

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WETLANDS RESTORATION PROGRAM
COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING SUMMARY
MAY 4, 2004**

Attendees:

Marcia Brockbank (San Francisco Estuary Project)
John Brosnan (Wetlands Restoration Program)
Molly Martindale (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
Steve McAdam (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission)
Mike Monroe (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)
Chris Potter (California Resources Agency)

1. Introductions

Mike Monroe chaired the meeting and opened with a roundtable of introductions.

2. April 8 Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary

John Brosnan noted the two action items from the April 8 meeting were to revise and distribute the draft Executive Council meeting agenda, and create and distribute the WRP draft Annual Report. Both of these actions were completed. John noted another follow-up item, which was that Carl Wilcox was to contact Rhonda Reed at CALFED and discuss any potential for the WRP to assume a role in implementation of CALFED's San Pablo Bay Implementation Plan. Carl suggested John contact Dan Ray at CALFED to follow up on this idea, and Dan noted that there was no movement at the Bay-Delta Authority to pursue this plan. John was asked to continue researching this concept; John noted this component was not prioritized in the CALFED Record of Decision (ROD). Steve McAdam felt that, absent prioritization in the ROD, the WRP could work with the CALFED-ABAG Task Force if it pursues this role. Steve recommended John speak with the Task Force co-chairs about this.

3. WRP Annual Report

John summarized the WRP Annual Report. The draft document summarizes the activities of the WRP since August 2002, reviews the Program's past and current objectives, highlights potential opportunities for the coming year and touches on the unresolved long-term funding situation. Overall, the Annual Report seeks to demonstrate that the WRP was created to fill a specific set of roles and that it has done that, plus so much more. John noted he needed the Committee's input specifically on how to approach the list of Monitoring Group members' activities, future roles and opportunities the WRP could explore, and how to characterize the report's section on funding.

Molly Martindale suggested itemizing the funding sources that were reviewed and what was determined. Mike agreed, and noted that the Executive Council should be made aware that they will need to get involved if funding is not secured by the June meeting time. Molly felt the report should list individual projects that Monitoring Group members are involved in, even if

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
MAY 4, 2004**

those projects are not WRP projects, yet the list should reflect the efforts supported by the WRP. Marcia Brockbank saw the report as the means to demonstrate efforts are on going and efforts that will get underway in the coming year. The Committee wanted to ensure the report's objectives and goals were in sync with the Charter of Working Principles.

The group revisited the Executive Council's June 2003 decision to cease all Design Review Group evaluation of privately sponsored mitigation projects. Molly suggested the Executive Council might want to change its stance on the review of privately sponsored mitigation projects; she noted that the WRP couldn't accurately assess whether or not the demand for this specific service exists. Molly felt that if these types of projects could be reviewed by the DRG, those projects that are purely restoration (i.e., are not compensatory in nature) should get priority with the DRG's schedule. **Molly suggested that the WRP take a year to quantify and assess the pros and cons of this DRG policy.** Mike reiterated his belief that changing the DRG policy could serve to undermine the WRP over the long term. **Steve McAdam felt the Committee should inform the Executive Council of the concerns around the mitigation project review policy and propose the WRP track the number of projects that could be reviewed if the policy weren't in place.** Mike agreed with this and suggested we inform the Council we'll bring this back to them in a year. Mike also proposed investigating why there aren't more projects coming to the DRG, as the group has reviewed fewer projects since the Executive Council policy was put in place.

Mike suggested the Annual Report should contain more background information in order to make clear the WRP's linkages to the Estuary Project, the CCMP and the Goals Report. Marcia felt the DRG projects section could be improved by presenting projects in a more concise and standardized format; she suggested referring to projects reviewed prior to June 2003 as Past Projects and all reviewed since as Recent Projects. Everyone agreed that photographs of the projects would be helpful. **John will revise the draft Annual Report based on Coordinating Committee members' suggestions and distribute to all WRP participants within a week. He will then work with San Francisco Estuary Project staff on formatting, layout and production of the final document. The final Annual Report will be sent along with meeting materials to Executive Council members in the last week of May.**

4. Planning for the Executive Council meeting

John presented the draft Executive Council meeting agenda to the Committee. The agenda is led by a presentation of the WRP Annual Report, which will segue into a discussion of the long-term funding for the program. These items will be followed by a brief update on the South Bay Salt Pond project (by Steve Ritchie), an update on West Nile Virus in California (by Karl Malamud-Roam), and an update on the Invasive Spartina Project (by Peggy Olofson). John said he was most interested in the Committee's idea of how to frame the discussion of long-term funding in order to best utilize the Council's time.

Steve McAdam suggested stating that the funding issue "is a question only you can answer" in the transmittal that accompanies the Council members' meeting materials. Committee members agreed with this approach. They also recommended reorganizing the updates so that the Salt Pond talk came at the end; this approach would allow Steve Ritchie to tie in the West Nile Virus and invasive spartina issues that will precede his presentation. Mike suggested allocating only

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
MAY 4, 2004**

20 minutes to the funding issue and pointing out that we'll be back in the fall with this issue should it remain unresolved.

5. Wrap-up/Next Meeting Date

Chris Potter noted the upcoming Oceans Symposium to be held in Sacramento on May 6. He mentioned interested Committee members could go to the Resources Agency website (www.resources.ca.gov) to view the oceans report, which contains a 10-page section on coastal wetlands. **The next Coordinating Committee meeting date was not set, but will be over email following the June 9 Executive Council meeting.** The meeting was adjourned.

ACTION ITEMS:

- **John will revise the draft Annual Report based on Coordinating Committee members' suggestions and distribute to all WRP participants within a week. He will then work with San Francisco Estuary Project staff on formatting, layout and production of the final document. The final Annual Report will be sent along with meeting materials to Executive Council members in the last week of May.**
- **John will revise the draft Executive Council agenda based on Coordinating Committee members' suggestions.**
- **John will work with Mike Monroe and Chris Potter on final planning for the Executive Council meeting.**