

Draft
BDAC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION WORK GROUP
Meeting Summary
November 26, 1996

The eighth meeting of the BDAC Ecosystem Restoration Work Group was held on Tuesday, November 26, 1996 at the Resources Building from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 pm.

BDAC members of the Work Group present were:

Mary Selkirk (Chair)
Tib Belza
Ann Notthoff
Marcia Brockbank
Pat McCarty
Lee Lehman

Invited participants to the Work Group were:

Pete Chadwick
Frank Wernette
Rod Fujita
Kate Hansel
Sally Shenks
Tom Zuckerman
Bob Shaffer

CALFED Staff/Consultants present were:

Lester Snow
Dick Daniel
Sharon Gross
Michelle Wong
Greg Zlotnick

Other Attendees:

Robin Reynolds
Tim Ramirez
Steve Ford
Scott Wilcox
Nancy Shaefer
Kelly Tennis

Jeff Phipps
Margi Aramburu
Earle Cummings
Bill DuBois
Jordan Lang
Robert Clark

Keena Lipsitz
John Coburn
Jan Jennings
Brian Collett

Mary Selkirk introduced the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Discussion at the meeting focused primarily on unresolved policy issues concerning targets, the implementation objectives described in the Targets document, and relationship between the Ecosystem Work Group and the Ecosystem Roundtable.

Some members stated that to the extent possible, objectives should be defined quantitatively and targets be set to fully achieve objectives. Specificity is necessary to assure development of a successful restoration plan. Some members suggested an objective should not be as specific as stating the exact acreage. Some commented that linkage between targets and objectives were not clear since some objectives are described as targets. A suggestion was made to reword objectives as "Restore X to achieve Y" or define objectives according to an outline of what needs to be achieved. Most participants felt that there is a need for greater assurance regarding targets and that targets need to be measurable.

Additionally, the basis or rationale driving the targets needs greater explanation. Some targets should be replaced with description of an adaptive management plan that contain specific hypothesis and associated range of restoration solutions.

Some participants urged for early implementation of some actions, saying that rather than trying to come up with a perfect and complete plan before doing something, we should start doing something now and see what happens. Others cautioned against it. Some suggested that the plan needs to identify remnants of habitat/geomorphic types/species etc. which must be restored, others say trying to patch here and there would not work when the overall "life support system" is not functioning well.

One question raised was regarding the purpose of the technical meetings that will be held over the next several weeks. Dick indicated that the objective was to discuss with the technical experts the rationale in setting the targets and objectives. Some stated a complete plan needed to consider more than those rationale contained in existing recovery and management plans because the objectives for CALFED are broader. In other words, there is potential for substantial system modification that was not considered when those recovery criteria were developed.

Some asked about the criteria used for selecting species for restoration. Dick replied that it was those species dependent on the estuary.

Comments on Implementation Objectives and Targets Document

- The document has a problem in interpretation of adaptive management. How adaptive management is defined should be reflected in objectives and targets.
- "Targets Rationale" section from Targets Workshop document should be

integrated into this document. Need to define where you have and don't have explicit performance indicators.

- Implementation objectives are habitats/population driven, need to reflect ecosystem function goals.
- It is best to distinguish geographic areas for each objective.
- Page 55,69 -- reduce harvest of fish and wildlife should not be an objective. It's a short term implementation action. Need to be consistent throughout document.
- Page 8 -- targets are too wide and too easily changed
- Page 12, 4c -- it says increase tidal acreage--entrapment null zone is not it
- Should delineate in document what makes CALFED uncomfortable.
- Page 63 -- what does protection of channel islands mean? Does it mean stop erosion? Erosion processes may be good for fish.

Dick acknowledged there's a big gap in the objectives document and that program objectives are not implementation objectives. The ecosystem strategy document should fill in the gap.

Relationship Between the Ecosystem Work Group and the Ecosystem Roundtable

Some suggested there is an overlap of the Ecosystem Work Group and Ecosystem Roundtable and the two groups should be combined. Cindy Darling indicated that there was some overlap, but objectives for each group were different. The Ecosystem Roundtable will coordinate activities and integrate existing programs, identify what's most urgent and feasible, and focus on implementation of projects for the next three to five years. The BDAC Work Group focus should be on the overall goals and objectives for the ecosystem. Some members are concerned that the two may not be going in the same direction. There needs to be some kind of check and balance to ensure consistency. Cindy said that the projects selected by the Roundtable must meet the criteria that they: 1) would not have cumulative impacts; 2) would not prejudice the long term alternative; and 3) would fulfill the long term objective.

Next Meeting

Next meeting will be held on December 18th. The dates for the technical team meetings on targets are December 3, 10,17 and January 3.

Some suggested that agenda for the December 18th meeting should include user assurances and streamlining multiple actions permits. Other issues for discussion included a follow up from this discussion related to rationales for targets and how existing information was utilized.