

# Meeting Summary

## Russian River Water Forum Planning Group Meeting #2

*Zoom*

*June 12, 2023, 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm*

### Executive Summary

The Russian River Water Forum Planning Group held its second meeting on June 12, 2023 via Zoom. The meeting was facilitated by Kearns & West (K&W), 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 Miro board used during discussion is viewable at the following link: [Timeline and Discussion](#)

The meeting objectives outlined in the agenda were as follows:

- Revisit outcomes from the May 17 Planning Group kick-off meeting and follow up on action items and key discussion topics.
- Discuss the PG&E decommissioning schedule and its relationship with the Planning Group process and schedule.
- Discuss preparation and timing of upcoming technical briefings, Working Group meetings, and convening Steering Committee.
- Provide opportunity for public comment.

The meeting agenda can be found in Appendix A. The kick-off meeting had a total of 95 participants. This included 24 Planning Group members, 19 alternates, and 52 other attendees. 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:

- The Planning Group was largely supportive of the draft charter with some recommended clarifications on External Communications.
- The Planning Group agreed to add Save California Salmon as a member. Robinson Rancheria was also added as a Planning Group member upon request.
- The Planning Group reaffirmed that it is a deliberative body, not a decision-making one. However, it is necessary to have processes in place for making decisions internal to the group. That process was affirmed to be consensus.

- Planning Group members offered edits on more appropriate language for various sections on the Summary of Planning Group Member Interests, and their feedback was recorded in the document.
- Planning Group members received clarifying statements from PG&E. The group reviewed the PG&E decommissioning plan / license surrender application schedule and a proposed timeline for the Planning Group and Working Groups.
- Planning Group members identified keys to success and challenges for moving forward on a collaborative Miro board.
- Planning Group members discussed whether Working Group sessions will be open to the public, and if so, how that would function. The group did not reach consensus on the question; the Steering Committee will discuss this question.
- Working Group and Steering Committee rosters were reviewed.
- Public comment was received and documented.

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Ben Gettleman, facilitator with K&W, welcomed Planning Group members, alternates, and other attendees to the meeting and introduced the K&W facilitation team.

Ben welcomed elected officials in the room and reviewed guidelines for participation.

Ben shared the meeting objectives and meeting agenda. Planning Group members introduced themselves in the chat.

### Outcomes and Follow-up from May 17 Planning Group Kick-off Meeting

Ben reviewed updates to the charter.

**Summary:** At the request of some Planning Group members the language of the charter was clarified regarding External Communications: members will present individual/organizational views only and note that they do not speak on behalf of the Planning Group. The facilitation team clarified that members of the Planning Group will be asked to actively agree to the charter upon finalization.

Ben asked if there were any other comments and stated that K&W would make the necessary updates (**Action**).

### Consideration of additional Planning Group members

Ben reviewed that the Planning Group confirmed Lake Pillsbury Alliance's membership last meeting. The Planning Group then moved to address Save California Salmon's petition to enter the group.

**Summary:** After a brief statement from Nikcole Whipple of Save California Salmon, Planning Group members discussed whether Save California Salmon represented a new interest or an already represented interest. It was clarified that Nikcole Whipple would be representing Save California Salmon and not the Round Valley Indian Tribes (of which she is a member). The group reached consensus that Save California Salmon would be a unique addition, providing a tribal conservation lens to the Planning Group. Save California Salmon was admitted into the Planning Group. Robinson Rancheria representative

Luis Santana also gave a brief statement expressing Robinson Rancheria's interest in joining the Planning Group; Robinson Rancheria was subsequently admitted.

### Planning Group decision-making

Ben reviewed that in the kick-off meeting the Planning Group had discussed striving for consensus. Ben noted that there had been concerns about majority decision making, whether it be about process decisions or otherwise. Having heard those concerns, Ben proposed taking voting off the table and striving for consensus. The Steering Committee was proposed as a resource if the Planning Group was at an impasse. A trial period of striving for consensus would last through the first four meetings. Ben reminded Planning Group members of the importance of working from interests in order to reach consensus.

**Summary:** Planning Group members sought clarification on whether the group was a deliberative or a decision-making body. It was clarified that the Planning Group is a decision-making body when it comes to its own internal processes, but not when it comes to external affairs. Some members were concerned about being misrepresented if the Planning Group moved forward with an action that they didn't support. They didn't want their name to be associated with decisions they didn't agree with. Members were assured that their disagreement would be documented, and that the group made decisions by consensus. It would be up to them to try to work from their interests to create a satisfactory alternative.

### Summary of Planning Group member interests

Ben thanked everyone for sharing their statements of interest and introduced Jim Downing. The Member Interests document summarizes interests expressed by Planning Group members. Jim explained that the document's emphasis was on interests, not specific solutions or alternatives. He stated that if a Planning Group member felt as though their interest was not adequately captured, they should raise their hand or follow-up with us.

Jim reviewed the document, incorporating additions from Planning Group members. The updated document, also incorporating written comments received after the June 12 meeting, is attached as Appendix D.

**Summary:** Planning Group members offered changes and additions and their feedback was recorded in the document.

**Action:** Share interests document and document further interest. Ben noted that our goal is to meet as many interests as we can.

### PG&E Decommissioning Schedule and Planning Group Process

#### Clarifying Statements from PG&E

Ben shared PG&E's clarifications, noting that K&W cannot speak for PG&E. K&W summarized points from the Planning Group; these were shared with PG&E and PG&E provided clarifications. Slides will be available to the Planning Group and on the project website (**action**). Ben asked if there were any follow-up thoughts or questions.

**Summary:** A few Planning Group members asked clarifying questions about what PG&E shared. The facilitation team confirmed that the slides would be shared with the Planning Group.

## Decommissioning Schedule & Project Timeline

Ben shared the screen with a Miro board. Showing a draft timeline of events, Ben asked for any questions on the timeline. There were none. Ben then moved the group into a brainstorming session. Planning Group members were allowed to enter the Miro board and add notes to it concerning what they believed to be keys to success and potential challenges for the Water Forum. The facilitation team requested at least one sticky note from each member, but members were allowed to add as many as they wanted in the allotted time. The board would be left open for one week.

The Miro board is available [here](#).

### Summary:

The themes of the keys to success Planning Group members noted were as follows:

- Taking advantage of Ad Hoc Committee / Two-Basin Partnership work
- Gathering information
- Comparing costs and benefits
- Learning what water is available
- Demonstrating long-term operation of PVP can be done with minimal disturbance

There was a question around the recognition of historic inequity as a key to success, and it was clarified that a Planning Group member believed that the objective of many participants is to correct a historic wrong. Other members should keep this in mind while moving towards a solution.

- The themes of the challenges that Planning Group members noted were as follows:
- Ongoing litigation that successor would take on
- Differing viewpoints
- Non consensus that continued diversions are warranted
- Detailed business plan for how diversion is operated
- Disparities in representatives on Planning Group
- Potential costs of dam removal

## Preparation and timing of Technical Briefings, Working Group Meetings, and convening Steering Committee

Ben shared the dates for upcoming technical briefings with the Planning Group. He reiterated that the Governance and Economics & Finance Working Groups were not yet ready to launch and would benefit from more progress with the Water Supply & Fisheries Working Group. Ben stated that there was a goal to kick off the Russian River Resiliency Subcommittee next month. The facilitation team committed to sending calendar invites with links that require registration.

Ben reviewed Working Group notes.

**Summary:** Planning Group members discussed whether Working Group sessions should be open or closed to the public. Some expressed that it made sense to keep them closed to the public, since the Working Groups were for exploring the technical side of the issue and would report back their findings to the Planning Group, which is open to the public. Others expressed that the meetings should be open to the public because the meetings were dealing with public resources and transparency was important to

the process. The group did not come to a consensus on this issue. Ben noted that the Steering Committee would discuss the issue at its first meeting.

Ben shared rosters of Working Groups and allowed Planning Group members to edit their selections as necessary. **(Action:** send updated roster to PG, ask for co-leads)

**Summary:** Ben shared the Steering Committee notes and roster with the group. Members discussed whether alternates should be allowed to attend these meetings. There was general agreement that members of the Steering Committee should try their best to attend all sessions. Decisions about whether alternates should be allowed to attend would be left to the Steering Committee itself. Mike Shaver, Nikcole Whipple, and Adriane Garayalde joined the Steering Committee.

### Public Comment

**Summary:** Public comments were received that expressed support for the idea of Working Groups being open to the public, either in an exclusively passive format where the public could only listen to the proceedings, or in a format where the public could also write in questions. One member of the public stated that their participation in these meetings helped keep them informed and asked the Planning Group to consider that in their discussion.

### Next Steps, Future Meetings, and Action Items

Ben summarized the meeting discussions and how they related to the objectives.

- The Planning Group revisited outcomes from the kickoff meeting and followed up on action items and key discussion topics, including reviewing the charter. The group was close to agreement on it, but a few sections will be edited. The facilitation team will then reach out to the Planning Group to make sure all are supportive of the charter.
- The Planning Group agreed that Save California Salmon and Robinson Rancheria will be added as members of the Planning Group.
- The facilitation team shared clarifying statements from PG&E. The Planning Group reviewed the PG&E schedule and a timeline for the Planning Group and Working Groups.
- The Planning Group members provided input on keys to success and challenges to look out for moving forward.
- The facilitation team provided an update on technical briefings and Working Group meeting cadence.
- The Planning Group discussed public participation in Working Groups.
- The Planning Group had a public comment period and recorded all comments.

Ben shared the upcoming schedule of meetings.

Ben thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 3:40.

## Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter
1:00 pm	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West
1:15 pm	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcomes and Follow-up from May 17 Planning Group Kick-off Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisions to Planning Group charter</li> <li>• Consideration of additional Planning Group members</li> <li>• Planning Group decision-making</li> <li>• Summary of Planning Group member interests</li> </ul>	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West
2:15 pm	PG&E Decommissioning Schedule and Planning Group Process	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West
2:45 pm	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Preparation and timing of Technical Briefings, Working Group Meetings, and convening Steering Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership for Working Groups and Steering Committee</li> </ul>	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West
3:15 pm	Public Comment	Members of public
3:45 pm	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Recap of Meeting and Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future Planning Group Meetings</li> </ul>	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West
4:00 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>	Zoom	Guinness McFadden <i>PVID; MCIWPC</i>	Did not attend
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Mendocino County	Cathy Monroe <i>Mendocino County RCD</i>	Zoom	Denise Woods <i>Mendocino County RCD</i>	Zoom
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Sonoma County	John Nagle <i>Sonoma RCD</i>	Did not attend	Adriane Garayalde <i>Russian River Confluence</i>	Zoom
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Sonoma County	Denny Murphy <i>Sonoma RCD</i>	Zoom	Bill Ricioli <i>Agriculture Landowner</i>	Did not attend
Agriculture NGO/RCD	Sonoma County	Allan Nelson <i>Agriculture Landowner</i>	Zoom	Pam Bacigalupi <i>Agriculture Landowner</i>	Zoom
Commercial Fisheries	Russian & Eel River Basins	Vivian Helliwell <i>PCFFA; IFR</i>	Zoom	Glen Spain, Andy Colonna <i>PCFFA; IFR</i>	Zoom
County Representative	Humboldt County	Hank Seeman <i>Humboldt County</i>	Did not attend	Craig Tucker <i>Suits &amp; Signs, Humboldt Co</i>	Zoom
County Representative	Lake County	Sup. Eddie Crandell <i>Lake County</i>	Zoom	Sup. Bruno Sabatier <i>Lake County</i>	Did not attend
County Representative	Mendocino County	Sup. Glenn McGourty <i>Mendocino County</i>	Zoom	Maureen Mulheren <i>Mendocino County</i>	Zoom
County Representative	Sonoma County	John Mack <i>Permit Sonoma</i>	Zoom	Mike Makdisi <i>Sonoma Co. Admin. Office</i>	Zoom
Environmental NGO	Eel River Basin	Charlie Schneider <i>CalTrout</i>	Zoom	Meghan Quinn <i>American Rivers</i>	Did not attend
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>	Did not attend
Environmental NGO	Russian River Basin	Matt Clifford <i>Trout Unlimited</i>	Zoom	Chris Shutes <i>CSPA</i>	Did not attend
Recreation	Eel River Basin				
Recreation	Russian River Basin	Bert Whitaker <i>Sonoma Regional Parks</i>	Zoom		
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>	Zoom
Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Brenda L. Tomaras <i>Lytton Rancheria</i>	Zoom		
Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Terri McCartney <i>Pinoleville Pomo Nation</i>	Zoom		
Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Gregg Young <i>Potter Valley Tribe</i>	Zoom	Mike Shaver <i>Potter Valley Tribe</i>	Zoom

Tribal Government	Russian River Basin	Chair Tyrone Mitchell <i>Yokayo Tribe of Indians</i>	Did not attend	Javier Silva <i>Yokayo Tribe of Indians</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Janet Pauli <i>PVID; MCIWPC</i>	Zoom	Tyler Rodrique <i>RRFCD</i>	Did not attend
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Beth Salomone <i>RRFCD</i>	Zoom	Chris Watt <i>RRFCD</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Sean White <i>City of Ukiah</i>	Zoom	Mari Rodin <i>City of Ukiah</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Mendocino County	Bree Klotter <i>RVCWD</i>	Zoom	Adam Gaska <i>RVCWD</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Mike Thompson <i>Sonoma Water</i>	Zoom	Don Seymour <i>Sonoma Water</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Tony Williams <i>NMWD</i>	Zoom	Paul Sellier <i>MMWD</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Shannon Cotulla <i>Town of Windsor</i>	Did not attend	Dan Herrera <i>City of Petaluma</i>	Did not attend
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Jennifer Burke <i>City of Santa Rosa</i>	Zoom	Mary Grace Pawson <i>City of Santa Rosa</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Gary Helfrich <i>Camp Meeker</i>	Zoom	Eric Schanz <i>Sweetwater Springs WD</i>	Zoom
Water Supplier	Sonoma County	Terry Crowley <i>City of Healdsburg</i>	Zoom	David Kelley <i>City of Cloverdale</i>	Did not attend
<b>TOTAL ATTENDEES</b>			<b>24/31</b>		<b>19/28</b>



## Appendix C: All Attendees, Alphabetized

Name	Affiliation	Attendance	Name	Affiliation	Attendance
Adam Gaska	RVCWD	Zoom	Laurel Marcus	California Land Stewardship Institute	Zoom
Adriane Garayalde	Agriculture Landowner, Russian River Confluence	Zoom	Lee Boatright	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	Zoom
Allan Nelson	Agriculture Landowner	Zoom	Lisa Bernard	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board	Zoom
Alicia Hamann	Friends of the Eel River	Zoom	Lisa Summers	Sonoma County Water Agency	Zoom
Alison Whipple	Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, MLSTEP	Zoom	Luis Santana	Robinson Rancheria	Zoom
Angle Lynn Slater	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	Zoom	Madeline Cline	Cline Consulting	Zoom
Ann DuBay	Sonoma Water	Zoom	Marc Commandatore	CA Department of Water Resources	Zoom
Bert Whitaker	Sonoma County Parks	Zoom	Makena Silva	California Indian Environmental Alliance	Zoom
Bob Anderson	SFitch Consulting	Zoom	Mari Rodin	City of Ukiah	Zoom
Brandon Axell	Mendocino County Farm Bureau	Zoom	Martha Barra	Redwood Valley Vineyards/Barra of Mendocino	Zoom
Bree Klotter	RVCWD	Zoom	Mary Grace Pawson	City of Rohnert Park, TAC Member	Zoom
Brenda Adelman	RRWPC	Zoom	Matt Clifford	Trout Unlimited	Zoom
Brenda Tomaras	Lytton Band of Pomo Indians	Zoom	Matt Graves	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board	Zoom
Candace Horsley	IWPC	Zoom	Matthew Rothstein	Lake County	Zoom
Carrie Shattuck	Mendocino County	Zoom	Maureen Mulheren	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors	Zoom

Cathy Monroe	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District	Zoom	Mike Makdisi	Sonoma County Administrator's Office	Zoom
Charlie Schneider	CalTrout	Zoom	Mike Lelmorini	City of Petaluma	Zoom
Chris Watt	RRFCD	Zoom	Mike Shaver	Potter Valley Tribe	Zoom
Craig Tucker	Suits and Signs, Humboldt County	Zoom	Mike Thompson	Sonoma Water	Zoom
Dakota Perez	Pinoleville Pomo Nation	Zoom	Mollie Asay	Sonoma Water	Zoom
David Koball	Agriculture Landowner	Zoom	Monica Huettl	MendoFever.com	Zoom
David Manning	Sonoma Water	Zoom	Monty Schmitt	The Nature Conservancy	Zoom
David Taber	Palomino Lakes Mutual Water Company	Zoom	Morgan Biggerstaff	Santa Rosa Water	Zoom
Dayna Ghirardelli	Sonoma County Farm Bureau	Zoom	Nancy Horton	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	Zoom
Debbie Heald	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	Zoom	Nicole McGloin	Sonoma Water	Zoom
Denise Woods	Mendocino County RCD	Zoom	Nikcole Whipple	Save California Salmon, Edtrust Justice Fellow, Round Valley Indian Tribes	Zoom
Denise Joyner	LPHA/Friends of Mendocino	Zoom	Palmer Hilton	City of Cloverdale	Zoom
Denny Murphy	Agriculture Landowner, Sonoma RCD	Zoom	Pam Bacigalupi	Agriculture Landowner	Zoom
Derrick Montanye	City of Cloverdale	Zoom	Pam Jeane	Sonoma Water	Zoom
Don Seymour	Sonoma Water	Zoom	Paul Kilkenny	Kilkenny Family Inc. (Habematolel Valley, Lake County) Member	Zoom
Eddie Crandell	Lake County Board of Supervisors	Zoom	Paul Sellier	Marin Municipal Water District, TAC Member	Zoom
Elizabeth Salomone	RRFCD	Zoom	Redgie Collins	CalTrout	Zoom
Eric Schanz	SSWD	Zoom	Richard Maas	Public	Zoom

Frank Lynch	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	Zoom	Ryan Long	Data Instincts	Zoom
Gary Helfrich	Camp Meeker	Zoom	Sam Todd	community member	Zoom
Gary Sack	California Farm Bureau	Zoom	Sarah Reith	Mendocino County Public Broadcasting	Zoom
Glen Spain	PCFFA/IFR	Zoom	Scott Shapiro	Downey Brand	Zoom
Glenn McGourty	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors	Zoom	Sean White	City of Ukiah	Zoom
Grant Davis	Sonoma Water	Zoom	Steven Elliott	PVID	Zoom
Gregg Young	Potter Valley Tribe, MLSTEP	Zoom	Susanne Zechiel	Jackson Family Wines	Zoom
Jaime Neary	Russian Riverkeeper	Zoom	Terri McCartney	Pinoleville Pomo Nation, MLSTEP	Zoom
Janet Pauli	PVID; IWPC	Zoom	Terry Crowley	City of Healdsburg	Zoom
Jason Liles	State Senator Mike McGuire	Zoom	Todd Lands	City of Cloverdale	Zoom
Javier Silva	Yokayo Tribe of Indians	Zoom	Tom Johnson	Inland Water and Power Commission	Zoom
Jennifer Burke	City of Santa Rosa, TAC Member	Zoom	Tony Williams	North Marin Water District, TAC Member	Zoom
Jenny Callaway	Congressman Jared Huffman	Zoom	Vivian Helliwell	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations	Zoom
John Driscoll	Congressman Jared Huffman	Zoom			
John Mack	Permit Sonoma	Zoom			
Kasil Willie	Save California Salmon	Zoom			

## Appendix D: Updated Summary of Interests

### Russian River Water Forum: Summary of Planning Group Member Interests

Updated July 6, 2023

This document summarizes interests expressed by Planning Group members at the May 17 and June 12 Planning Group meetings and in written interest statements.

- Collaboration and process
  - Finding common goals and mutually acceptable solutions.
  - Finding solutions that are affordable, equitable, and have broad support.
  - Finding solutions that will be acceptable to PG&E and FERC in the license surrender proceedings.
  - Reaching a solution in a timely manner.
  - Clear and transparent communication.
  - Enhancing collaboration.
  - Supporting shared understanding of scientific/technical issues and the decommissioning process; relying on the best available science and engineering analyses for decision making.
- Watershed resiliency
  - Improving watershed resiliency.
  - Improving resiliency in the context of climate change.
  - Collaborating on identifying and funding water supply resiliency alternatives for the Russian River basin.
  - Addressing watershed resiliency now (rather than delaying).
- Water supply and water management
  - Providing reliable water supplies to Russian River communities, Tribes, and agriculture.
  - Equitable allocation of water in the Russian River watershed.
  - Alignment and enforcement of Russian River water rights consistent with sustainable use; clarification of water rights; seeking solutions that are feasible from a water rights perspective.
  - Maintaining adequate in-stream flows through all reaches of the Russian River throughout the year; ensuring that any decisions regarding the continued flow of water are consistent with the 2006 Restructured Agreement for Water Supply.
  - Evaluating the costs and benefits of PVP diversion water vs other water supply options.
  - Maintaining sufficient water in Lake Mendocino for fire suppression.
  - Preserving water supply to support the secondary benefits provided by agriculture, including open space, fire breaks, wildlife corridors, carbon storage, and pervious soils that can support groundwater recharge.
  - Provide optimal flows for fisheries recovery in the Eel River.
  - Vetting all alternatives to dam removal and comparing the costs and benefits of each alternative to the cumulative costs and benefits of dam removal and new water infrastructure construction projects in the Russian River basin.
- Fisheries/habitat restoration

- Restoration/improvement of Eel River fisheries
  - Full-basin restoration of viable, self-sustaining populations of Eel River salmon, above what is needed for de-listing.
  - Unobstructed fish passage into the headwaters of the Eel River.
  - Volitional fish passage to and from the headwaters of the Eel River.
  - Improved fish passage on the Eel River.
  - Restoring a harvestable surplus of salmon in the Eel River and in the ocean fishery
- Protection and enhancement of salmon and steelhead populations in the Russian River.
- Restoring a harvestable surplus of salmon in the Russian River and in the ocean fishery
- Protection and enhancement of water quality in the Russian River.
- Restoring the health and ecosystem function of the Eel River and the Russian River
- Supporting equitable sustenance
- Economic development and recreation
  - Increasing fishery-related jobs.
  - Protecting and improving the health and economic welfare of both basins.
  - Maintaining agricultural productivity.
  - Expanding public access to outdoor recreation.
  - Minimizing the economic impacts on property values in the Russian River and Eel River basins due to the actions taken.
- Tribal interests
  - Protecting tribal cultural, economic, and other interests in both the Eel and Russian River basins.
  - Sharing Tribal knowledge of water and natural resources.
  - Supporting Tribal self-sufficiency.
  - Supporting Tribal land management and co-management.
- Lake Pillsbury
  - Preserving the benefits currently provided by Lake Pillsbury, including water supply, fire protection, environmental diversity, and recreation.
  - Ensuring that, if dam removal proceeds, there is sufficient funding for ecological restoration.
  - Ensuring that, if dam removal proceeds, there is sufficient funding to develop early warning systems and alternative water supply sources for wild-lands fire protection.
  - Ensuring that, if dam removal proceeds, there is sufficient funding to compensate property owners for damages.
  - Ensuring that, if dam removal proceeds, alternative recreational opportunities will be implemented within the Lake Pillsbury basin for public benefit.
- Finance
  - Ensuring that Russian River water users will not be obligated to pay costs disproportionate to the benefits received from preserving the water diversion.
  - Ensuring that Russian River users pay the full cost of diverted Eel River water, including compensation for damage to the Eel River basin.
  - Ensuring that each basin is compensated for any damage that is caused by changes to the PVP dams and infrastructure.