

AGENDA
Freshwater Wetland Restoration Strategy Meeting

Tuesday, August 3rd, 2010
1:30 PM
RIDEM, Room 280 C1/C2

I. Welcome

II. Review of URI Process and Actions in Phase 1 and Phase 2

III. Wetland Restoration Strategy Development Tool

IV. Discussion of Restoration Goals

- Do the 4 recommended goal areas leave out any important points?
- Should the goals be different for different parts of the state? (i.e. urban/rural/suburban)
- State vs. local goal setting/priorities
- How can state/local goals be better aligned?

V. Discussion of Geographic Scope

- At what scale is restoration best planned and implemented?
- Statewide vs. Watershed? Is a watershed the appropriate unit?

VI. Discussion of Site Identification Methods

- Should we use a comprehensive or selective approach?
- How best to ID potential restoration sites?
- What methods can be done by volunteers vs. professionals?
- Where do we have data limitations?

VII. Discussion of Prioritization (expected to be the subject of further future discussion)

- prioritization at the state level
- prioritization at the watershed level

VIII. Conclusion

Next Meeting:

- Tuesday, August 31, 2010 @ 1:30 PM

Issues Raised at Kick-off meeting

MAPPING/SITE ID: { Mapping or other methods to identify restoration opportunities, noting the status of mapping on a watershed basis }

- How to make method more efficient/targeted
- Is 1939 the right basis for comparison?
- Is this the appropriate method statewide?
- Priority for protection
- Mapping broadly
- Involve locals to ID and gain practical knowledge (help assess “do-ability”)
- Rapid assessment model with watersheds
- Are watersheds the right unit/scale?
- Private properties, restoration potential - need to pull opportunities/agencies together
- NRCS can’t do outreach directly to private property owners – watersheds can help with reaching out
- Take into account what is healthy around the wetlands
- Bias to urban or degraded areas?

PRIORITIZATION/ASSESSMENT: { Assessment approaches to allow prioritization of potential restoration sites }

- Goal setting/objective
- Does the method translate well to less degraded sites, but still benefit of restoration to habitat? (urban vs. rural)
- Limited resources
- Could vary per watershed priorities (and per wetland types)
- Mechanism/team approach to review assessment, but open enough to take advantage of opportunities that arise (not too rigid, open to opportunities, i.e. funding, cultural, public interest)
- Start with those easy to pick out (stream continuity, hydro alterations, dams, floodwalls) – can assess with aerials, easy to get to
 - Volunteers can help with this b/c all road accessible
 - Need support for volunteer projects (\$\$)
 - Need more intensive study for higher level of detail
- Figure out who is using the tool ahead of time (purpose before design) and the questions
 - Want people to use it
 - Ask the users what do you need to do and how could you do it better with a tool?
- Bring in DOT early on
- Set goals to provide clarification – state level/watershed level