

Cape Mohican Trustee Council
Meeting Minutes 9/2/99
CDFG Office - Cordelia, CA

Council Members Attending: Terri Thomas (NPS); Chuck McKinley (DOI); Don Lollock, John Tarpley, Kathy Verrue-Slater, Mike Sowby (CDFG); Dan Welsh and Marge Kolar (USFWS); Nick Franco (CDPR); NOAA was absent.

Guests: Jim Haas (USFWS)

Administration

- Minutes from the June meeting cannot be accepted - Roger Helm (USFWS) has not completed nor distributed them to the Council. Dan will attempt to get them from Roger.
- All fund allocations received by trustees - yes
- Newspaper fund reimbursement for publicity of public workshop, (\$8,874) not received - inquire with Tammy. Will probably need formal resolution. Will include with CDFG's budget allotment for FY2000.
- Fund investment - Tammy still doing
Dan/Don think interest is approximately \$150,000/year

Restoration Plan Development

- SOW - Cost based on number of projects
- Without Tammy in attendance, no further discussion.

Proposed Project Review

In the absence of Ed Ueber or Katherine Pease (NOAA) - will proceed with discussions but not make any resolutions.

- 1) A Summary of Project Scoring was given by Dan. He provided bar graphs and tables.
 - Hand out - revised summary of project scores.
 - Bar graphs of average scores for fish, bird, wetland projects.
 - Review of process - Dan reviewed how he averaged scores and developed graphics

Criteria reviewed briefly.

- 2) Jim Haas was invited to provide some insight into the project selection and project criteria. He gave us some "formal" training as well as experience from the Cantara Trustee Council. He provided copies of his overheads. A very brief outline follows:
 - "Multi Attribute Decisions Making" = a process for making decisions in the presence of multiple, usually conflicting, criteria.
 1. Steps in decision making
 2. What to do with scores?
 3. Weighing criteria/scores

Recommendation from Jim

Evaluate results of preliminary screening - Is it Acceptable? Defensible?

If project is acceptable and weighing is considered desirable, then:

- Decide on method and develop weights

Discussion of criteria

- Threshold criteria - compliance w/laws - caution here

Don't rank zero w/out legal consult

- Additional criteria - CDFG had difficulty with "cost/benefit"

It was suggested that we delete or add qualifying language. Other trustees considered this criterion to be very subjective and qualitative, not quantitative. Should compare to other similar projects. It was suggested that Pierre DuVair or Steve Hampton (CDFG-OSPR) come to discuss the cost/benefit criterion.

- Rephrase "benefits" as Environmental/Resource.

Weighing of Criteria

Tiered approach?

Rank all criteria in one group or use to separate tiers

The general consensus of the council was to continue evaluating projects with the current set of criteria and with an even weighing system. No weighted scale should be imposed at this time.

3) Use of funds by project recipients to be considered for matching grants

DOI opinion (Chuck)- In general, OPA/NRD co-Trustee funds are allowed to be used to match federal monies. Dispersed funds have to go to state intermediary or tribal or other, not a federal account. However, each federal fund agency has requirements regarding matching.

TASK= Chuck - can non-trustee state agencies hold funds (e.g. Coastal Conservancy)?

TASK= Kathy - OSPR fund fee - 17% - can the State accept intermediary funds and hold temporarily? Is overhead charged in all cases?

4) Crissy Field Update - (Terri)

A question arose as to whether money allocated to an endowment fund for Crissy Field could be left in the NRDAR Fund and earn interest for this project. The NRDAR Fund can be used for this purpose.

5) CDFG Request

\$17K for State AG office fees while working on the settlement, filing and closing out the case once settled. There was a great deal of active discussion. Dan had no disagreement w/payment but to be fair, all agencies should re-evaluate any potential unresolved costs. Chuck mentioned that the State of CA is very important to process. He expressed a concern with legality under OPA and of using NRDA fund for "litigation" costs. (Chuck will investigate

legality of this request) Kathy indicated that this is a joint State/Fed fund and special considerations may apply.

TASK - All - All agencies look for unrecovered assessment costs

6) Individual Project Review

Discuss project review process

- evaluate, list questions
- set deadlines for questions and project revisions
- how (what) much do council vs HLA do? - answer questions/investigate costs NEPA/CEQA compliance

Process

- Screen
- Address questions - council or HLA?
- Prepare Draft RP/EA

All project proposals were discussed. Many missing pieces of information and project updates were identified. No formal decisions or resolutions were voted on as not all trustee representatives were present. However, as a result of our discussion on the projects and the criteria, it was decided that all trustees would rescore the projects. Not all project discussions will be identified here, only those from which action items were generated will be noted.

Bolinas

- Terri is on the Bolinas TAC and will ask Ron Miska of Marin County Parks and Open Space District why this project proposal couldn't be wrapped into the RP for Bolinas Lagoon and get matching funds. We would like to have prioritized sites for cleanup. Possibly decrease fund allocation.

Red Rock

- Don presented an argument for making fair and reasonable movement to properly evaluate the possibility of completing this project. One of the biggest questions regarding this project is the cost of acquiring the island. The Wildlife Conservation Board estimates it would cost between \$15,000 and \$20,000 to conduct a fair market appraisal. Don's proposal was that to act in good faith on one of the originally preferred projects that we consider using interest generated on the trust fund to pay for this appraisal. This will require a resolution and will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Alameda Point - It was suggested that we split the two tern projects and rank them separately.

Next meeting suggested for Friday October 15 or Friday October 29. Time will be 0900 - 1500, bring lunch.

Dan check with Ed's office so he and Don can brief on meeting topics
DFG work on Berkeley Pier project

Next meeting agenda items:

- Reach agreement on dropped and preferred alternatives
- Vote on appraisal for Red Rock
- Review final scores
- Review SOW

All - Revised scores to Dan September 17 or sooner

John - Put out meeting minutes
