

To:		From:	
Name:	Tony Danna and Earl Nelson and meeting attendees	Name:	Debra Bishop, Matt Wacker, and Elizabeth Boyd
Firm:	DWR - DFM	Firm:	AECOM
Fax number:		Date Sent:	March 14, 2011
Meeting Date:	February 17, 2011		
Project Name:	Feather River Corridor Management Strategy		
Project Number:	08110038.16		
List of Attendees:	See attached attendance sheet		

Subject: Kick off Meeting – Meeting Summary and Action Items

Distribution:

The following is a summary of our meeting held on February 17, 2011. It is not a direct transcript, but rather a summary of the discussion. Please notify us of any changes or corrections needed.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
Introductions	Earl Nelson opened the meeting and introduced Elizabeth Boyd and Jessica Law of AECOM as new support for future meeting facilitation and note taking. Each of the attendees at the meeting introduced themselves.
Corridor Management Plan Status Report	<p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>Earl Nelson presented a brief overview of the status of the process so far, using a PowerPoint presentation available with these meeting notes. For the benefit of those who had not attended before, he reviewed the reason for the study: to develop a long term management plan for the Lower Feather River corridor that will lead to improved ecosystem functions and programmatic permitting for flood system maintenance. The project is to develop a corridor management plan and the environmental documents to support the plan. This will allow regulatory agencies and flood system maintaining agencies to work together efficiently within the corridor.</p> <p>Earl presented an overview of the agenda, including introducing the speakers whose names were on the agenda. He asked whether anyone had additional topics for the meeting. No additional items were suggested.</p> <p>TIMELINE UPDATE</p> <p>Tony Danna presented the timeline as found in the PowerPoint for the meeting. He reiterated that the goal is that this project be a template for other efforts, including the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) and related efforts.</p> <p>Jeff Twitchell suggested that there should be an informational presentation to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB).</p> <p>Larry Lloyd asked for clarification on the timeline and if there would be overlap on the phases.</p> <p>Earl Nelson clarified what would be involved in Phase 2. The original cost estimate was approximately \$1 million. They are in process of modifying this estimate. The team asked the modelers to cut their costs and the modeling team removed approximately \$100k from their costs. The CEQA/NEPA task is being separated out to a separate task order, described as Phase 2b. Phase 2a may include preliminary scoping.</p> <p>Kelly Barker asked if CEQA/NEPA was removed entirely from the next phase and was told that the cost for Phase 2a is being reduced but some money will be available for</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
	<p>some scoping, possibly the project description.</p> <p>DFG FEATHER RIVER WILDLIFE AREA MOU</p> <p>There was a discussion that there is a need to clarify who is liable for endangered species. Kelly Barker didn't discuss this further because she explained that it is a lands issue, and she represents the California Department of Fish and Game's (DFG) regulatory program. The MOU was drafted by DWR and sent to DFG for review. . DFG was not happy with the product and said they would revise the MOU. This is still in progress. Tony Danna is in contact with Andy Atkinson, who wants to reference the new routine maintenance document because it's an accepted document by both parties. DFG also wanted to eliminate any references to old expired agreements.</p> <p>US Fish and Wildlife Service isn't part of this agreement right now; however, the biggest issues are federally-protected species such as the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB), so USFWS will have to provide some type of endangered species take coverage before the Central Valley Flood Protection Board will approve elderberry plantings on DFG properties in the floodplain .</p> <p>Jennifer Hobbs stated that the CMP would address what the USFWS needs.</p> <p>Earl and Tony indicated there is a need an agreement to address federal species for the short-term before the CMP is ready, to allow projects such as Abbot Lakes restoration to proceed with CVFPB approval.</p> <p>There was general discussion, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does that mean for the O'Conner Lakes MOU? This MOU would cover additional properties, like Abbot Lakes. There is some concern whether this MOU would cover additional state properties. There is no biological opinion for expanding this MOU. • What is the applicability for the O'Conner agreement as a short-term fix (including Sacramento Wildlife Refuge)? The permitting strategy is more long-term than short-term. USFWS hasn't indicated their willingness to build on the O'Conner MOU. <p>John Carlon shared that it is his personal opinion that there are about 2,000 acres that could be restored within the study area. The first challenge is getting a permit from the CVFPB. CVFPB in the past has said it wouldn't approve the planting of elderberries without indemnity for federal endangered species that could be affected by future flood fights. John stated that there's an opportunity to plant 40,000 elderberry plants this spring, this fall, and next spring. It would be ideal to get a short-term agreement from USFWS that would allow these bushes to be planted and provide the necessary assurances to all parties those future impacts to these shrubs from flood fighting and routine maintenance could be allowed in the short term while the CMP and associated permitting mechanisms were being developed. The other option would be to conduct habitat restoration activities without planting elderberries, which is not ideal from a habitat or species recovery standpoint.</p> <p>If we focus on the DFG MOU, then federal species are not covered. It seems like we need something short-term from USFWS to cover the needs for federal species take.</p> <p>Jennifer Hobbs suggested that there needs to be a discussion with the USFWS regarding how to deal with short-term issues. She emphasized that the short-term decision must complement the long-term solution.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that DWR was not aware that the biological opinion from O'Conner Lakes, which could be a short-term solution, could not be expanded. He asked that members of the permitting subcommittee be ready to discuss ideas during their March meeting. (it was later decided that the short term permitting issues would be take up at a subsequent meeting of the permitting subcommittee.)</p> <p>There was general discussion, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some take covered in the O'Conner Lakes biological opinion. If the new MOU is done correctly, then there would be very little impact. It is a

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
	<p>bridging mechanism to keep this moving forward and provide take authorization for species until long-term solution can be worked out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LD1 wanted a safe harbor agreement and incidental take authorization. The LD1 Board wanted exactly what was done for O'Conner Lakes. The situations are too different. O'Conner Lakes MOU dealt with restoration and LD1 dealt with mitigation, which has a different legal requirement than restoration without a mitigation nexus. • USFWS needs to hear from CVFPB staff clearly on their concerns and what they view as the best way to address them . • Could CVFPB staff provide their concerns in writing? Earl summarized these concerns: CVFPB doesn't want to see an expansion of elderberries plantings if in the future, there will be a need to do mitigation for elderberry plantings damaged through maintenance or flood fights. If they are given a take permit for the future effects to elderberries from maintenance, flood safety improvements, or flood fighting), then the CVFPB would allow elderberry planting now. • River Partners needs to start planting, but it won't happen before there is federal take coverage for endangered species acceptable to the CVFPB. <p>TASK ORDER PHASE I – DELIVERABLES</p> <p>Matt Wacker presented on what products have been delivered. He summarized what was shown on the PowerPoint.</p> <p>The permitting memo will go to the permitting subcommittee for further guidance and discussion.</p> <p>TASK ORDER PHASE II – SCOPE OF WORK</p> <p>Earl Nelson summarized what will be included in the next phase.</p> <p>There is a need to get clarity on the hydraulic modeling. The project description should be finalized in Phase II. Information on maintenance activities will come from DWR and the local maintenance agencies. There will be some working sessions to identify the high flow low roughness channel opportunities. It will be a cooperative effort. The project description will define the types of permits needed and the hydraulic modeling runs. The project description should be done as early as possible to drive the discussion.</p> <p>There will be more in-depth discussion of the project description at the permitting meeting. Kelly Barker cautioned against using the routine maintenance agreement. It's very specific in scope and based on an exemption under CEQA. It is not able to cover many activities. And it's only for the Sacramento and Sutter Maintenance Yards. Not with LMAs. Earl Nelson said that LMAs perform many of the same activities as Sacramento and Sutter Yards.</p> <p>Kelly Barker encouraged creating something for this corridor that covers LMAs.</p> <p>Earl Nelson said there has been discussion on whether to include sediment removal and mitigation. It may not be possible to cover all activities in the CMP and there may be a need for supplemental permitting.</p> <p>There was additional discussion regarding having a project description that would address all of these issues and what kind of environmental review would be needed. This will be addressed during the permitting subcommittee meeting.</p>
<p>Stakeholder Outreach</p>	<p>Larry Lloyd presented. See the PowerPoint from RCD.</p> <p>Jeff Twitchell asked for clarification on whether the Existing Conditions Summary presented by Larry covered CALFED. The answer was that there was a grant. He was encouraged to look in the document for more information.</p> <p>Stan Cleveland presented. He has some concerns that he shared, including he hasn't been included in previous discussions and he would like to do some work on Nelson Slough to address issues including inadequate capacity. He would like to return it to its</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
	<p>original function but is finding it difficult because it is under the jurisdiction of DFG. The group discussions should be part of the Sutter County feasibility study in order to allow them to accomplish the county's goals.</p> <p>He stated that Sutter County didn't know anything about this CMP until Dan Peterson said there were grants coming up and told Stan Cleveland that the process had been happening for almost a year. There is concern that there has been no communication. He would like the CMP to be presented to the Board of Supervisors. The municipalities are the primary partners. Sutter Butte Flood Control agency is also a primary partner. FEMA has acknowledged them for their outreach to the public on their projects. They voted to assess themselves to get the levees fixed. They want to be part of this effort. He is concerned regarding a potential duplication of engineering efforts on one and two dimensional modeling (for the Sutter bypass). Hydraulic modeling for this study is underway. ICF has been doing the environmental review for the County, and anticipate completing their work within a month. The CMP work should match the Corps feasibility study, the early implementation project, and the 44 miles of levees they are doing.</p> <p>Jeff Twitchell commented that the CMP group has attempted to contact the Sutter Butte FCA and that he doesn't believe there is duplication. He is familiar with both programs. The CMP group is using the modeling for both sides of the river and it is not duplicative of the efforts in the Sutter Bypass. ICF is looking at the area from Thermalito and downstream levee improvements.</p> <p>Earl Nelson described that the genesis for the CMP came from the group dealing with State maintenance issues. SBFCA was invited but didn't take initiative until now. There will be more outreach in Phase II. Sutter County is welcome to come and be a part of these meetings. Stan Cleveland said he will make sure that the communication is continued into the future on the county's side.</p> <p>Fraser Gensler presented to the group regarding the Sutter Basin feasibility study. This study is conducted by CVFPB, SBFCA, and Corps. The goals are to reduce the risk of flooding in the study area, restore degraded ecosystems, and provide improved recreation access. The study area is the area hydraulically connected to Yuba City and includes 280 square miles. It started off as flood risk management with the two other goals coming later. Right now, a lot of the focus is playing catch-up with the two recently added study purposes (ecosystem and recreation). The status of the study is working towards a report documenting all the different measures talked about, producing a preliminary array of alternatives and screen those alternatives to a smaller array. Last it would identify the alternative that maximizes net benefits.</p> <p>In advance of the end of the feasibility study is an early implementation project consisting of improving the performance of the existing levees from Thermalito to the confluence at the Sutter Bypass.</p> <p>He mentioned the Parkway Project. This is to develop the Yuba City Side of the river. Some of this may be in the CMP area. Later this year they will produce a report to document the "without project" conditions.</p> <p>Terri Gaines asked if they participated in the early part of the CVFPP? The answer was yes.</p> <p>Phase I of the Parkway Project is about to go to construction (Willow Island Project). It is a 7.1 mile potential park.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that the CMP group has discussed using Nelson Slough as a sediment removal area.</p> <p>The EIP (early implementation grant program) requires looking at set back levees as an option. The feasibility study is considering set back levees.</p> <p>John Carlon stated that the timing is great to have more local representatives participate. There is a need for local input on the pressing needs and vital projects.</p> <p>Debra Bishop reiterated that all are welcome and AECOM is willing to invite others if there are suggestions.</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
	<p>Jeff Twitchell asked for RD 1001 to be included.</p>
<p>Break</p>	
<p>Permitting Subcommittee</p>	<p>Earl Nelson began the next portion of the meeting. He described that during a Collaborative meeting, he read the list of permits that pertain to the CMP. He also read this list to the group. He stated that the permitting memo is still in review and not ready for the main group. He suggested including SMARA even though it is not a likely candidate for a programmatic permit. Lisa Mangione said that it's in the memo but Earl suggested that a further description be provided that describes the permit, when it is needed, who administers, etc.</p> <p>Jeff Twitchell suggested including Section 408 amendments to the federal control system and the 104 credit approvals. Lisa Mangione was not familiar with the 104 permit but had listed 408 in the table as a potential permit.</p> <p>The memo will be passed to the permitting subcommittee that consists of the regulatory agencies and DWR.</p> <p>Lisa Mangione will be coordinating with agencies for the permitting subcommittee meeting on March 9. The goal is to get the memo to the group two weeks ahead of the meeting. Participants will be asked to be prepared to discuss likely approaches on permitting through their agencies. The draft letter report is with DWR for review, and it should be going out next Wednesday (February 23).</p> <p>Terri Gaines reiterated that one of the objectives of the CMP is that this is a pilot project for the CVFPP conservation strategy. This permitting approach would be a template on how to deal with permitting in a corridor. A short-term approach and long-term approach would both be useful in the report.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that one of the motivations for the CMP was the frustration with the State maintenance group having to mitigate for each elderberry or giant garter snake. It is expensive and this process is looking for a way to get programmatic permits in place so they can last a number of years. They anticipate having renewable or long-range permits so that the permits and mitigation don't have to occur over and over again, resulting in cost savings to taxpayers and more efficient use of staff time both for regulators and maintaining agencies. DWR would like to get credit for restoration and not have to do mitigation in the same area where restoration has already occurred. He suggested that the state maintenance staff should be viewed as environmental stewards rather than environmental damagers. A lot of the laws are written for urban development not for flood channel maintenance.</p> <p>Issues for the permitting subcommittee include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What level of environmental review will be needed? • Whether section 7 or 10 consultation is needed? <p>Jennifer Hobbs asked that the subcommittee talk about permitting with CVFPB. Is it going to streamline the permitting process? Are they still going to require a permit? It would be nice if CVFPB staff could brainstorm and bring proposals for how it may work. During the policy meeting, Nancy Moricz presented on some ideas that are a good example of what Jennifer Hobbs would like to see.</p> <p>Earl Nelson said that Butch Hodgkins described the corridor plan development to CVFPB in the beginning and there is a need to go back and give them a progress report. There was a suggestion to change CMP to a Flood Protection Plan. Earl Nelson made the point that if it's an enforceable document, then it's a project under CEQA, and the environmental documents must be in place. If the CMP is a guideline, then the CEQA/NEPA review would happen later to support permitting rather than supporting the plan. No matter what is decided, the CMP should help expedite things through the Board because of the extra information presented there regarding hydraulic effects and federal species take authorization.</p> <p>Kelly Barker asked whether the CVFPB would accept something that doesn't have</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
	<p>permits in place.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that the sequence is that the plan is created, CVFPB endorses the plan, and then the permits are pursued.</p> <p>Kelly Barker stated that with a discretionary permit, there would still need to be something covered under CEQA.</p> <p>Jennifer Hobbs asked that when new information comes up please bring it back to the group so that everyone is informed.</p> <p>John Carlon stated that it's difficult to know exactly what CVFPB expects. There is no clear process written down. Sometimes CVFPB comes back with requests that conflict with deed restrictions on some restoration properties. We need to identify this up front with the Board.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that he hopes to have CVFPB staff involved in future CMP meetings.</p> <p>Jeff Twitchell stated that it's impossible to get a blanket permit or perfect understanding of what the CVFPB staff wants to see in future modeling results, but the CMP and its hydraulic models would help facilitate the review of permits in the future.</p> <p>John Carlon asked if there are going to be net benefits and net issues for the corridor. He asked that the group look at the whole reach rather than individual projects because something might be out of the requirements at a specific location but not in the corridor.</p> <p>Earl Nelson said there is an issue of who owns the capacity that comes from a setback levee. Nancy's response during the Collaborative was that the determination that CVPPB makes that on a case-by-case basis. It is the Board's jurisdiction to decide per project. He hopes that through the plan, there can be a decision on a low-roughness high flow channel that allows for some restoration throughout the area without compromising flood safety by raising stage elevations. The Board has the final say.</p>
<p>Policy Meeting Follow-up Discussion</p>	<p>Earl Nelson gave an overview of what was presented at the last permitting subcommittee meeting.</p> <p>John Carlon asked if the modeling will meet the regulatory needs of the CVFPB. There is some confusion for him regarding how the modeling could be used to guide the CVFPB's decisions.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that not all the modeling would be done. If there are different configurations, then new modeling would have to happen to reflect specific project conditions.</p> <p>Are we having a 2-D model that covers Nelson Slough? Yes. Levee to levee.</p> <p>And the tools will be available to do further runs if there is a need.</p> <p>Stacy Cepello stated that it's important to have Board or Board staff approve in concept this work. We need them to respond and acknowledge that we are doing this significant work and unless there is something radically different, then a project could be moved through the board quickly.</p> <p>Don Trieu stated that the modeling includes a lot of engineering judgment and the Board has their own technical staff. The Corps also has required more modeling runs in the past.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that they are doing representative models but can't anticipate everything. He said that the modeling cover 95 percent of what is needed. And the tools will be there to reduce the effort for future project-specific runs.</p> <p>There is a need for input on the SOW and the project description from the CVFPB/staff. Some of the staff has looked at it. And there has been some input.</p> <p>Jeff Twitchell stated that the modeling includes representing baseline conditions as the first step.</p> <p>If we want to do specific projects, we should get that before the general modeling occurs.</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
	<p>Terri Gaines said that it's the intent for the existing conditions model to help develop the project description.</p> <p>Stacy Cepello said that he and Terri represent FESSRO and they are working on the system-wide benefits of the CVFPP...</p> <p>Earl Nelson said that DWR has always acknowledged the potential for setback levees. Right now, there is no specific target of any specific setback areas. The model should be expandable for examining the effects of setback levees.</p> <p>Footprint for the Corridor is levee to levee with 15 feet beyond toe. Model runs will be confined to in-channel flows, although the effects of future setback levees could be analyzed in the future.</p> <p>Terri Gaines asked that everyone remember that we need a permitting mechanism and a pilot for the CVFPP long-term implementation.</p> <p>Earl Nelson stated that, until there is a decision to do a setback levee, we don't have to worry about it. Depends on how this CMP is endorsed by the Board.</p>
<p>Additional items?</p>	
<p>Agenda topics for next meeting</p>	<p>Earl Nelson asked for input on the agenda for next meeting. Suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on the phase II task order • Summary of the permitting strategy meeting • Summary of the modeling meeting • Presentation from SBFCA on early implementation projects (EIP) project for another group... also have a board meeting every month that we could participate in on the status of the project. • John – There have been a lot of EIP setback projects... and some of these have resulted in management issues. Future EIP projects should benefit from earlier projects... how they are awarded, how funded, and what it means for future management. There is an opportunity to learn from these. <p>The next meeting for the CMP is on March 17.</p>

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by AECOM within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan Thursday, February 17, 2011 Meeting Work Group Member Attendance

Name	Affiliation	Telephone #
Earl Nelson	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-1244
Tony Danna	FMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-2738 916-531-2410 c
Kelly Barker	D Fish & Game – Northern Central Region	916- 358-4353
Elizabeth Boyd	AECOM	916-414-5852
Paul Brunner	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	530-749-5679
Erin Brehmer	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2236
Debra Bishop	AECOM	916-414-5818
John Carlon	River Partners	530-894-5401 x224
Stan Cleveland	Sutter County Supervisor	530-713-7502
Stacy Cepello	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-698-5287
Juleah Cordi	Sutter Co. Resource Conservation District	530-674-1461
James Cornelius	Sutter Co. Resource Conservation District	530-674-1461 x133
Terri Gaines	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-653-6520
Fraser Gensler	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	916-557-6849
Lisa Grudzinski (Telephone)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	530-223-9538
Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	916-414-6541
Jessica Law	AECOM	916-799-9125
Larry Lloyd	Sutter Co. Resource Conservation District	530-674-1461 x130
Lisa Mangione (Telephone)	AECOM	916-414-1605
Scott Rice	Department of Water Resources	916-837-6415
Gary Sprague	Nat. Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin.	916-930-3615
Don Trieu	MBK Engineers trieu@mbkengineers.com	916-456-4400
Jeffrey E. Twitchell	Levee District 1 & Yuba City Basin	916-631-4555
Matt Wacker	AECOM	916-266-4907

	Action Items:	Who		Status & Target Date
		Requested	Responsible	
1)	Coordinate with the FERC relicensing of the Oroville Dam. Follow-up: Stacy Cepello joined group - Cassandra Enos (Water Project Office, DWR), the Oroville FERC relicense settlement team to join Work Group.	Gary Hobgood	Len Marino	Done
2)	Work Group membership and representation: Include a recreation component in the CMP; need Yuba and Sutter land use people; local agriculture representation. Follow-up: The current group members can represent the other interest groups.	Jeff Twitchell & Gary Hobgood	Paul Brunner	On-going as needed
3)	Revise the language to the Purpose & Need to reflect the difference in the “Vision” & the CMP. Follow-up: New language inserted to purpose and need.	Terri Gaines	Terri Gaines	Done 7/30/10
4)	An ESA or NEPA process may be needed, what types of legal challenges are foreseen? Follow-up: Ask for permit clarification on all permits.	Earl Nelson	AECOM	@ Phase II
5)	Define “Funding” and get agreement on what this term means to the team. Follow-up: Future Work Group discussion. Include as future Agenda item	Jeff Twitchell & John Carlon	Tony Danna	Done
6)	Include Safe Harbors conditions in the CMP. Follow-up: AECOM will include in CMP.	Jeff Twitchell	AECOM	@ Phase III
7)	Develop a land ownership map in the CMP. Follow-up: Included in Deliverables list in Task Order.	Jeff Twitchell	AECOM	Done 12/1/10
8)	Include economic and social impacts analysis in CMP prior to decisions. Follow-up: Include in Deliverables list in future Task Orders.	Steve Fordice	AECOM	@ Phase III
9)	Hydraulic modeling needs to be added in the CMP; need to find a contractor to work with AECOM; Subgroup needed to review and suggest hydraulic modeling contractor to AECOM. Follow-up: Added to a future Task Order deliverables. “Request a Subgroup discussion?” Present a hydraulic modeling discussion at a later meeting. Len Marino will share a CVFPB hydraulic modeling Task Order with Work Group! Added Ray McDowell, a FESSRO person on to the subcommittee.	Paul Brunner & Group Discussion	Jeff Twitchell & AECOM	Phase II
10)	Improve meetings management by having clear objectives to meet deadlines. Follow-up: Move Agenda closer to Task Order deliverables.	Debra Bishop	Tony Danna	On Going
11)	Define what you want to list in the round table, Corps – Vegetation Framework Agreement. Follow-up: More Stakeholders involvement in defining list.	Gary Hobgood	Earl Nelson	No Action
12)	We should consider phasing in the contracting. Follow-up: Three phased Task Order was adopted into T.O. over 18 months.	Marti Kie	Earl Nelson	Done
13)	Draft MOU references to former agreements or MOU’s. Follow-up: Include a list of MOU’s and agreements for area on website.	Andy Atkinson	AECOM & Tony Danna	Done

14)	Put items into a website, that will include all past data & MOU's, agreements, relicensing (project 2100), and other items currently available. Follow-up: Working with Anna Fong to develop web site.	Andy Atkinson & Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Done
15)	Add "Ecological Function" to the Objective #3 definition. Follow-up: Added to revised Objectives	Earl Nelson	Earl Nelson & Tony Danna	Done
16)	Need new Safe Harbor mitigation wording for Objective #5 Follow-up: Added to revised Objectives	Jennifer Hobbs	Jennifer Hobbs	Done 7/20/10
17)	Fundamental changes to the Goals and Objectives format. Will redefine these based on Work Group input. Follow-up: Will to provide these to Group at next meeting for further review.	Work Group	Earl Nelson & Tony Danna	Done 7/20/10
18)	HCP - Contact local counties within the Yuba – Sutter HCP development area. The HCP forum for all environmental actions and there could be a benefit for the CMP in the future. Follow-up: Representation from Working Group on the HCP and Feather River.	Paul Brunner	Tony Danna & Mike Thomas	Working with Sutter RCD
19)	Have any HCP or State NCCP been done in the region? Follow-up: AECOM analysis needed. USFWS says no. The Sutter HCP not what we need.	Group Discussion	AECOM	Phase II
20)	Supply a current HCP map and the project description to the Group and will also supply the Group a list of individuals in the HCP. Follow-up: Working on from local group.	Mike Thomas	Mike Thomas	Done 7/30/10
21)	Hydraulic Modeling - Will be given to a subgroup for further discussion. Follow-up: Jeff Twitchell will form subgroup.	Earl Nelson	Earl Nelson & Tony Danna	Ongoing since 8/16/10
22)	Clarify the legal and CEQA requirements for the CVFPB to approve the CMP when completed. Follow-up: Len Marino suggested "CVFPB endorsement" to clarify the position.	Earl Nelson	Len Marino	Done 8/19/10
23)	Identify significant Stakeholders and interested Parties; send contact suggestions to the Group. Follow-up: Contact local planning boards to discuss CMP effort	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	On-going
24)	Additional stakeholders who should be consulted and kept informed of the CMP development activities. FloodSafe a good first effort to identify stakeholders. Follow-up: Continued - working with Sutter RCD	Gary Hobgood	Scott Rice	Done
25)	Subcommittee needs to look into the legal questions on maintenance responsibilities and who currently has levee, channel, and other maintenance responsibilities. Follow-up: Meeting on 5/27/10 and 8/16/10. Working on issue with legal!	Earl Nelson	Paul Brunner (Chair)	Pending
26)	Status of the Abbott Lake DWR / DFG MOU: May be out of legal review from DFG. Follow-up: Gary Hobgood looked into status and found it was still in DFG legal on 7/15/10	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Pending
27)	The Lower Feather River CMP Website is up and running at WebSite: http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/fmo/msb/	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Done – 9/10/10

	Follow-up: Site updated with the 4/15/10 Meeting minutes, all known MOU's added, new Goals and Objectives. Still need land ownership maps added to website.			
28)	Reword Goal #3 to be similar to the FLOODSAFE goals. Promote ecosystem functions by incorporating flood management system improvements that integrate the recovery and restoration of key physical processes, self-sustaining ecological functions, native habitats, and species. Follow-up: Done	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Done- 9/16/10
29)	Suggest a <u>subgroup should be formed to discuss Safe harbor (like) agreements</u> . The challenge seems to be how to organize all the obligations from differing agencies to make a more effective plan. A Sub-committee met to recommend a course of action. The group was formed to blend a safe harbor approach to what happens in permitting. Follow-up:	Paul Brunner	Jeff Twitchell	Done – 8/16/10
30)	Public Safety should be high in the Goals. Public safety needs to be included in the vision statement. Public safety needs to be an integrated into the goals. It is not clear whether the restoration of an area or public safety has superiority in a conflict area. The CMP should define this so that there never is a conflict between safety and restoration choices. What is the standard for public safety? Follow-up: Public Safety included in Purpose Statement. Future meeting discussion.	Paul Brunner	Earl Nelson	Done - 9/16/10
31)	Work Group feedback to Jeff Twitchell on hydraulic modeling proposal by the next meeting of subcommittee, prior to the Sept. 16.	Jeff Twitchell	Jeff Twitchell	Done 9/16/10
32)	Notify Kelly Briggs of the discussion and the meeting with MBK. Talk to Joseph Chan, DWR and Marjorie Caisley, DFG about hydraulic modeling proposal.	Earl Nelson & Jeff Twitchell	Tony Danna	Done 10 20/10
33)	A Work Group task might be to identify all the existing and potential permits / MOU's in the CMP area. Action Items – Existing Permits and MOU's Spread Sheet – break out as the private vs. public.	Terri Gaines	Tony Danna	Pending - 1/20/11
34)	Status of draft MOU & DFG/DWR January 2011 meeting follow-up.	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Ongoing - 1/20/11
35)	Policy Team meeting in January 2011 to discuss 1. Geomorphology and Hydrology Field Services Support 2. Draft Task Order phase II development 3. Policy Team review and approval prior to being finalized	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Done 2/3/11
36)	Send Policy Team Meeting minutes to Work Group.	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Done 2/18/11
37)	Existing Permits and MOU's Spread Sheet – break out as the private vs. public.	Terri Gaines	Tony Danna	Pending - 1/20/11
38)	Draft DFG/DWR Feather River Wildlife Area MOU redline ver. send to Kelley Barker/Jennifer Hobbs	Kelly Barker	Tony Danna	Done 2/18/11
39)	Organize and schedule meeting on the O'Connor Lakes DFG/DWR MOU for short term issues	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Prior to 3/17/11

	with maintenance and management in the project area.			
40)	Resend the Draft CMP Table of Contents to Work Group members.	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	Done 2/17/11
41)	At the Permitting Meeting discuss the Project Description Development.	John Carlon	Lisa Mangione	3/9/11
42)	Convene another Concepts meeting with Work Group participation and mapping mark-up to help develop Project Description,.	John Carlon	Tony Danna	?
43)	Develop letter to the CVFPB requesting Board expectations are for the LFRCMP.	Jennifer Hobbs	Earl Nelson	3/17/11
44)	Develop formal CMP update presentation to the CVFPB this Spring 2011.	Earl Nelson	Earl Nelson	5/1/11
45)	Request for Work Group identification of additional Stakeholders sent to Tony Danna	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	3/17/11
46)	Finalization of the Hydraulic Modeling effort by having subcommittee meeting and working with AECOM for redrafting of Task Order phase II proposal. Invite Ray McDowell, FESSRO.	Jeff Twitchell	Matt Wacker	3/17/11
47)	Send suggestions for Work Group Meeting facilitation and note taking for the next meeting.	Elizabeth Boyd	Working Group	3/17/11
48)	Requested Sutter County RCD and county supervisor to get RD1001 participation in Work Group.	Jeff Twitchell	Stan Cleveland	3/17/11
49)	Establish contact with Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency and invite them to Work Group to discuss coordination of effort in the Feather River region.	Earl Nelson	Larry Lloyd	3/17/11
50)	Add project description or initial environmental scoping to Phase II. Separate all other environmental review into Phase II(b)	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	3/17/11
51)	Tony has a copy of Nancy's presentation and will send that out to the working group.	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	2/22/11
52)	Finalize the meeting minutes from the last meetings.	Earl Nelson	Tony Danna	2/25/11