Meeting Summary Russian River Water Forum Planning Group Meeting #7

Ukiah Valley Conference Center and Zoom December 7, 2023, 10:00 am to 1:00 pm

Executive Summary

The Russian River Water Forum Planning Group held its seventh meeting on December 7, 2023, inperson in Ukiah and online 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.

The meeting objectives outlined in the agenda were as follows:

- Revisit outcomes from the October 5 Planning Group meeting.
- Provide learning presentations on the Eel River and discussion.
- Review and discuss PG&E draft decommissioning plan.
- Provide update on plan for Water Forum moving forward.
- Provide the opportunity for public comment.

The meeting agenda can be found in Appendix A. The meeting had a total of 86 participants, including 23 Planning Group members, 18 alternates, and 45 other attendees. The list of meeting attendees can be found in Appendix B.

Key takeaways from the Planning Group's deliberations during the meeting, including action items identified and agreements reached, include:

- The Planning Group will next meet in spring 2024; Working Groups are not expected to meet again due to limited funding.
- The deadline for comments on the Initial Draft Surrender Application is December 22, 2023. Comments may be submitted in writing to Tony Gigliotti at PVSurrender@pge.com.
- On December 6, 2023, a Regional Entity was formed via a Joint Powers Authority (JPA). The JPA is composed of Sonoma County, Sonoma County Water Agency (Sonoma Water), and Mendocino County Inland Water and Power Commission (MCIWPC). The board of directors includes a representative from Sonoma Water, Sonoma County, Round Valley Indian Tribes (RVIT), and two representatives from MCIWPC.
- 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, introduced the K&W facilitation team, and shared the meeting objectives.

Planning Group members introduced themselves, first members who attended in person and then members joining on Zoom.

Ben reviewed the agenda, which is included in Appendix A, and reminded the attendees of the Planning Group purpose and participation guidelines.

Outcomes and Follow-up from October 5 Planning Group Meeting

Ben reviewed outcomes from the October 5, 2023, Planning Group meeting, which included:

- Grant Davis and Janet Pauli provided an update on the New Eel-Russian Facility Proposal and discussion with the Planning Group.
- Kearns & West provided updates on recent and upcoming Working Group meetings.
- Lake County and Lake Pillsbury Alliance gave presentations; discussion followed.
- Public comment was provided.

Review of PG&E Decommissioning Plan

Jim Downing, Kearns & West, then gave a high-level overview of the Draft Decommissioning Plan, which is posted on PG&E's Potter Valley Surrender Proceeding site, here. Sections of the Draft Decommissioning Plan include:

- Introduction: context, timeline/milestones, request for comments
- Description of Project facilities and operations
- Reason for proposed license surrender
- Conceptual decommissioning plan
 - Scott Dam removal and restoration
 - Cape Horn Dam alternatives
 - Dam removal
 - Control section with pump station
 - Roughened channel with gravity supply

Jim then reviewed license surrender application process milestones, summarized in the following table.

Distribution of Initial Draft Surrender Application	November 17, 2023
Deadline for Comments on Initial Draft Surrender Application	December 22, 2023
Initial Consultation with Resource Agencies and Tribes	December 2023 – February 2024
Distribution of Final Draft Surrender Application	June 3, 2024
Consultation with Resource Agencies and Tribes	June 2024
Deadline for Comments on Final Draft Surrender Application	July 18, 2024
Filing and Distribution of Final Surrender Application	January 25, 2025

Jim reminded attendees of the December 22, 2023 deadline to submit comments on the Initial Draft Surrender Application, and that comments may be submitted in writing to Tony Gigliotti at PVSurrender@pge.com.

Jim then opened the floor for comments and questions.

- Comment (C): The schedule indicates that later in the process there is a consultation with resource agencies and Tribes. My understanding is that back in 1972 when the previous relicensing occurred, consultations only occurred with NOAA and Round Valley Tribe because many of the other Tribes in the area were terminated or not active governments at the time. I have great concerns that the proponents are waiting for the last month or two of the process to reach out to multiple Tribes for consultation. I encourage the proponents to do intensive outreach and consultation with Tribes before that or there may be delays or other complications that occur very late in the process.
- Question (Q): I'm concerned that the consultations are only with resource agencies and Tribes. What about the various entities and industries that use the water? How are they going to be consulted during these consultation periods? It seems like the users are being frozen out of the process. We should map out who uses the water and where it comes from.
 - Response (R): I did request a water budget be developed and Sonoma Water does have a fairly complete and detailed document detailing where the water comes from and who is using it. What a "water user" is, that's an open discussion. Is a water user just someone that consumes water or is there water use for non-consumptive needs like fisheries?

Overview of Revised Proposal Made to PG&E

Charlie Schneider, CalTrout, presented an overview of the revised proposal made to PG&E on behalf of an expanded list of proponents, which included Sonoma Water, MCIWPC, RVIT, CalTrout, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), Humboldt County, and Trout Unlimited. The proposal can be found here.

Charlie overviewed the PG&E decommissioning timeline and clarified that PG&E had consented to a non-binding agreement to include the New Eel-Russian Facility proposal in the plan.

Pam Jeane, Sonoma Water, then shared progress on the proposal, informing everyone that on December 5th 2023 a Regional Entity had been formed via a Joint Powers Authority. Pam also shared that:

- PG&E had indicated non-binding acceptance of the proposal concept.
- The original Proponents (Sonoma Water, MCIWPC, RVIT) had engaged with interested parties and brought in four new partners (CDFW, CalTrout, Humboldt County, Trout Unlimited)
- Design work on the proposed New Eel-Russian Facility was progressing.

Pam then summarized the revised proposal (see the <u>Proponents Proposal Slides</u>).

Ben then opened the floor for comments and questions.

- Question (Q): Which organizations are part of the JPA?
 - Response (R): The signatories to the JPA are Sonoma County, Sonoma Water, and the MCIWPC. The board of directors includes a representative from Sonoma Water, Sonoma County, RVIT, and two representatives from the MCIWPC.
- Comment (C): The proposal only includes protections for the RVIT. While understanding that there are concerns about having too many members on the board, we would like to see broader Tribal representation on the board.

Planning Group Meeting #6 Summary Version: November 29, 2023

- Q: Who will have oversight over the JPA and how will that be communicated to the rest of the participants throughout the region?
 - R: The JPA is a public body and will hold Brown Act meetings that the public can participate in. They are going to want to be very inclusive and transparent. They haven't sat down yet.
- Q: Being that it's a public body, how did you choose who is sitting on the board of the JPA? Who made that decision?
 - o R: Each of the parties to the JPA chose their own representative.
- Q: Will there be any changes to the board in the future and will there be opportunities for more Eel River Basin participation on the JPA?
 - o R: I can't answer that question, but we do expect things to change over time.
- Q: How will the voting rights of the board operate given that there is an emphasis on water use?
 - R: The JPA is being formed to construct the New Eel-Russian Facility. If you read the formation document, you can see how the voting works. The document is publicly available on the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors website here.
- C: Fisheries are not mentioned at all, and there is a significant economic and cultural fishing
 presence on the Eel River that has a strong interest in a harvestable surplus beyond what's
 necessary for delisting. Speaking on behalf of commercial fishing interests, we want to be
 included.
- Q: In the Klamath River, there's a board that involves the Tribes for the dam removal. Do you envision a second board that would be more involved with restoration and activities in the Eel River that the Tribes and other stakeholders in the Eel River might be involved in?
 - R: We don't know yet. The situation is different from Klamath. A potential Eel River restoration fund is likely to be outside of the FERC process and something PG&E is not involved in. From CalTrout's perspective, fisheries recovery is an all-hands-on-deck exercise, so we want as much involvement as possible.
- C: Other groups have negotiated with the Sonoma water users group on this second proposal. Though they've talked to some of us we haven't been at the table. We don't necessarily support trading a water right for money for restoration in the Eel River. We want to make sure that enough water stays in the Eel River to make sure we have a robust recovery of salmon in the Eel before any transfer to another basin occurs.
- Q: What are the goals for the new JPA? You'll have to figure out the financing for this entity and where the water will be allocated based on its finance. Are those things you'll be working on in this next year?
 - R: Yes. There is a calendar in the proposal that includes information about allocating water and financing.

Eel River Presentations

Tribal Water Rights and Activities

Save California Salmon

Nikcole Whipple, intern with Save California Salmon, presented on Tribal Water Rights on behalf of Save California Salmon. The presentation covered various Federal and State laws and executive orders with relevance to Tribal Water Rights.

Robinson Rancheria and Tribal Eco-Restoration Alliance

Luis Santana, Fisheries Biologist with Robinson Rancheria, presented on fisheries and Robinson Rancheria. The presentation outlined the history and present situation of fisheries in the Clear Lake area, including measures that are being taken to restore fisheries.

Stony Timmons, Crew Lead for Tribal Eco-Restoration Alliance (TERA), presented on efforts conducted by TERA to restore fisheries. The presentation included efforts at Robinson Creek, Clover Creek, and the practice of cultural burning.

Potter Valley Tribe

Mike Shaver, Water Resources Manager for Potter Valley Tribe, presented on the Potter Valley Tribe. The presentation included an overview of the historical and present land holdings of the Tribe, current programs run by the Tribe, and activities the Tribe is conducting to restore the watershed.

Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians

Anna FarPorte, Environmental Director for Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians, presented on the Sherwood Valley Tribal Environmental Program. The presentation outlined the history and present situation of the Eel River watershed and fisheries, including measures that are being taken by the Sherwood Valley Tribal Environmental Program to restore fisheries.

Ben then opened the floor for comments and questions.

- C: Thank you all for your presentations, they were very educational and helpful.
- C/Q: They were great presentations. I'm glad to see the Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians is working with the RCD. Are the lamprey showing up? Because I know it was a very important food source.
 - R: At Cape Horn Dam last year there's a video weir where they recorded about 8,000 lamprey last year whereas they typically record a few hundred. We've heard from other water sheds across the state that last year was very good for lamprey.
- C: Thank you, Nikcole, for highlighting the legalities of living with the Tribes in the area. I want everyone to remember how many Tribes are living along the Ukiah Valley. When you're working on projects, please keep in mind who you're working with. We're trying to get back in contact with our cultural practices, our cultural heritage, and ourselves.

California Trout

Charlie Schneider, CalTrout, presented on ongoing efforts on the Eel River to restore the fishery. The presentation covered the history of Eel River fisheries, the effects that dams have had on these fisheries, and opportunities for restoration.

Ben then opened the floor for questions.

- Q: Do you have funding for the Basin-Wide Restoration plan? How did you obtain that and from where?
 - R: The first pillar has been funded by a CDFW grant with the support of the Two-Basin Solution Partnership. The other three pillars are yet to be funded.
- Q: You mentioned that the forum is open to everyone, are you working with any Tribes?
 - R: Yes Laytonville, Round Valley Indian Tribes, Wiyot, and I'm sure others as well. Any Tribes are welcome to join.

- C: Tribes have many federal funding sources available to them through the Clean Water Act, 319, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs fisheries program. Tribes can help with implementation.
 - R: Learning what everyone is doing and integrating that work to get better recovery outcomes is a big part of the work we're doing.
- C: CalTrout has been a great leader putting together these Eel River Forums. It's a great place to learn what others are doing and it shows the level of community involvement that people are willing to put in.
 - R: Darren and the North Coast Team did the lion's share of the work so shout out to them.
- C: I encourage Tribes to get involved with the Eel River Forum.
- C/Q: There's a study by Fish & Game showing about a thousand miles of spawning streams on the Eel River that are blocked or partially blocked. That seems like the best place to start because it's low-hanging fruit. Are you using that study to identify places where clearances can be gotten so that the restoration could begin? Are you working on these spawning streams and barriers?
 - R: Yes absolutely. Culverts and roadbuilding are probably blocking more stream miles than dams in the Eel River.
- C: I appreciate all the work that's being done in the Eel River watershed and to restore the fisheries. What I'm hopeful we can put together is something complementary to that for the Russian River, as the Russian River fishery is equally impacted and collapsed. I'm putting together a blog called Sustainable Mendocino to get a coordinated effort to restore fisheries in the Russian River, especially in the Upper River and possibly the lower. I'm going to start listing out the resources I know of that are ongoing right now like grant opportunities and just try to get something going like what you have (for the Eel River) to begin a coordinated effort to restore the fisheries because I think we really need that here as well.
 - R: I see a need for that, and we would welcome being a part of that and I know other folks would as well.
 - R: I saw on the National Marine Fisheries Service website that the Russian River has been chosen as a funding priority for fisheries restoration, that should help with your coordination.

Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA)

Vivian Helliwell, PCFFA, presented on the history of fisheries on the Pacific Coast, particularly around Fort Bragg, and the present situation and efforts to restore the fishery.

Ben then opened the floor for questions.

- Q: Can you comment on the impact of fishing in international waters, which is unregulated, at least by us, on our salmon populations here in California?
 - R: In 1978 the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act created a 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone off the West Coast. This protected salmon for the U.S. and Tribes
- Q: Outside of the 200-mile limit, is there any international reporting on the take out there and what species?
 - R: They're mostly fishing for tuna on the high seas, the salmon don't tend to go out to the high seas.

- C/Q: As part of the Marine Protection Act, there are preserves that act like seedbanks that help feed and help restore the ecosystem along the whole marine shoreline. It might be more beneficial to surf fish or rock fish, but do you see any benefits from the marine protection act with the salmon stocks or is there any potential for coordinating with that effort for marine preserves?
 - R: I don't see how the marine preserves help salmon because the salmon migrate right through them, and they are designed to reduce impacts on fish that stay in one place. They're very difficult to fish around because there are so many of them with different designations. You're subject to being fined over 5 years later for slowing down in one of those areas.

Next Steps for Water Forum

Pam Jeane, Sonoma Water, gave an update on behalf of Grant Davis regarding the Russian River Water Forum. Pam praised the Forum for the progress it had made on issues across basins, including but not limited to the Potter Valley Project. Pam complimented the information sharing that the Forum had enabled, the common ground that had been identified, and what the Forum had accomplished. She then went on to explain that the Forum is running low on funding. While the first part of the Forum was funded by a DWR grant that was matched by Sonoma Water, the second phase had been funded by Sonoma Water and their water contractors. While Sonoma Water had applied for another DWR grant, it did not win the grant and so was running out of money. The remaining budget would be used to fund today's meeting as well as a Planning Group meeting in March or April of 2024. Pam noted that if others had funding they could contribute and wanted to, Sonoma Water would love to continue to work with the Forum. Pam added that the Forum could switch to being entirely virtual to save costs.

Ben then opened the floor to questions.

- Q: I know we have many Working Groups associated with this Forum. I'm wondering if the number of those sub-groups is impacting how we can stretch that funding. I do think it's important to stay assembled through PG&E's release of the final draft license surrender application.
 - R: Water Rights Working Group is the only group that has been meeting recently. Those
 Working Groups will not meet from this point forward. We see a meeting for the
 Planning Group in the March/April timeframe and then maybe a June meeting, but that's
 it.
- Q: Will the RRWF website be maintained? And can the Water Rights Working Group materials be shared within the group?
 - R: There isn't agreement on some of the information that's been shared as part of that Water Rights group. We don't want the Forum to be sharing information that isn't accurate. Since that information is in draft form it will not be released as a Forum work product. The website should be up for quite some time. We don't intend to take it down, even after this group stops meeting.

Public Comment

Ben then opened the floor for public comment.

Craig Bell: I'm past president of the Statewide Salmonid Restoration Federation, I was chair of the Mendocino County Fish and Game Commission for 15 years, I'm executive director of the Northern California Association of River Guides and we are formal intervenors in the FERC licensing process for the Potter Valley Project, and I've also worked for 25 years as a salmon and steel head fishing guide on the Eel River. I'd really like to say how impressed I am with the Tribal watershed literacy I want to talk about loss of harvest. I was also a commercial salmon fisherman and in the Eel River we lost harvest of coho salmon in 1994. In the beginning of 2000, we lost the steelhead harvest. Then we lost the Chinook harvest. This is a river that was one of the top three producers of salmon steelhead in the entire state of California. It now has less than 0 harvest. Right now, on the Eel River, catch and release is not good enough. You are not allowed to fish on the Eel River for the first time in history. You're not allowed to fish. No catch and release. Catch and release is no longer good enough. In the South Fork Eel, the guides and the sport fishermen brought a large amount of money and tourist revenue. The restaurants were full. The motels were full. The bars were full. Waitresses at the Eel River Cafe in the morning would walk out with \$125 cash in their pocket, serving breakfast. And a sport cut fish, as Vivian says, was worth over \$700 by the time you figure out guide fees, license, tackle, bought, staying in at motels and restaurants. That is gone. I'd like to talk about the pikeminnow. Back during the earlier FERC re-licensing, Larry Week, who then ran the anatomist program for the Department of Fish and Game, he told me that their estimates were that pikeminnow eat 30% of all smolts in the entire Eel River system, 30% right off the top gone to an invasive species. This species, as near as we can tell, came from bait that was brought over to a bait shop on Lake Pillsbury sold the fishermen the pikeminnow reproduced in that lake and then in high flows came down into the Eel and permanently infected the entire Eel River system. It is probably the worst impact right now with the improvement of logging and the restoration that's going on, taking out barriers, improving roads, the pikeminnow. We started catching these fish in the early 90s, we didn't know what they were, these suckers with big teeth. So that is an insidious problem, absolutely insidious. The Department of Fish and Wildlife has directed this and that is tragic. It is shameful in my opinion. Our guide association made efforts to fund pikeminnow elimination projects and we could not get a permit from the Department of Fish and Wildlife to use spear guns with experience to kill adult spawner pikeminnow we could not get a permit. I praise CalTrout's efforts. We began long before you did funding surveys by the Eel River Recovery Project under the direction of biologist Pat Higgins. Identifying areas, we could have gone in and killed thousands of adult spawning pikeminnow, the Department of Fish and Wildlife would not give us permits. We have lost 200 miles of spawning habitat above Potter Valley. A lot of the Lake Pillsbury supporters tried to say for many years I saw letter after letter only 50 miles, a measly 50 miles. There's 200 miles. There's summer steelhead genetics up there that can be reactivated and put the most endangered run of steelhead back in there to spawn in the shadow of snow mountain. And the cold-water run-off of Snow Mountain where those fish can out-climb pikeminnow and rear and go to the ocean. So right now, I view the Eel River sort of like Rachel Carson's book Silent Spring. I hope to live long enough to be able to see a young man go down to the Eel River, catch a salmon, take it home, and feed his family.

Nancy Todd: When PG&E bought the Snow Mountain Light and Power Company's facility, they became part of a 100-year long process that set the expectations for people who have set up businesses, bought homes and operated farms all the way down along the Russian watershed. And we are about now going to threaten their ability to continue to do that. And I do think that that puts a financial responsibility on PG&E. They're meeting right next door. We could go tell them. And the second thing about it is they're giving up a source of energy that is absolutely clean and we need to worry about the whole environment

or else we're going the way of the salmon. And it doesn't seem right to be considering giving carbon taxes to guys while we're letting people get rid of facilities that produce power with no negative consequences other than the cost of maintaining it. Making power is going to become that expensive that it'll be worth operating the project as time goes on. I came here this morning thinking, how come there's no data about the specifics of the seismic power of Scott Dam? And Craig explained it to me this morning that you're not allowed to talk about how a dam could be weak and therefore brought down by a terrorist. So, my thought is, let's just strengthen it and put in a fish ladder that lets the fish get around it. Some of you may know my old friend Barbara Hopper. She may have been your teacher, your principal. She was our friend in Potter Valley for a very long time. And she tells me CalTrout gave this wonderful presentation in which they talked about figures of counts of salmon going back to the 60s. Now Barbara will tell you that she and her husband David used to go up to the Eel, and in the 60s you could reach down and with one hand pick up the salmon by the tail and you didn't even need a fishing rod. So, to say that Scott Dam, which had by then been in place for 40 years or more, is responsible for the decline of the salmon in the Eel seems a little fallacious. It might have more to do with the pikeminnow, the logging, and the over fertilizing of marijuana crops along the Eel. So, my solution is to keep Scott Dam and make it stronger.

John LaBoyteaux: I'm a mostly retired farmer in Lake County now, but previously for many years in Humboldt County. And I just have two questions. The first is there anyone here who is representing Humboldt County? [Ben confirmed that Hank Seeman represents Humboldt County on the Planning Group and is present] The second question that I have is that the JPA is going to interface with PG&E and simultaneously develop a plan and probably construct a modified diversion facility. So, who decides, approves, or disapproves what has to be a greatly changed diversion schedule?

Hollie Smith: My questions may be moot given what Pam said. It sounds like this Forum is not going to continue, at least in its previous composition or frequency. I just have concerns, and I would have thought there would have been a Working Group on this, about what happens if the diversion group, the planning entity, doesn't get the funding that they want for the diversion. What does that mean for water users in the area if the diversion infrastructure does not come about? That's one question. The other is that I don't know if the restoration that Charlie talked about includes...I'm just concerned for the Lake Pillsbury community, and they are going to be pretty impacted by the dam removal. Besides the restoration of the river, it seems like the entire area is going to need some environmental restoration so that it all works together to support the river and so that you have something perhaps that isn't as bad as people think it will be with the lake being gone. If it's done appropriately, it might be an extremely beautiful and healthy area. But I don't know if the Lake Pillsbury group or Lake County is intersecting with the Tribal community which we heard from today that have some great ideas around restoration of land and rivers. You know, how is that area going to be addressed? I can't imagine that PG&E is going to leave it in a really great state. I don't know. Just a concern. Just putting it out there. Thank you.

Devon Boer: This question, or two-part question, isn't directed towards a specific presenter. I was hoping maybe there could be at least some discussion or someone could get back to me offline. Has there been any recent analysis looking at what the goals are for restoration numbers of anadromous fish on the Eel River? In terms of one, comparing to the limited historic data we have, which does include hatchery returns such as at Van Arsdale. And then two, how is that correlated with some of the oceanic issues, not just the foreign fishery concerns that were mentioned earlier, but other issues that do affect the life cycles of these fish outside of the freshwater habitat. I'd just be interested to see if there's any sort of

updated information and how those two questions relate to overall goals for restoration numbers. Thank you.

Next Steps, Future Meetings, and Action Items

Ben summarized the meeting discussion and confirmed that all slides as well as a summary and recording would be posted to the Russian River Water Forum website here. Ben then reiterated the December 22 deadline for comments on the Draft Decommissioning Plan and that all comments must be submitted in writing to Tony Gigliotti at PVSurrender@pge.com.

Ben shared the upcoming schedule of meetings:

• **Planning Group**: Spring 2024, timing to be determined.

Ben thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 1:04 p.m.

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter	
9:00 am	Optional Networking Time; arrive early to meet other members!		
9:50 am	Please arrive by 9:50 am to ensure the meeting can begin promptly at 10:00 am.		
10:00 am	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West	
10:15 am	Outcomes from October Planning Group Meeting	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West	
10:20 am	Review and Discuss PG&E Draft Decommissioning Plan	 Jim Downing, Kearns & West Janet Pauli, Mendocino IWPC Charlie Schneider, CalTrout Pam Jeane, Sonoma Water 	
11:00 am	Eel River Presentations and Discussion	 Nikcole Whipple, Save California Salmon Mike Shaver, Potter Valley Tribe Luis Santana, Robinson Rancheria Anna FarPorte, Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians Charlie Schneider, CalTrout Vivian Helliwell, PCFFA 	
12:15 pm	Next Steps for Water Forum	Pam Jeane, Sonoma Water	
12:30 pm	Public Comment	Members of public	
12:55 pm	Recap of Meeting and Next Steps	Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West	
1:00 pm	Adjourn		

Appendix B: Meeting Attendance Planning Group Members, Alphabetized

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Present?	Name	Organization/Affiliation	Present?
Alicia Hamann	Friends of the Eel River	٧	Hank Seemann	Humboldt County	٧
Allan Nelson	Agriculture Landowner	٧	Jaime Neary	Russian Riverkeeper	٧
Anna FarPorte	Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians	٧	Janet Pauli	PVID; IWPC	٧
Bert Whitaker	Sonoma County Regional Parks		Jennifer Burke	City of Santa Rosa Water	
Brandon Axell	Mendocino County Farm Bureau		John Mack	Permit Sonoma	٧
Bree Klotter	Redwood Valley County Water District	٧	John Nagle	Sonoma RCD	
Brenda L. Tomaras	Lytton Band of Pomo Indians	٧	President Lewis Whipple	Round Valley Indian Tribes	
Vice Chair Brian Mead	Wiyot Tribe		Luis Santana	Robinson Rancheria	٧
Carol Cinquini	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	٧	Matt Clifford	Trout Unlimited	٧
Cathy Monroe	Mendocino County RCD	٧	Nikcole Whipple	Save California Salmon	٧
Charlie Schneider	CalTrout	٧	Orval Elliott Jr.	Hopland Band of Pomo Indians	
Dennis Murphy	Agriculture Landowner, Sonoma RCD	٧	Sean White	City of Ukiah	
Supervisor Eddie Crandell	Lake County		Shannon Cotulla	Town of Windsor	٧
Elizabeth Salomone	RRFCWCID		Terri McCartney	Pinoleville Pomo Nation	٧
Gary Helfrich	Camp Meeker Rec. & Park District		Terry Crowley	City of Healdsburg	
Sup. Glenn McGourty	Mendocino County		Tony Williams	North Marin Water District	٧
Grant Davis	Sonoma Water	٧	Sgtat-Arms Tyrone Mitchell	Yokayo Tribe of Indians	٧
Gregg Young	Potter Valley Tribe	٧	Vivian Helliwell	PCFFA; IFR	V
			Total Planning	Group Member Attendance	23/36

Planning Group Alternates, Alphabetized

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Present?	Name	Organization/Affiliation	Present?
Adam Gaska	Redwood Valley County Water District	٧	Glen Spain	PCFFA; IFR	
Adriane Garayalde	Agriculture Landowner; RR Confluence	٧	Guinness McFadden	PVID; IWPC	
Alicia Beecher	Hopland Band of Pomo Indians		Javier Silva	Yokayo Tribe of Indians	٧
Andy Colonna	PCFFA; IFR	٧	Mari Rodin	City of Ukiah	
Bill Ricioli	Agriculture Landowner		Mary Grace Pawson	City of Rohnert Park	
Supervisor Bruno Sabatier	Lake County		Maureen Mulheren	Mendocino County	
Chris Shutes	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	٧	Meghan Quinn	American Rivers	٧
Chris Watt	RRFCWCID		Michael Makdisi	Sonoma County Administrator's Office	٧
Craig Tucker	Humboldt County	٧	Mike Shaver	Potter Valley Tribe	٧
Dakota Perez	Pinoleville Pomo Nation		Pam Bacigalupi	Agriculture Landowner	
Dan Herrera	City of Petaluma		Pam Jeane	Sonoma Water	٧
David Kelley	City of Cloverdale		Paul Sellier	Marin Municipal Water District	٧
David Manning	Sonoma Water	٧	Redgie Collins	CalTrout	٧
Denise Woods	Mendocino County RCD	٧	Shayna Williams	Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians	٧
Don McEnhill	Russian Riverkeeper	٧	Chair Ted Hernandez	Wiyot Tribe	
Don Seymour	Sonoma Water	٧	Tyler Rodrique	RRFCWCID	
Eric Schanz	Sweetwater Springs Water District		Wyatt Smith	Round Valley Indian Tribes	
Frank Lynch	Lake Pillsbury Alliance	٧			
	'	1	Total Planning G	roup Alternate Attendance	18/34

Other In-Person and Virtual Attendees, Alphabetized

Name	Affiliation
Pat Abercrombie	
Indigo Bannister	Russian River Watershed Association, Ukiah Valley GSA
Lee Boatright	Russian river watershed Association, origin valley doz
Devon Boer	Mendocino County Farm Bureau
Cathie Buchanan	Wendocino County Farm Bureau
Madeline Cline	Mendocino County Farm Bureau
Matt Colwell	Wendocino County Farm Bureau
Tom Daugherty	National Marine Fisheries Service
Henry DeRuff	Kearns & West
Michelle Downey	Reditis & West
Jim Downing	Kearns & West
Tom Fischer	Kearns & West
Kate Fishman Justin Fredrickson	The Mendocino Voice California Farm Bureau
Joshua Fuller	National Marine Fisheries Service
Rue Furch	Russian River WC, Sierra Club
Bob Gaston	Lake Pillsbury Alliance
Ben Gettleman	Kearns & West
Tony Gigliotti	
Ruth Goodfield	
Neil Hancock	
Debbie Heald	Lake Pillsbury Alliance
David Helliwell	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Candace Horsley	Inland Water and Power Commission
Jeff Jahn	NOAA Fisheries Arcata Office, National Marine Fisheries Service
Peter Kiel	Law Office of Peter Kiel
Ryan Long	Data Instincts
Richard Maas	
Laurel Marcus	California Land Stewardship Institute
John Mendoza	Sonoma Water
Mark Millan	Data Instincts
Marilyn Ogle	Potter Valley Resident
Donita Proctor	
Rick Rogers	
Deb Sally	
Daniella Santana	
Craig Scott	City of Cotati, TAC Member
Hollie Smith	Sierra Club
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, Institute for Fisheries Resources
Brendan Sweeney	Field Representative for Congressman Mike Thompson

Ray Todt	
Harry Williamson	
Kasil Willie	
Danny Wind	
Susanne Zechiel	Jackson Family Wines