

**San Francisco Bay Area  
Wetlands Restoration Program**

**Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program  
Draft Meeting Notes  
September 10, 2002**

**Attendees:**

Bob Batha (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission)  
Andree Breaux (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
John Brosnan (Wetlands Restoration Program)  
Josh Collins (San Francisco Estuary Institute)  
Giselle Downard (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)  
Paul Jones (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)  
Leslie Lacko (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission)  
Molly Martindale (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)  
Mike Monroe (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)  
Nadav Nur (Point Reyes Bird Observatory Conservation Science)  
Gary Page (Point Reyes Bird Observatory Conservation Science)  
Anita Pawley (The Bay Institute)  
Chris Potter (Resources Agency)  
Mike Vasey (San Francisco State University)

**1. Introductions and Agenda Review/Announcements**

Paul Jones (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) chaired the meeting and opened with a brief round of introductions. Paul reviewed the list of those WRMP group members that were not present and stated that attendance has been a problem. He pointed out that there is a particular gap in staffing in the Fish Team.

**2. WRMP Management Issues**

Due to time constraints, Paul moved this agenda item up so that Mike Monroe (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) could have adequate time to discuss these management issues. The group then began discussions of whether or not to (1) become a part of the Bay Area Wetlands Restoration Program and (2) whether or not to combine in some way with the Design Review Group of the Restoration Program. Paul asked Josh Collins to summarize the outcome of the previous meeting with regard to combining the DRG and the WRMP

Josh Collins (San Francisco Estuary Institute) stated that there was not unanimity of opinion but the general consensus at that time was for the WRMP to maintain some autonomy while providing a service to the Restoration Program, that there was a common sentiment to make sure that by becoming part of the Restoration Program the WRMP would not restrict its opportunities. Paul responded saying that he would iterate these key points to the Restoration Program's Management Group.

In terms of lost opportunities with CALFED, Mike Vasey (San Francisco State University) pointed out that CALFED is not engaged in the Baylands and that the mission of the WRMP is broader. Andree Breaux (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board) wanted to make sure that as part of the Restoration Program, that the WRMP would not be dictated to by the Executive Council.

Mike Monroe then provided the group with an update on why the Restoration Program exists. He highlighted the long history of documentation, which has consistently pointed towards the formation of a Monitoring Group to come into the Restoration Program. Josh and Paul stated their support for these statements. Mike continued with the fact that the Executive Council is anxious to see a Monitoring Program that they can support, both financially and politically. What needs to occur in advance of that is the creation of a simple and coherent plan that includes what the program will bring, when it will occur, and how much it will cost.

Mike then read the tasks of the Monitoring Group from the working agreement and mentioned the potential for one, consolidated Science Group. He pointed out that the joining of the Restoration Program would be financially advantageous to the WRMP. Josh then itemized the tasks that the WRMP needs to be looking ahead to: (1) Need to be tracking projects, (2) Need to know how wetlands are doing individually, and (3) Need to know how projects are affecting the overall ecosystem. The information system meant to track these items is being compiled at SFEI.

Andree pointed out that, within the Restoration Program, there needs to be a feedback loop to the Executive Council and the Management Group within the program structure. Molly Martindale (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) stated that this is way that the Program currently functions. Anita Pawley (The Bay Institute) stated that the organizational structure should allow for the best science at all times and not allow for the politics to drive the science.

Nadav Nur (Point Reyes Bird Observatory Conservation Science) wanted to clarify the distinctions between the Restoration Program and the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture. Mike Monroe pointed out that the Joint Venture attracts monies and is a booster for habitat projects, while the Restoration Program resolves interagency policy issues through its Executive Council and deals with mitigation projects, in contrast to the Joint Venture. Chris Potter (Resources Agency) also pointed out that the Goals Project is different from the Joint Venture Implementation Plan.

Paul then posed the question of whether or not to merge into the Restoration Program. Josh suggested that the questions circulated be brought to the Management Group for resolution and that the Management Group should make the formal recommendation to the Executive Council. Mike Vasey then made a motion to join the Restoration Program, which was seconded by Molly Martindale. There seemed to be a general consensus.

Paul will craft and email to the Management Group and the WRMP Steering Committee, which will be revised and approved before being sent off to the Executive Council. The email will include the following three options: (1) no action, (2) make investments in an information management system, and (3) make investments in an information management system that

measures conditions, as at least \$500,000, as put forth in the Working Agreement. Paul then suggested that it would not be fair to have paid members of the Design Review Group and not have paid members of the Monitoring Group. Bob Batha (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission) noted that a range of costs – for startup and ongoing monitoring projects – should be presented in order to be sensitive to the California state budget situation.

**3. Break**

**4. Focus Team Updates**

Paul initiated a roundtable review of WRMP focus team updates.

**5. Wetlands Monitoring in the San Pablo National Wildlife Refuge**

Giselle Downard (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) made a presentation to the group on the methods and progress in restoration monitoring at Tolay Creek in San Pablo National Wildlife Refuge. Monitoring data has been collected at Tolay Creek ever since the breaching of the levees three years ago. Data was shown that represented sedimentation, species abundance and species distribution since the time that the levee was breached.

**6. Update on EMAP effort, Review of Crissy Field, and Rapid Assessment Methods**

Josh shared with the group that there is one rapid assessment method (RAM) currently being developed for use in the San Francisco region, the Central Coast region, and the Los Angeles region, which may lead to a statewide RAM.

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting was running slightly behind schedule and was adjourned.