Date: Fri Time: 8:30-10:20am Session: Restoration BMPs
Moderator: John Clement Note-taker: Susan Kenzle
Notes From Discussion:

1. The order the RFA is done, does that have effect?
    a. The order isn't factored in per Aaron. The system picks the variable, there is no way to subjectively control the parameters. Random forest uses genie criteria. There are many possibilities other than Random Forest.
2. Bacteria and riparian forest – dog parks and access – will they be looked at?
    a. Scoop the poop campaign – waste bags and can. This helps nutrient issue especially in Bull Creek Park.
    b. Narrowing access? This won't help. Dogs are random actors, they go where they want, including the water. Riparian areas increased canopy cover – UV helps with bacteria. There are no clear answers.
3. What other tools do people use to evaluate riparian area?
    a. More soil emphasis is needed but this is difficult per Ana. You can't use time consuming activities due to large number of sites sampled. Soil moisture correlated with soil organic carbon. Soil infiltration rate will be tested. Temporally, the soil structure should change and they expect infiltration rate will change also. Also looking at studying soil nitrogen. Nitrification and denitrification. Our dry soils may preclude this.
    b. Most data taken during severe drought, surface area is super dry and creeks not running during last 5 years. Change too wetter weather may help with soils and measurement of soil variables/parameters. We thought the presence of hydrophytic veg would be a signal but all the sites have them. Diversity and vigor/measure of cover of hydrophytic veg may be a helpful study.
    c. What about other indicator species? Ana will look into it.
    d. Our studies are as good as could be hoped for. There will always be dry and wet periods.
4. Going from technical, scientific to something practical for landowners? We developed a citizen monitoring protocol that is on-line that doesn't need special equipment but still requires knowledge of plants.
5. Have we looked at Native vs invasives in the scoring? The citizen version has that and we have that data but haven't used it for scoring. We use the term invasive too broadly; not all foreign species are invasives. Species presence is better than nothing. Volunteer groups can be too enthusiastic with invasive removal, creating moonscapes and that is problematic. Each invasive species has its own particular impact and we don't know that for each species yet.
6. Our goals are inclusive, don't include for wildlife, for particular. We are a drainage utility and cannot extend into those areas but encourage other groups to work in those area. We don't penalize our functional score for diversity for wildlife for instance.
7. We encourage low impact activities by volunteers. Huge brush piles created by volunteers are problematic for us in terms of clean up. We want to focus on restoration rather just elimination of all invasives.

8. Would just measuring plant diversity be a good measurement? No because you can have high diversity with invasive species.