

MEETING NOTES | Wednesday, January 27, 2010, 2:00-3:00

Dry Creek Advisory Group

Russian River Instream Flow & Restoration Program

Location

Dry Creek Vineyard, 3770 Lambert Bridge Road

Contact Information

Anne Crealock, Sonoma County Water Agency, 707-547-1948

Time	Agenda Item
2:00	Welcome & Updates
2:10	Discussion with Inter-Fluve: Draft Current Conditions Inventory Report Discussion, Questions & Feedback
2:55	Wrap Up Next steps

Attendees:

Ann DuBay, SCWA

Anne Crealock, SCWA

Bob Coey, NMFS

Dane Petersen, Grower

Dave Manning, SCWA

Don Wallace, DCV

Doug Lipton, landowner

Edson Howard, DCVA

Eric Brown, SCWA

Fred Corson, DCVA

Fred Euphrat, Senator Wiggins' office

Glen Wright, City of Santa Rosa

Greg Koonce, Inter-Fluve

Jessica Martini-Lamb, SCWA

Jim Neumiller, Grower

Judith Olney, DCVA

1LT Matt Brauer, USACE

Mike Burke, Inter-Fluve

Pam Jeane, SCWA

Paul Bernier, Grower

Renee Webber, SCWA

Valerie Sherron, Sotoyome RCD

Welcome & Updates

Anne Crealock thanked everyone for coming and thanked Don Wallace for hosting the meeting at his vineyard.

The purpose of the meeting was to hear from Inter-Fluve and take plenty of time to address questions and concerns. SCWA asked them to save the formal PowerPoint presentation for the community meeting later that afternoon so that the group could have more of an informal dialogue-type discussion with Inter-Fluve.

Before the meeting started, Anne gave a quick update on the status of a meeting facilitator. Based on feedback received last year on the structure of the group and use of a charter, it was decided to look into abandoning the charter and continuing the group in much the same way as it functions today: as an informational group which shares information among agencies and interested participants. SCWA would continue to seek input from the group as it implements the BO. If the group foregoes the use of a formal charter, a professional facilitator probably would not be needed. This is why Gina Bartlett, from the Center for Collaborative Policy, wasn't in attendance. Anne said that she would like to talk more about this with the group at a future meeting rather than taking time away from Inter-Fluve on this day's agenda. The group agreed.

Anne introduced Greg Koonce and Mike Burke from Inter-Fluve who, thanks to the many landowners who allowed them on their property, were able to gather a substantial amount of information that will help SCWA make well-informed decisions as it implements the BO.

Greg and Mike discussed what they found during their study and how Inter-Fluve's work will proceed. Anne encouraged people to interrupt with questions and comments.

Inter-Fluve's Presentation

Please see the separate handout for a summary of Inter-Fluve's Presentation. Inter-Fluve also provided a large map of Dry Creek with pools, riffles and other habitat features labeled, for reference.

Discussion Following Presentation

Question: Can you explain why Oregon is seeing record salmon runs this year?

Response: Those salmon runs reflect conditions 3-4 years ago. In Oregon's case, these were drought conditions. Also, El Niño conditions are more beneficial for salmon in Oregon and Washington than for those runs further south in California. In Alaska, the runs are down and it appears to be related to El Niño. Geographically, central California is on the fringe of the coho's range. It makes sense that those runs on the edge of a species' range would get hit first and hardest. Recent fishery closures in this area are likely due in large part to poor ocean conditions.*

Question: It looks like you looked at the creek structure. Did you do modeling at different water levels? If not, why not?

Response: That wasn't part of this phase of the study. But modeling based on different flows will be a major part of the next phase.

* Editor's note: Salmonids are also directly affected by coastal upwelling patterns. Upwelling moves nutrient-rich water towards the ocean's surface and directly impacts the food supply for young salmonids. In 2005 and 2006, changes in oceanic upwelling patterns along the California coast negatively affected the food supplies for young salmonids and likely contributed to recent fishery closures.

Question: What kind of projects do you see coming out of this study? It sounds like you are just looking for areas to place more gravel.

Response: While there aren't as many riffles as we'd like to see, we'll look at many different types of projects. We found many more opportunities than we were expecting.

Question: Are there percent goals for riffles, pools, and glides?

Response: You can think of it like we have a shopping list for what fish need and we'll need to make decisions about how much to buy of each item for the best overall benefit for fish. Also, the BO has specific requirements that we will incorporate. One thing to remember is that we can't create something completely artificial because within 10 years, it would just revert back.

Initially, because the creek is so incised, we didn't think there would be very many opportunities, but our study is showing that there are many more opportunities than we thought. It will all be based on partnerships with landowners for win-win projects.

Comment/Question: I'm concerned about losing the professional facilitator and charter. I'm also concerned about the role of the advisory group. What are we advising? I'm disappointed that there was not PowerPoint presentation for this meeting and I'm not available to attend the community meeting.

Response: The information regarding Inter-Fluve's report presented during this meeting is the same information people will be receiving during the community meeting, just without the PowerPoint. It's all summarized in the handout provided today. The PowerPoint presentations from all presenters will be available online in the next few days.

Regarding the advisory role of the group, we want your input on the draft report. The current draft still likely needs a few revisions based on comments from NMFS and DFG. Once that's done, a hard copy of the second draft report will be sent to all DCAG members for review. You'll have about a month to get your comments back to us.

Question: And these reports will still be *draft*?

Response: Yes.

Wrap-Up

Anne asked DCAG members to make sure she has their street addresses so that SCWA can send copies of the draft report for review. She thought it would take 3-4 weeks to get the draft reports out in the mail. Since there was a ½ hour before the community meeting begins, Anne also encouraged attendees to stay, talk to Greg and Mike from Inter-Fluve, peruse the map that Inter-Fluve created, and enjoy the refreshments provided. She also encouraged attendees to stay for the community meeting since, in

addition to Inter-Fluve's presentation, there would also be other updates regarding fisheries monitoring, work on Grape/Wine Creek, and work planned for 2010.