

**San Francisco Bay Joint Venture  
Restoration Committee  
Oakland Museum. October 4, 2010 10:30 AM – 2:30 PM**

**Meeting Notes**

**Participants**

Noreen Weeden (Golden Gate Audubon Society), Arthur Feinstein (Citizens' Committee to Complete the Refuge), Mike Perlmutter (Bay Area Early Detection Network), Jeff McCreary (Ducks Unlimited), David Thomson (SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex), Jill Demers (SF Bay Bird Observatory), John Klochak (US Fish and Wildlife Service), Anthony Khalil (Port of Oakland), Jasmine Don (Port of Oakland), Laura Valoppi (USGS), Meg Mariott (USFWS), Brad Olson (East Bay Regional Parks District), Matt Gerhart (State Coastal Conservancy), Peggy Olofson (Invasive Spartina Project), Julian Wood (PRBO Conservation Science), Julian Meisler (Sonoma Land Trust), Tom Gundesbery (SCC), Karen Taylor (Department of Fish and Game), Cheryl Strong (USFWS), Marc Holmes (The Bay Institute),

*Guests:* John Kelly (GreenInfo Network), Joel Peter (City of Oakland), Chris Richard (Oakland Museum)

*SFBJV Staff:* Beth Huning (Coordinator), Christina Sloop (Science Coordinator)

**PRESENTATIONS**

**1. Bay Area Early Detection Network (BAEDN) -Mike Perlmutter**

Mike distributed the BAEDN Species List, which can be found at [www.baedn.org](http://www.baedn.org). The list identifies species deemed as high threats with only small occurrences in the Bay Area for early detection & rapid response, over 1400 species to start, with 73 high alert species. The BAEDN list is part of the Cal flora database, which is free to use if you are doing work for nonprofit or with BAEDN. It is also a great resource for tracking, storing & monitoring of invasive plant information.

The next phase will be a GIS database of all the listed species, which of them needs additional assistance. There is also an iPhone & droid app being developed/beta tested to use in the field to report invasions instantly!

Discussion focused on how we can engage partners. BAEDN is a small program administered through the California Association of RCDs, using stimulus grants. Existing funding covers mainly uplands, and money is needed for wetlands. Brad Olson requested information on how BAEDN or others could help get rid of one population of gorse in East Bay as it is the only population and needs immediate attention.

BAEDN's motto is "Preventative 'medicine' for landscape: finding noxious invasives early so that early and cost-effective eradication can be achieved".

*Action:* Link the BAEDN lists and possibly the BAEDN Cal Flora database to the JV database.

**2. Invasive Spartina Project (ISP) Update - Peggy Olofson, ISP Director**

Peggy presented an update on hybrid Spartina control in the SF Bay estuary. She compared net cover of invasive Spartina 2004 of 691-789 acres, which is now down to 67 acres in 2010!!! She projects 15 staff for 6 months will eradicate the remaining stands, with a focus on individuals after that. She reinforced the need to know locations of individual hybrid plants. Invasive Spartina is a highly effective ecosystem engineer, converts mudflat to high marsh, which is part of the reason that it became a refugia habitat for Clapper Rails. The ISP is experimenting with replanting of S.

foliosa. There is No more S. alterniflora in the Bay and S. densiflora (in North Bay) is on its way out!

#### Success stories

- Burlingame Lagoon: 2006-10, only root mass left
- Airport channel 2006-10, only root mass left, and only individuals remain. Some are easy to kill, others persist.
- Old Alameda Creek 2006-09, photo point monitoring shows pickle weed is growing back down to channel edge area (resistant to emazapyr herbicide)
- Whales Tail South 2006-10, from complete cover to all gone!
- Elsie Roemer Bird Sanctuary (Alameda Island) 1991-2010, needed extensive control: 'sinuous' channels were dug (proved difficult), replanted a berm with Grindelia (did not take). Hybrid Spartina was still present in 2007, but now looks much better with only a few individual hybrids remaining. They cannot add native Spartina yet, since it could mate with cryptic hybrids.

#### Clapper Rail Data

There has been concern in the past 5 years that the ISP may be contributing to population declines in Clapper Rails populations as the decrease follows Spartina trajectory, especially between 2007 and 2009. The decrease seems to be slowing now in last few years. For example, in Arrowhead & MLK marshes rails increased after Spartina introduction (after 2000), and there are 2-3 rails per hectare in Arrowhead in 2010.

#### Remaining Challenges

***ALERT: All places that have been opened to tidal action in the marsh has been invaded by invasive Spartina – causing an additional requirement of \$\$\$ for control!***

- Cooley Landing: Treated clones still remain. There is extensive study about cryptic hybrids present. Is it S. foliosa or hybrid?
- Breuner and San Pablo Marshes: Some plants still out there. It takes time to control them.
- Outer Bair: Was populated by hybrids right after the restoration breach. Although it's only individual plants, it's still problem and will take additional funding to eradicate.
- West Bay: Now only dots (individual plants) not polygons (large areas).
- Arrowhead Marsh: Still invaded; hard to do consistent treatment due to Clapper Rail concerns; hybrids produced seeds last year (no control) and these are released into the Bay to disperse.
- Coyote Creek/Island Ponds: Seemingly only S. foliosa
- China Camp: One clone treated, but State Parks is reluctant to have the marsh treated.
- Knapp Tract/Alviso Slough: Scheduled for opening a restoration breach on October 22. There are still hybrids in the vicinity which will require additional treatment after the breach.

#### Next Steps

The ISP will continue monitoring and treatment. There will be a Section 7 consultation in 2010. UCLA & genetics lab in France are working on it. They will be expanding restoration efforts, replanting of S. foliosa.

*Action: Mark your calendars for March 10-11, 2011 Spartina Hybrid Forum, a meeting to decide how to approach remaining hybrids.*

### **3. Napa Plant Site Salinity Reduction Breach - Karen Taylor**

The initial salinity reduction breach took place on 8/25/10. At that time, the water was hyper saline, ~1000 ppt. It was allowed to stay and dilute at bottom of pond but was not allowed to leave the ponded area into the Napa river (usually 25 ppt). Salinity decreased and mixed in the

pond very fast. Within the first weeks, salinity was around/below 30ppt. Recently the breach was widened to the full width of 200 feet. DFG is very happy with results.

#### **4. Seasonal Wetland Goals Update - Beth Huning for Kevin Petrik of DU**

For the past couple of years the JV has been analyzing data to correct our initial seasonal wetlands goals. This project was frozen just as it was getting going; so much of the work has been done post-freeze.

##### Background

The process was to review the current goals & projects, added new data, identify new resources, to more scientifically calculate new seasonal wetlands goals as part of updating the JV implementation plan. Many of seasonal wetlands included in the initial goals were behind dikes/levees, many of which have been, or are scheduled to be, converted to tidal habitats.

The JV also added the Russian River and Coastal areas to our territory subsequent to establishing our goals. The acquisition goals in the Suisun area were too high (11,000 acres) as they are protected under the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act, and many of them are within the Central Valley JV (CVJV), which includes Suisun Marsh proper. However, the SVBJV has the upland areas of that part of Solano County. 17 of 19 projects in Contra Costa County (CoCoCo) are being done by SFBJV partners. As part of this process, our boundary was adjusted with the CVJV to incorporate those project, giving SFBJV the mainland area of CoCoCo, and keeping the delta islands within the CVJV.

##### Data Collection Process

The SFBJV has conducted regional meetings for interactive mapping exercises with local experts in the following regions: Napa/Solano, Contra Costa/Alameda, Marin, Sonoma, South Bay, and San Mateo County. These meetings are complete, with the exception of a couple of meetings with individuals in the Napa and Solano areas. Available data sets were analyzed, and an interactive mapping sessions gathered additional data about other wetland areas and reports/data sets that are or will soon be available to contribute additional information.

Kevin Petrik has prepared a report that summarizes the findings and makes recommendations. The report is available to JV partners. Key findings, other than those noted above include the following:

- We have a goal of 37,000 acres for protection. This is grossly over estimated. A key question is whether that is exact acreage of the seasonal wetlands or the full parcel/tract on which those wetlands occur. We have currently identified ~6,000 acres of seasonal wetlands.
- Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP's) will have additional data that need to be analyzed prior to setting goals. In addition, SFEI is doing an analysis of the location of moist grasslands, which will soon be done. These may or may not cover the entire SFBJV area. Kevin has recommended that we not proceed with goal setting until these data sets are available.

##### Suggested Next Steps

- The goals need to be adjusted accordingly to reflect double counting these areas in our acreage goals.
- We also need to assess the feasibility of where seasonal wetlands could be incorporated into restoration designs.
- It was agreed that we should accept Kevin's recommendation not to recalculate acreage goals until the SFEI data sets are complete.

- In the meantime, conduct a biological assessment of the value of these seasonal wetlands. Include information as to the function of seasonal wetlands as refugia during high tides/ storm events, the need for these types of seasonal wetlands,
- Analyze the optimal numbers for waterfowl/waterbirds and other wildlife supported by seasonal wetlands.
- We might also identify different habitat values provided by different types of seasonal wetlands. If we do, it needs to be teased out from distinguishing seasonal wetlands from grasslands (farmed grasslands behind levees will turn into seasonal wetlands (i.e. Cullinan Ranch). Is this important component of the JVs? Should this kind of science become a priority?

It was pointed out that we need more resources to cover ‘all birds all species’ and that this will be an ongoing process.

*Comment: Cheryl Strong rediscovered monitoring data from South Bay also includes seasonal wetland data (data in box next to Cheryl’s desk*

*Action: Someone needs to get the data from Cheryl and enter it in a way that can be used to help refine our goals.*

##### **5. San Pablo Bay Public Access Mapping – Beth Huning and John Kelly**

Beth reported from the recent meeting with BCDC and summarized the purpose of the mapping and database. This process was initiated by the San Pablo Bay Managers working group to avoid permit-by-permits requiring access, to negotiate alignments out of sensitive habitats, provide more of an overall regional analysis and vision for access in the region, and to help negotiate alignments with BCDC on more of a regional, planned basis.

##### BCDC Meeting

The BCDC meeting held some promise, but some staff members continued to propose access across private lands or in sensitive habitats. Bay Trail staff participated in the BCDC meeting and reinforced the message that the managers and Bay Trail have already negotiated alignments, and we want BCDC to accept those alignments rather than determine their own preference. They did acknowledge that connectivity of the Bay Trail was their most important goal, and the map and data base show how that can occur. It was also suggested that our information be presented to the BCDC design review board. The educational process and dialog needs to continue.

##### Access Data Base and Maps

A Google Earth tool is now available to SFBJV partners who do not have GIS software John provided an overview of our the tool, which shows proposed alignments for trails, access points, and launch sites throughout the North Bay. This map was developed as a tool for planning purposes for the partners and BCDC so everyone can become more united about trail alignments.

The key message is that the information is for planning purposes and shows various alternatives but not commitments to specific alternatives. Land managers would not necessary choose to do all of these, and may not do them at all unless required to do so in the permitting process. In other cases, they may be part of a manager’s access plan.

##### Next Steps

The maps and data are usable in Google Earth and will be available to SFBJV partners. They should note that they are for planning purposes only and should not be circulated to the public. Always state that maps are for planning purposes only and only drafts!

South Bay members would like to see a similar program for the South Bay.

*Action: SFBJV will coordinate with GreenInfo about the best way to make them available to partners while limiting availability to the public. GreenInfo will label the Google Earth and other versions that these are for planning purposes only.*

## **DISCUSSIONS AND PLANNING**

### **1. Federal Project Funding Priorities - Marc Holmes & Beth Huning**

Marc Holmes and Beth led a discussion to confirm projects priorities for federal funding. Senator Feinstein has indicated a willingness to help secure additional funding for restoration, but her staff have also asked the JV to confirm priorities for projects on federal lands as she wants to make certain that the JV members are speaking with a united voice.

Marc described the annual process of federal project funding priorities as well as the two pending bills, HR5061 and S3539 (?) that will create a federal SF Bay program under EPA. With the federal budget likely to be cut if Republicans win in November, the focus will be on the omnibus bill that the Democrats hope to pass in the lame duck session. The support would be a direct appropriation from Feinstein's discretionary funding, which will go through EPA or possibly directly to the Refuge, if it's in Interior appropriations.

In follow up to meetings between SFBJV partners and the Senator, the JV was asked to identify priorities. Sandra Scoggin confirmed with partners the list of high-priority shovel ready projects, which was provided to both the Estuary Partnership and the Senator's appropriations staff. While in DC a few days ago, Beth met with Ryan Hunt of her staff to review the list and reconfirm interest in securing additional funding. He is willing to entertain an earmark for our priorities but requested that the Restoration Committee confirm them and coordinate those priorities with the FWS, which JV partners have been doing as background for the discussion.

The discussion focused on confirming Cullinan and Sears Point as recommendations to move forward as a top priority. Marc clarified that this would not detract from the appropriations request for the South Bay for FY 2011. It was also noted that Skaggs Island is getting ready to transfer, and the Refuge will be preparing an estimate of maintenance costs. Sen Feinstein will not be requesting O&M funding, but the JV should take note of the fact that it will be significant and continue to push for increased funding for the Refuge to maintain Skaggs.

*Action: The Restoration Committee agreed to support funding for Cullinan now and for Sears Point when the federal transfer occurs. Beth will communicate with Ryan Hunt to confirm our collective support for this priority in addition to the requested appropriation for the South Bay and the \$7 million EPA request.*

### **2. SFBJV Science Program Overview - Christina Sloop, Ph. D, JV Science Coordinator**

Our new Science Coordinator was officially introduced to the committee. She presented an overview of the SFBJV Strategy. The purpose is habitat conservation, restoration & enhancement to maximize ecosystem function, connectivity & native biodiversity in the face of global change.

#### Challenges

- Effective evaluation of conservation/restoration/enhancement delivery in the biological context
- Tie habitat changes to target species population changes;

- Coordination of development, implementation, and long term tracking of population objectives for focal species;
- Lack of available population data for many focal species;
- Use of surrogates & empirically based models – Are they appropriate?
- Limited funding for monitoring;
- Project success – impact on target species, physical attributes;
- Vital signs – impacts of climate change, pollutants, other stressors;
- Quantification of population changes are difficult to track overall in the Flyway;
  - Challenges of meaningfully ‘scaling up’
- Setting and implementing appropriate & achievable ecological goals for all wetlands
- Climate Change
  - Sea level rise, phenology changes, species movements, community disassociation;
- Tidal Marsh Restoration Trajectory
  - Waterfowl & shorebird species could be harmed if most of the coastal impoundments are converted to tidal salt marsh

### Science Program Goals

- Develop comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan
    - Determine baseline biological information
    - Evaluate conservation/restoration success at local/regional/continental scales
    - Provide information for adaptive management strategies
    - Determine what SF Bay is contributing to waterfowl population goals
    - Determine monitoring & research needs
  - Review and Update Implementation Plan each 5-years
    - Incorporate biological targets for habitats, species, populations
    - Track net landscape change
  - Coordinate tools & empirical data to incorporate climate change in conservation planning
    - SLR models
    - Local scale vegetation change predictions using downscaled models
- Further region-wide conservation planning for wintering sea ducks;
- Establish closer ties to Pacific Coast & Sea Duck JV’s to
- Increase science focus on additional wetland types;
    - Seasonal wetlands, lakes, streams, outer coast
  - Incorporate Sub-tidal & coastal Foci into program;
  - Provide relevant data to help guide decision-making about salt pond conversion ratio.

### Potential Focus Groups

Christina proposes the following focus groups as part of the Science Sub-committee that will address the above goals and challenges in support of the Restoration Committee:

- Tidal marsh restoration–San Pablo & South Bay [*NOTE: There are already working groups for these regions.*]
- Tidal marsh upland ecotone
  - Genetic considerations in restoration
- Climate change
  - Coordinating with/integrating the Bay Area Ecosystem Climate Change Consortium (BAECCC), North Bay Climate Change Initiative (NBCAI), and others
  - Carbon sequestration
- Contaminants
  - Mercury, Selenium, estrogenic compounds, others
- Sub-tidal

- Fisheries, eelgrass, clams, oysters...
- Seasonal wetlands
- Riparian, creeks & lakes
- Shorebirds, herons, egrets
- Waterfowl
- Invasive Species
  - ISP, Cal-IPC, BAEDN
- Wetlands Managers
- Other

#### Science Sub-committee Role

- Inform & guide biological planning, restoration design, habitat delivery, monitoring and evaluation;
- Determine existing research and monitoring efforts;
  - Gather information
  - Help establish priorities
  - Coordinate future efforts
- Guide Adaptive Management;
- Expand SFBJV database – monitoring data module;
- Provide recommendations to restoration committee & management board
  - projects, funding needs, policy needs, etc;
- Provide information to outreach committee
- Other?

#### Science Sub-committee Members and Structure

- 17 ACTIVE members signed up so far
  - Attend regular 2-3 hour meetings every other month
  - Actively help develop and guide the processes of M&E plan development, JV implementation plan update, Define data gaps and relevant research needs, Coordination of focus groups
- 27 Advisors
  - Participants in focus groups
  - Periodic meetings focused on specific topic(s)
- First Sub-committee meeting set for Thursday, Oct 21, 10:30 am – 1:30 pm.

*Action: There was consensus that Restoration Committee enthusiastically supported the above approach.*

### **3. 2010 Summary of Committee Accomplishments & Work plan for 2011 – Beth Huning**

Beth provided a summary of goals and actions that were targeted in the 2010 work plan and beyond, as some of them were multi-year projects. The purpose was to show committee members their accomplishments and to get feedback for recommendations to the management board for discussion at their annual planning retreat. After that retreat, a more definitive work plan for 2011 will be developed.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS in 2010

##### **Project Implementation Goals (Ongoing)**

- Provide guidance to member organizations on project design and planning
- Facilitate creation of project partnerships to accomplish JV acquisition, restoration, and enhancement goals

- Provide forum for technical aspects and funding for projects
- Support short term and long term funding strategy for project implementation
- Provide recommendations to Public Outreach Committee to develop messages and publications for decision-makers
- Conducted 3 decision-maker tours of wetland projects;
- Publications are available for partner use
- Track JV partner projects and provide information to funders
- Integrated SFBJV project tracking data base with California Avian Data Center
- Identified specific funding needs for all “Ready to Go” projects and distributed information to decision-makers
- Reporting on projects completed in 2010 to FWS in November, be sure to update projects as completed in the database if you had any projects or project phases completed this year

### **2010 SFBJV Science Program Goals**

- Complete analysis and update SFBJV seasonal wetlands goals;
  - Analysis complete, goals to be revised in 2011
- Develop monitoring and evaluation plan;
  - Scope of Work developed, plan to be completed I 2011
- Implement project design review program;
  - 1 review completed, several others in process
  - Recommend that this be an ongoing program of the SFBJV
- Complete energetics and carrying capacity modeling (USGS);
  - Work mostly completed; analysis in process and should be completed by end of 2010
- Hire Science Coordinator to coordinate the above and other SFBJV science needs
  - Done - Welcome, Christina Sloop!

### Recommendations for 2011

#### **JV Implementation Plan Update (Multi-year)**

- Continue developing content for update of SFBJV Implementation Plan, *Restoring the Estuary*
  - *RECOMMENDATION: Committee recommended that we revise the scope of work to include climate change impacts on wetlands and species;*
- Incorporate Upland Habitat Goals Project, Subtidal Goals Project recommendations, particularly as they apply to wetland restoration integration
- Determine need and possible role to for possible update of Baylands Habitat Goals Project in FY 2011
  - BAEECC is being funded to update Baylands Goals for climate change
  - *RECOMMENDATION: The Committee wants to be involved in the update planned by BAEECC. They also recommend that we not wait to update our Implementation plan but that we write a chapter on what we know, the importance of addressing climate change, and recommendations for future work.*

#### **Issues Affecting Restoration**

##### Access

- Continue coordination on access and habitat impacts; continue to compile, distribute, and facilitate information on impacts of public access on wildlife and sensitive habitats;
  - *RECOMMENDATION: Committee felt that this is important and that we should put resources into analyzing the studies that have been completed and provide recommended guidelines to managers for access design and distances from sensitive species;*

- Coordinated among San Pablo Bay land managers to map all existing and proposed public access points and trails; presented information to BCDC to discuss planned and future access
  - *NOTE: The South Bay would like to have a similar access mapping tool as was done in San Pablo Bay. While the JV has funding that could provide this, it was recommended that we review the budget and other priorities before committing.*
- Assisted partners with access/permit conflicts
- Tracked and participate in Water Trail Planning; coordinated with JV partners to provide comments on Draft Revised EIR

#### Climate Change

- JV partners and staff took leadership role in establishment of CA LCC
- Established a committee of the JV to integrate with LCC, analyze proposals, and communicate SFBJV priorities
- Participated in and supported program of emerging Bay Area Ecosystem Climate Change Consortium (BAECCC)
- Developed web site to support BAECCC and make climate change information accessible
- Encouraged project managers to plan for climate change in restoration plans

#### **Coordination with Other Planning Processes**

- Coordinate with Upland Habitat Goals project, Subtidal Goals projects
- Participated in both planning efforts
- Integrating the Subtidal Goals into JV project tracking data base and project implementation
- Participated in activities of the Bay Area Watershed Network (BAWN) to ensure SFBJV goals/projects were incorporated and to avoid redundancy

#### **Proposed 2011 Work Plan Activities Continued from 2010**

##### **Project Implementation (Ongoing priorities)**

- Provide guidance to member organizations on project design and planning
- Continue process to develop project priorities
  - Update Project Adoption and Prioritization Criteria for riparian and sub-tidal habitats
- Facilitate creation of project partnerships to accomplish JV acquisition, restoration, and enhancement goals
- Provide forum for technical aspects and funding for projects
- Provide recommendations to Public Outreach Committee to develop publications for DC and JV Leg. Day in Sacramento
- Track JV partner projects and provide information to funders
- Support short term and long term funding strategy for project implementation
- Integrate Subtidal Projects and Habitats into project tracking
- Integrate more monitoring into the database
- Project Design Review Program
- Organize and conduct 3 individual project reviews

#### **JV Science Program**

##### Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

- Working through new Science Committee, complete Monitoring and Evaluation Plan;
  - Identify tasks for expanded scope of work, if necessary
- Develop strategy for implementation of M&E plan

#### Seasonal Wetlands Goals

- Confirm next steps for development of revised goals as per maps and identified acreage
- Establish new goals
- Incorporate seeps and springs? *(This needs to be discussed)*

#### JV Implementation Plan Update

- Refine scope of work – Determine whether to complete initial update with seasonal wetlands and waterfowl changes or wait until Baylands Goals are updated for climate change
  - *RECOMMENDATIONS: 1) Refine the scope for an update, not a revision; revise seasonal wetlands goals, integrate energetics modeling for waterfowl goals, and add chapters on climate change needs/recommendations*
  - 2) *Do not wait for update for completion of Baylands climate change goals. This can come as another update later.*
  - 3) *Add chapter on accomplishments since founding of the SFBJV;*
  - 4) *Need to explain acreage reassessments*
- Integrate Subtidal Goals
  - *RECOMMENDATION: Incorporate a chapter linking the goals and recommending how the JV will implement them.*

#### Climate change

- Continue leadership role on CA LCC steering committee
- Confirm/restructure SFBJV LCC committee
- Continue integration with BAECCC and other emerging climate change groups
  - How - TBD*
- Add climate change chapter to implementation plan

#### Access Impacts

- Develop white paper reviewing and analyzing research on impacts of access on wildlife and habitat and provide recommendations for project planners and regulators *(See above recommendations)*
- Promote information and research findings and opportunities for partner comments re: proposed ferries

#### Restructure Restoration Committee

- Structure new Science Sub-committee to ensure integration with project managers through the JV Restoration Committee
- Determine how Creeks Sub-committee will integrate

#### JV Science Program

Determine priority science/research needs to implement JV goals

#### Other

State Wildlife Action Plan Update/Revision

- *RECOMMENDATION: This is important to track and participate to ensure SFBJV goals are well integrated.*

**2010 Watch List** (NOTE: These were not discussed as time was running short)

- Concord Naval Weapons Station Closure
- Ferries/Ferry Channels
- Port Sonoma
- State Wildlife Grant Implementation

Discussion and additional recommendations:

The discussion focused upon the feasibility of an implementation plan revision rather than update. Marc suggested that we do an analysis of the need for timing of revision accordingly so that the revision could be incorporating new information, an analysis of period of time needed for an appropriate update/revision. Everyone acknowledged that a revision would be a major re-write, would be expensive, an extensive undertaking and would be a longer, more protracted process. We have been working on securing funding and updating seasonal wetlands and energetics modeling for waterfowl for 3 years (recognizing that bonds were frozen for half of that time). If we do an update, are we really addressing the magnitude of the changes?

It was agreed that we need for acknowledging the reality of climate change on what we are trying to accomplish through habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement as well as it's impact on target species. This to be incorporated but we do not need to wait for the Bayland Goals update to be completed if we do a chapter acknowledging this and the work that is in progress. At a minimum, this chapter should describe how to proceed in addressing climate change impacts. It is key to frame the needs, even if we don't have the solutions right now.

It was noted that process is missing from the implementation plan document update habitat goals, but also incorporate process as information is available (sedimentation, mercury, etc.) It is an iterative process to revisit population goals. It was also discussed how to incorporate the Uplands Goals project decision support tool for upland habitat protection in light of the fact that the JV's implement all federal bird conservation plans. Ecotone restoration was also identified as item to incorporate, which has been the focus for many of the more recent NAWCA grants.

Beth suggested that we continue on our trajectory for an update based upon the earlier defined scope of work and suggestions above. We can then do additional updates when further base information is available (i.e. carrying capacity, climate change, seasonal wetland, Baylands Ecosystem Goals, etc).

*ACTION: 1) It was recommended that we move ahead with and update as planned and add a climate change section. Later we can revisit and redo our riparian goals, ultimately leading to an overall revision. It as also recommended that either LCC funding or JV funding be allocated to writing and developing these sections.*

*2) In response to a question about LCC funded projects, Beth will have the link to the funded projects sent to committee members. [NOTE: Here it is: <http://californialcc.org/projects.html> ]*

#### **4. Other Discussion**

##### Funding

Beth announced that the FWS had held back \$42,000 of JV funding for FY10, which got added to our budget near the end of the fiscal year. To be able to amend our contract with PRBO, we needed to account for how it would be spent and timing.

- \$15,000 will go to PRBO to help complete the SFBJV State of the Birds Report, a priority in the JV work plan for 2010
- \$28,000 was identified to spend on access impacts in the next calendar year. Discussion focused on whether this was enough to do all that was identified in the work plan above and what the priorities should be.

The committee was in consensus that the analysis of access studies and providing recommendations is the highest priority, and that it should be a published paper, not just a white paper. Costs for a similar access mapping effort for the South Bay and the coast have yet to be developed. With all of the other priorities, Marc recommended that the funding be used for climate change analysis, but feels there is not enough information to make a recommendation. Brad noted that there are too many cooks in the kitchen regarding climate change, and if we divert the funding, it should go toward producing the chapter for our implementation plan update as described above.

*Recommendation: There was no clear consensus, but these recommendations will be made to the Management Board for discussion in the context of the overall JV priorities and work plan.*

#### **5. Other Agenda Items**

- Beth circulated the JV project map and requested that members review it for any needed corrections. The 2011 JV project map will be finalized by December.

*Action: Send recommended changes to Sandra or Beth by mid October.*

- Project Updates & Announcements were dropped from agenda
- Joel Peter provided a brief history of Lake Merritt and the Oakland Estuary channel and described planned for the remediation under construction.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30pm to Lake Merritt site visit.