

Alameda Creek Fisheries Restoration Workgroup  
Minutes of Meeting  
July 13, 2000  
9:30 am  
Alameda County Public Works Agency  
951 Turner Court  
Hayward, CA

Attendees

Laura Kilgour	ACFCWCD
Emmanuel da Costa	ACFCWCD
Carla Schultheis	ACFCWCD
Eric Cartwright	ACWD
Jim Reynolds	ACWD
Bill DeJager	USACE
Jonathan Ambrose	NMFS
Gordon Becker	CSU Hayward
Jeff Miller	ACA
Brenda Buxton	Coastal Conservancy
Pat Coulston	CDFG
Stuart Moock	PG&E
Lanette Davis	Trihey & Assoc.
Mark Mueller	SFPUC
Josh Milstein	SF City Attorney's Office
Jeff Hagar	HES
Pete Alexander	EBRPD
Richard Wetzig	Citizen
Andy Gunther	AMS
Paul Salop	AMS

Agenda Item No.

1. Update on §1135 Proposal

Eric Cartwright gave an update to the Workgroup on the following subjects:

**ACWD - ACFCWCD Partnership.** The Water District and Flood Control District have developed an agreement that formalizes the co-sponsorship of the proposed §1135 project for fish passage and diversion screens in the lower portion of the Alameda Creek watershed. The agreement must now be adopted by the Boards overseeing the two agencies. The goal of this partnership is to develop a draft §1135 proposal for the Workgroup's review by July 31<sup>st</sup>, and a finalized application by August 31<sup>st</sup>. The partnership calls for a cost-sharing among the two agencies through the Corps' planning process; if the project is approved by all parties, final arrangements for cost-sharing will need to be developed at that time.

**Conceptual Designs for §1135 Structures.** CH2M Hill has been retained for the purpose of developing conceptual designs and cost estimates as part of the §1135 application. Eric informed the group that the designs and cost estimates do not necessarily have to accompany the application, and that the current goal is to have these completed by the end of October. CH2M Hill has begun work on the project and is currently working with the Corps to design the facilities without sacrificing flood control capacity.

Both Pat Coulston (CDF&G) and Jon Ambrose (NFMS) offered the services of their engineering units to assist in the development of these designs. Andy Gunther added that the resulting conceptual design would only be strengthened by peer review. He also mentioned that the incorporation of a viewing area into one of the passage structures, and a research platform where migrating fish can be enumerated or captured, would be valuable to include in the conceptual design of the facilities.

**CALFED's Integrated Storage Investigation (ISI) Program.** Ted Frink was unable to attend today's meeting, but has been in consultation with Eric regarding the ISI Program, a CALFED program investigating different storage options for both surface and groundwater resources. ISI is currently examining barriers to fish passage within existing water supply operations, and there is the possibility of grant opportunities originating from the ISI for Alameda Creek.

## 2. Report on "Jump Start" Meeting

Paul Salop summarized a memorandum (Attachment 1) that outlines the recommendations of the subgroup convened on June 16th to discuss the issue of potential propagation efforts. The subgroup easily reached consensus that some form of artificial assistance in helping establish a "desirable" run of steelhead would benefit the restoration efforts. Two potential methods of artificial propagation were discussed, use of hatcheries and relocation of land-locked smolts below impassable barriers.

The reason behind discussion of this issue so far in advance of structural restoration activities is that there will be a substantial lag time between initiation of propagation activities and time of first return of adults. If these efforts are not begun well in advance of fish passage improvements, less desirable populations will have an equal opportunity to establish a foothold within the watershed. The subgroup therefore recommended activities to begin identification of a suitable genetic stock for propagation as soon as possible.

Populations behind Calaveras and San Antonio Dams are believed to have the best potential to serve as suitable genetic stock. These fish are thought to have been isolated from previous fish-stocking operations for the longest period, and they exhibit indications of anadromy. Josh Milstein commented that San Antonio may offer the best potential as Arroyo Hondo behind Calaveras Dam has been stocked in the past. Jeff Hagar added that populations behind San Leandro Dam could also be investigated as potential genetic stock.

Paul attempted to contact Jennifer Nielsen, who had performed the most recent set of genetic analyses for the County through Hopkins Marine Station, to get a quote for performing more fin clip analyses. She has been unavailable, however. These earlier fin clip analyses had ranged in price from \$50 to \$80 per sample. Based on Jerry Smith's recommendation of 30 to 50 samples per population, an analysis of both San Antonio and Calaveras populations could be expected to range between \$3000 and \$8000 (this estimate doesn't include the cost of collection). Lanette Davis indicated that Tom Taylor believes that he can supply the tissue samples taken previously from Calaveras for further analysis. Brenda Buxton commented that the Coastal Conservancy may be one source of funds to pay for the genetics sampling and analysis. Paul and Andy will continue to try to reach Jennifer to obtain a firm proposal.

### 3. Update on Proposed SFPUC / ACWD Monitoring Efforts

Josh indicated that the SFPUC and ACWD have requested and are reviewing a Statement of Work developed by Tom Taylor and Chuck Hanson to perform hydrological and biological monitoring in the watershed, focusing on the area below the proposed recapture facility and above the proposed §1135 project area. He added that the focus is on Sunol Valley and how to manage water releases to move fish downstream, and that the PUC could perform planned releases to observe how they affect hydrology downstream.

Lanette distributed the draft Statement of Work (Attachment 2) and briefly discussed its contents. The proposed scope recommends collection of a number of data types, including water quality data, genetic information, fish and macroinvertebrate surveys, and habitat conditions under varying flow regimes. Please forward any comments on the SOW to Tom Taylor prior to the next Workgroup meeting.

Josh also distributed a timeline for the proposed enhancement project / recapture facility, and the proposed dam removals / modifications of Sunol and Niles Dams. He added that one barrier that may need to be overcome in removing the dams is that they may be targeted by historical preservationists as worthy of protection. The PUC has begun the process of historical documentation of the dams in hope that the removals will proceed.

The discussion then turned to other activities within the watershed that may have bearing on Workgroup activities. Richard Wetzig informed the Workgroup that the FCD will be resuming desilting operations below Decoto Road during the Fall of 2000. He also mentioned that the FCD is currently negotiating with USGS to perform a study of sediment sources within the watershed. Andy felt that this study may assist the Workgroup by filling in data gaps identified within the watershed previously, and requested that a presentation on the USGS study be added to a future Workgroup meeting agenda.

Bill DeJager mentioned that the government is in discussions with Cargill to purchase salt ponds on the Bay margins near the confluence of Alameda Creek. If the sale does proceed, a larger restoration project on the lowest sections of the creek is then more likely, including the possible modification or removal of some existing levees. Carla Schultheis added that the FCD has prepared an application for a 205(j) grant that was highly ranked locally, and is now being considered by EPA.

Jeff Miller commented that, if possible, the use of volunteers in data collection efforts would be an excellent method of involving schoolkids, interested volunteers, and the general public. He added that in San Geronimo Creek (Marin County), people even donated construction materials and labor in efforts to modify a barrier to passage.

### 4. CDF&G Grant Opportunities

Pat Coulston had invited Marty Gingras, a grants specialist with CDF&G, to attend the Workgroup meeting to discuss funds available through CDF&G and how best to go about pursuing them. Marty was unfortunately unable to attend the meeting. Pat therefore addressed a few of the funding opportunities and recommended the Workgroup contact Marty with potential projects to see how best to package the requests.

As discussed at previous Workgroup meetings, SB271 proposals are expected to be due by May of 2001. Another funding opportunity available through CDF&G is the Coastal Salmon Recovery Program, which makes Federal funds available through the CDF&G. The proposal

due date is August 11<sup>th</sup>, so any proposal would have to be completed soon. Pat mentioned that proposals with quick implementation (in the 2000-2001 timeframe) will be given higher priority. Paul recommended developing a proposal to cover the fish sampling and genetics analysis discussed earlier. Eric added the possibility of submitting a proposal to cover costs associated with future work of CH2M Hill in developing the designs and costs for fish passage facilities and diversion screens.

Andy recommended developing a structure for the Workgroup to apply for grants, so that competing proposals are not developed for the same grants, and all potential sources of funding are pursued. Brenda suggested convening another subgroup to discuss this topic. Andy and Paul agreed to schedule the meeting and, based on input from Workgroup members, develop a list of projects requiring funding and a list of potential funding opportunities.

## 5. Update on Stonybrook Creek

Manny da Costa gave an update to the Workgroup on activities that have occurred to-date on Stonybrook Creek. The County Survey Department surveyed the creek up to the second Palomares Road crossing. Richard and Manny then performed a survey of the culvert at the first road crossing and sent the results to Jon Mann of NMFS for review. Based on this information, Jon determined that the culvert formed an impassable barrier and recommended removing the culvert entirely.

Subsequently, Manny requested a Scope of Work from Michael Love and Associates to analyze fish passage at all nine road crossings on Stonybrook Creek. As part of the Scope, the consultant will review passage and recommend alternatives where problems exist. The lowermost culvert in the system is the responsibility of Caltrans, who have their own funding to modify if deemed necessary. Pat mentioned that the timing of the passage analysis could match up with the next funding cycle for the SB271 grants in May.

## 6. Agreements / Action Items

1. Paul Salop will contact Jennifer Nielsen to obtain a quote for performing future genetic analyses.
2. Any comments on the Taylor / Hanson Statement of Work should be forwarded to Tom Taylor prior to the next meeting.
3. Paul Salop will schedule the meeting of the grant subgroup.
4. Requests for specific projects requiring funding assistance and recommendations for potential funding opportunities should be forwarded to Paul by July 26<sup>th</sup>.

## 7. Items for Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Workgroup was scheduled for Friday August 18<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 am at the ACPWA Turner Court offices. Possible agenda items include (1) an update on the results of the grant subgroup; (2) distribution of the draft application letter for the \$1135 project; (3) a discussion of information dissemination options for Workgroup activities (including use of a web site); (4) a presentation of the USGS sedimentation study; (5) a discussion of the process for contacting private landowners within the watershed; (6) a discussion of comments to the Taylor / Hanson Statement of Work; and (7) an update on "jump start" activities. The agenda will be pared down as needed to fit within the meeting time constraints.