): Responding to tribal concerns. Is this the appropriate group for questions of tribal water rights?
 - (R) (Jim): Yes.
- (C) (Matt Myers, CDFW): We can't assume there are no illegal diversions on the Russian River side, too.
- (Q) (Mike Shaver): Water supply and quality are managed by regional water boards? How will they interact?
 - (R) (Ben): The state and regional water boards are aware and will participate. They don't have the resources to be in every conversation, but our job is to keep them in the loop and have them at the table when needed.

- (C) (Craig Tucker): The water rights issue is not insignificant. The water right for most water rights of Russian on Eel is for power generation. This will require a significant shift to consumptive use.
- (C) (Beth Salomone): Regarding the water rights working group, I look forward to a discussion of tribal water relationships to water. English language is insufficient. Term means state-issued water rights. Bills are looking at systemic racism in the water rights system and monetization of it now. Looking for better language to meet all our needs and concerns.
- (C) (John Nagle): SWRCB is more open to innovation and changes to look at and come up with creative solutions that don't currently exist.
- (C) (Janet Pauli): There have been lots of comments about information that we don't have accurate answers to yet. Part of the work of the working groups will be figuring out the answers to these challenging questions and developing a shared understanding of truth of these issues.

Working Group and Steering Committee Membership

Ben encouraged all Planning Group members and alternates to sign up and participate in the Working Group(s) that are of most interest to them. He also explained the role of the Steering Committee which will be comprised of Planning Group members, including:

- Advise on Planning Group and Working Group meeting topics;
- Facilitate coordination between Planning Group and Working Groups, and among Working Groups;
- Support broader community engagement and education; and
- Help identify path forward where Planning Group is unable to reach consensus

Ben reminded the group that K&W would be sending a participation survey to the Planning Group to indicate which group(s) they'd like join.

Mike Thompson noted that Sonoma Water is nearing the end of its DWR funding to support the Water Forum, and that it has applied for another DWR grant to keep the process going for two additional years. He added that there is a \$650,000 required local match: the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors recently approved \$350k, the water contractors are providing \$150k to continue the effort, and Mendocino County has also committed \$150k to continue work. If anyone has ideas about how to secure funding or other sources, please reach out to K&W or Mike to keep this going.

Next Steps, Future Meetings, and Action Items

The following next steps and action items were identified:

- The next Planning Group meeting will be held in mid-June (virtual only). K&W will develop a proposed agenda and send in advance of the meeting.
- Starting in July, the Planning Group will meet during a standing monthly meeting time. These meetings will likely be in-person/virtual hybrid.
- K&W will send a participation survey to the Planning Group to inform scheduling for future meetings and to confirm interest in joining the Steering Committee and/or one or more of the Working Groups. K&W will include the Russian River Resiliency Subcommittee in the survey.
- K&W will set up a SharePoint site for Planning Group file sharing.

- K&W is in the process of confirming the dates/times for the technical briefings which correspond to the Working Group topics. It will notify Planning Group members and post on the project website when the times are confirmed.
- K&W will look into having an Eel River representative present during the Water Supply & Fisheries technical briefing.
- K&W will look into Brown Act considerations and potential requirements for Planning Group members.
- K&W will make suggested revisions to the Draft Planning Group charter incorporating input from the Planning Group.
- K&W will reach out to PG&E and request clarifying information regarding its decommissioning process.
- K&W to add links to the Water Forum website for technical reports (Phase II Feasibility Study, etc.).
- Planning Group members should send in their interest statements if they have not already done so.

Public Comment

- Glen Spain, Executive Director of PCFFA:
 - The system that exists today is representative of 100 years of gross injustice. 100 years ago, people decided to take water from one river to another, sacrificing water interests and salmon fisheries in ER basin, sacrificing Humboldt, Del Norte counties. Used to be 4th largest salmon run in Western United States. That provided what would today be an \$80 million fishery, which was destroyed by the status quo we're dealing with today. There is a huge cost to the status quo. Now, we're down to about 3000 fish and are listed under the ESA.
 - The underlying assumption is that diversions will continue. We cannot make that assumption. That is not fair, reasonable, just, or even legal today. We are more than happy to work on resilience and living within our means, but it's not okay to borrow from Eel to support Russian.
- Nikcole Whipple, Save California Salmon, member of Round Valley Indian Tribes.
 - We don't like the term ownership, but we are the ancestral "owners" of this water and land. The Yuki Tribe has six other tribes that were forcibly relocated onto our reservation. As I was talking about earlier, states and federal grant dollars are going toward resiliency and restoration. Our tribal ancestral territory goes from Fort Bragg to the Nevada border. The Yuki has seven tribes within it across its land. It's discouraging to hear costs associated with what was taken from us. We recently had a bill passed recognizing that Hastings massacred our people, took our lands and committed treason. When we're talking about numbers and the costs, take into consideration that you may be hurting today or affected today, but since the dams have been put up, we have been the ones who have been hurt and impacted, and it's just now being recognized. Before I lived in Round Valley, I lived in Redwood Valley. In the RV fire, I lost people, lost homes, lost forests. When we're talking about safety issues and concerns, let's move past cannabis; I've been trying to be included in Mendocino County discussions, and every time I participate, it's all about cannabis. If the movement is about safety, let's talk about

water, fire, ground, ancestral land stewardship, cultural burns, and the way we've done things forever. If we focus on cannabis farms instead of our people's safety, we won't get far.

- There is a misconception about public law 280 and our communities. We can talk about "relationships," but the law is "water rights" so let's talk about it as it works now. Agencies have a federal obligation to support and care for our tribal people.
- Thank you for your time and information. I hope we can move forward with self-sufficiency.
- Scott Greacen, Conservation Director, Friends of the Eel River:
 - Our objective is for both dams to be removed in five years. The current effort rests on shaky premises with respect to timing. PG&E wants a proposal by August at the latest. We haven't been heard from by Russian River folks yet.
 - If you are on the Russian River side and want a deal, study the dam removal scenario which was taken out of the previous set of studies. And we are going to insist that you take Cape Horn Dam off the table. If you don't, we'll oppose.
 - This meeting has been shamefully poorly run. There's no excuse not to have an excellent hybrid meeting. K&W is not doing you a service with this meeting.
 - SCWA has had the option to buy the PVP since 1964.
 - The pre-1914 water right that you hope to use is from a racist system that has no place today.

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter
10:00 am	Opening Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sonoma County Sup. James Gore • Mendocino County Sup. Maureen Mulheren
10:10 am	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Gettleman, K&W
10:30 am	Planning Group Purpose and Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Gettleman, K&W • Jim Downing, K&W
11:15 am	Planning Group Member Interests and Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Group members
12:30 pm	Lunch	
1:00 pm	Presentation on Potter Valley Project, PG&E Decommissioning Process, and Two-Basin Efforts to Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Downing, K&W
1:40 pm	Overview of Working Groups and Future Discussion Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Supply • Fisheries • Economics and Financing • Governance • Water Rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Downing, K&W
2:10 pm	Working Group and Steering Committee Membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Gettleman, K&W • All
2:25 pm	Next Steps and Future Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Briefings • Future Planning Group Meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Downing, K&W
2:30 pm	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of public
3:00 pm	Adjourn	

Appendix B: Planning Group Member/Alternate Attendance

Category	Geography	Member	Attendance	Alternate	Attendance
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Mendocino County	Brandon Axell <i>Mendocino Farm Bureau</i>	In-person	Guinness McFadden <i>PVID; MCIWPC</i>	In-person
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Mendocino County	Cathy Monroe <i>Mendocino County RCD</i>	In-person	Denise Woods <i>Mendocino County RCD</i>	In-person
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Sonoma County	John Nagle <i>Sonoma RCD</i>	In-person	Adriane Garayalde <i>Russian River Confluence</i>	In-person
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Sonoma County	Denny Murphy <i>Sonoma RCD</i>	In-person	Bill Ricioli <i>Agriculture Landowner</i>	Zoom
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Sonoma County	Allan Nelson <i>Agriculture Landowner</i>	In-person	Pam Bacigalupi <i>Agriculture Landowner</i>	In-person
Commercial Fisheries	Russian & Eel River Basins	Vivian Helliwell <i>PCFFA; IFR</i>	In-person	Glen Spain, Andy Colonna <i>PCFFA; IFR</i>	In-person
County Representative	Humboldt County	Hank Seeman <i>Humboldt County</i>	Did not attend	Craig Tucker <i>Suits & Signs, Humboldt Co</i>	In-person
County Representative	Lake County	Sup. Eddie Crandell <i>Lake County</i>	Zoom	Sup. Bruno Sabatier <i>Lake County</i>	Zoom
County Representative	Mendocino County	Sup. Glenn McGourty <i>Mendocino County</i>	In-person	Maureen Mulheren <i>Mendocino County</i>	In-person
County Representative	Sonoma County	John Mack <i>Permit Sonoma</i>	In-person	Mike Makdisi <i>Sonoma Co. Admin. Office</i>	In-person
Environmental NGO	Eel River Basin	Charlie Schneider <i>CalTrout</i>	In-person	Meghan Quinn <i>American Rivers</i>	In-person
Environmental NGO	Eel River Basin	Alicia Hamann <i>Friends of the Eel River</i>	Zoom	Redgie Collins <i>CalTrout</i>	Zoom
Environmental NGO	Russian River Basin	Jaime Neary <i>Russian Riverkeeper</i>	Zoom	Don McEnhill <i>Russian Riverkeeper</i>	In-person
Environmental NGO	Russian River Basin	Matt Clifford <i>Trout Unlimited</i>	In-person	Chris Shutes <i>CSPA</i>	Zoom
Recreation	Eel River Basin				
Recreation	Russian River Basin	Bert Whitaker <i>Sonoma Regional Parks</i>	In-person		
Tribal Government	Eel River Basin	President Randall Britton <i>Round Valley Indian Tribes</i>	Did not attend	Wyatt Smith <i>Round Valley Indian Tribes</i>	Zoom
Tribal Government	Eel River Basin	Vice Chair Brian Mead <i>Wiyot Tribe</i>	Did not attend	Chair Ted Hernandez <i>Wiyot Tribe</i>	In-person
Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Brenda L. Tomaras <i>Lytton Rancheria</i>	Did not attend		
Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Terri McCartney <i>Pinoleville Pomo Nation</i>	In-person		
Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Gregg Young <i>Potter Valley Tribe</i>	Zoom	Mike Shaver <i>Potter Valley Tribe</i>	In-person

Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Chair Tyrone Mitchell <i>Yokayo Tribe of Indians</i>	In-person	Javier Silva <i>Yokayo Tribe of Indians</i>	In-person
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Janet Pauli <i>PVID; MCIWPC</i>	In-person	Tyler Rodrique <i>RRFCD</i>	Did not attend
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Beth Salomone <i>RRFCD</i>	In-person	Chris Watt <i>RRFCD</i>	In-person
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Sean White <i>City of Ukiah</i>	In-person	Mari Rodin <i>City of Ukiah</i>	In-person
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Bree Klotter <i>RVCWD</i>	In-person	Adam Gaska <i>RVCWD</i>	In-person
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Mike Thompson <i>Sonoma Water</i>	In-person	Don Seymour <i>Sonoma Water</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Tony Williams <i>NMWD</i>	In-person	Paul Sellier <i>MMWD</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Shannon Cotulla <i>Town of Windsor</i>	Zoom	Dan Herrera <i>City of Petaluma</i>	Did not attend
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Jennifer Burke <i>City of Santa Rosa</i>	In-person	Mary Grace Pawson <i>City of Santa Rosa</i>	In-person
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Gary Helfrich <i>Camp Meeker</i>	Zoom	Eric Schanz <i>Sweetwater Springs WD</i>	Did not attend
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Terry Crowley <i>City of Healdsburg</i>	In-person	David Kelley <i>City of Cloverdale</i>	In-person
TOTAL ATTENDEES			27/31		25/28

Appendix 3: All Attendees, Alphabetized

Name	Affiliation	Attendance	Name	Affiliation	Attendance
Aaron Fairbrook	Sonoma RCD	Zoom	John Mendoza	Sonoma Water	Zoom
Adam Gaska	RVCWD	In-Person	John Nagle	Sonoma RCD	In-Person
Adriane Garayalde	Agriculture Landowner, Russian River Confluence	In-Person	Josh Fuller	National Marine Fisheries Service	Zoom
Alicia Beecher	Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, MLSTEP	In-Person	Karen Mills	California Farm Bureau	Zoom
Alicia Hamann	Friends of the Eel River	Zoom	Kate Fishman	The Mendocino Voice	Zoom
Allan Nelson	Agriculture Landowner	In-Person	Kelley Lincoln	KMUD	Zoom
Andy Colonna	PCFFA	In-Person	Ken Screechfield	Landowner	In-Person
Angle Lynn Slater	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	In-Person	Kristin Peer	BKS Law Firm	Zoom
Anne Morkill	Laguna de Santa Rosa Foundation	Zoom	Kyle Farmer	UCANR, Magruder Ranch LLC	Zoom

Bert Whitaker	Sonoma County Parks	In-Person	Larry Thornton	farmer	In-Person
Bill Ricioli	Agriculture Landowner	In-Person	Laurel Marcus	California Land Stewardship Institute	Zoom
Bob Anderson		Zoom	Lisa Bernard	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board	Zoom
Bob Coey	National Marine Fisheries Service	Zoom	Makena Silva	California Indian Environmental Alliance	Zoom
Brandon Axell	Mendocino County Farm Bureau	In-Person	Mari Rodin	City of Ukiah	In-Person
Bree Klotter	RVCWD	In-Person	Mark Millan	Data Instincts	In-Person
Brendan Sweeney	Congressman Mike Thompson	Zoom	Martha Barra		In-Person
Brock Dolman	Occidental Arts & Ecology Center	Zoom	Mary Callahan	Press Democrat	Zoom
Bruno Sabatier	Lake County Board of Supervisors	Zoom	Mary Grace Pawson	City of Rohnert Park, TAC Member	In-Person
Candace Horsley	IWPC	In-Person	Matt Clifford	Trout Unlimited	In-Person
Carol Cinquini	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	In-Person	Matt Graves	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board	Zoom
Carrie Shattuck	Mendocino County	In-Person	Matt Myers	CDFW District 3	In-Person
Cathy Monroe	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District	In-Person	Maureen Mulheren	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors	In-Person
Charlie Schneider	CalTrout	In-Person	Meghan Quinn	American Rivers	In-Person
Chris Shutes	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Zoom	Mike Makdisi	Sonoma County Administrator's Office	In-Person
Chris Watt	RRFCD	In-Person	Mike Shaver	Potter Valley Tribe	In-Person
Colleen Hale	RRFCD	In-Person	Mike Thompson	Sonoma Water	In-Person
Craig Tucker	Suits and Signs, Humboldt County	In-Person	Monica Huettl	MendoFever.com	In-Person

Dakota Perez	Pinoleville Pomo Nation	In-Person	Monty Schmitt	The Nature Conservancy	Zoom
Darren Mierau	California Trout	Zoom	Morgan Kilgour	CDFW District 1	In-Person
David Kelley	City of Cloverdale	Zoom	Nancy Todd	Farm Bureau	In-Person
Dayna Ghirardelli	Sonoma County Farm Bureau	Zoom	Nick Malasavage	US Army Corps of Engineers	In-Person
Debbie Heald	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	Zoom	Nikcole Whipple	Save California Salmon, Edtrust Justice Fellow, Round Valley Indian Tribes	In-Person
Denise Woods	Mendocino County RCD	In-Person	Palmer Hilton	City of Cloverdale	Zoom
Denny Murphy	Agriculture Landowner, Sonoma RCD	In-Person	Pam Bacigalupi	Agriculture Landowner	Zoom
Devon Boer	Mendocino County Farm Bureau	Zoom	Paul Sellier	Marin Municipal Water District, TAC Member	Zoom
Don McEnhill	Russian Riverkeeper	In-Person	Peter Martin	City of Santa Rosa	Zoom
Don Seymour	Sonoma Water	Zoom	Poppy Lozoff	US Army Corps of Engineers	In-Person
Eddie Crandell	Lake County Board of Supervisors	Zoom	Randy Dorn		In-Person
Edward Ballman	Balance Hydrologics, RRFC	Zoom	Redgie Collins	CalTrout	Zoom
Elise Weiland	Russian River Confluence, District 5 County of Sonoma	In-Person	Sam Todd	community member	In-Person
Beth Salomone	RRFC	In-Person	Sarah Reith	Mendocino County Public Broadcasting	In-Person
Frank Di Massa		Zoom	Scott Greacen	Friends of the Eel River	Zoom
Frank Lynch	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	In-Person	Scott Shapiro	Downey Brand	Zoom
Frost Pauli	Mendocino County Farm Bureau	In-Person	Sean White	City of Ukiah	In-Person
Gary Helfrich	Camp Meeker	Zoom	Shannon Cotulla	Town of Windsor	Zoom
Glen Spain	PCFFA/IFR	In-Person	Stephen Maples	Sonoma Water	Zoom

Glenn McGourty	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors	In-Person	Steven Elliott	PVID	In-Person
Grant Davis	Sonoma Water	Zoom	Susan Knopf	City of Ukiah	In-Person
Gregg Young	Potter Valley Tribe, MLSTEP	Zoom	Susanne Zechiel	Jackson Family Wines	In-Person
Guinness McFadden	PVID; IWPC	In-Person	Tamara Alaniz	Resident of Willits	Zoom
Indigo Bannister	Russian River Watershed Association, Ukiah Valley GSA	Zoom	Ted Hernandez	Wiyot Tribe	In-Person
Jaime Neary	Russian Riverkeeper	Zoom	Terri McCartney	Pinoleville Pomo Nation, MLSTEP	In-Person
James Gore	Sonoma County Board of Supervisors	Zoom	Terry Crowley	City of Healdsburg	In-Person
Janet Pauli	PVID; IWPC	In-Person	Tim Derry	Eel River Property Owners	Zoom
Jared Walker	Willow County Water District	Zoom	Tom Daugherty	National Marine Fisheries Service	Zoom
Javier Silva	Yokayo Tribe of Indians	Zoom	Tom Johnson	Inland Water and Power Commission	Zoom
Jeanne Zolezzi	RRFCD	Zoom	Tom Schoenman	Willow County Water District	In-Person
Jeff Jahn	NOAA Fisheries Arcata Office, National Marine Fisheries Service	Zoom	Tony Williams	North Marin Water District, TAC Member	In-Person
Jen Mendoza		Zoom	Tyrone Mitchell	Yokayo Tribe of Indians	In-Person
Jennifer Burke	City of Santa Rosa, TAC Member	In-Person	Valerie Quinto	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board	Zoom
Jenny Callaway	Congressman Jared Huffman	Zoom	Virginia Mahacek	Sonoma County resident; river restoration professional	Zoom
John Driscoll	Congressman Jared Huffman	Zoom	Vivian Helliwell	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations	In-Person
John Mack	Permit Sonoma	In-Person	Wyatt Smith	Round Valley Indian Tribes	Zoom