

**Alameda Creek Fisheries Restoration Workgroup
Minutes of Meeting
October 18, 2000
9:30 am
Alameda County Public Works Agency
951 Turner Court
Hayward, CA**

Attendees

Bill Bennett	DWR
Eric Cartwright	ACWD
Pat Coulston	CDFG
Emmanuel da Costa	ACFCWCD
Bill DeJager	USACE
Ted Frink	DWR
Michael Ferry	Graduate Student
Chris Gray	Supervisor Haggerty's Office
Andy Gunther	AMS
Darryl Hayes	CH2MHill
Jim Horen	Zone 7
Laura Kilgour	ACFCWCD
Chet Lelio	Alameda County Fish and Game Commission
Jeff Miller	ACA
Josh Milstein	SF City Attorney's Office
Stuart Moock	PG&E
Jim Reynolds	ACWD
Paul Salop	AMS
Carla Schultheis	ACFCWCD
Gary Stern	NMFS
Dan Suyeyasu	Environmental Defense
Richard Wetzig	ACFCWCD

Agenda Item No.

1. Announcements

Jeff Miller informed the group of two dam removals currently underway in California. The first, Saeltzer Dam on Deer Creek, a tributary to the upper Sacramento River, began earlier this month. Demolition of the second, Matilija Dam on Matilija Creek, a tributary to the Ventura River, also began this month and will likely take twenty years to complete.

2. Update on 1135 Proposal

Eric Cartwright informed the Workgroup that since the last meeting, the ACFCWCD and ACWD had submitted an application letter to the USACE to request initiation of a §1135 project in Alameda Creek to address fish passage and protection issues in the flood control channel area (full letter available on website). The initial indication is that funds are available in this fiscal year to complete the Preliminary Restoration Plan (PRP), an initial \$10k study of the proposed project to be performed by the Corps. Funding for the next phase, the Ecosystem Restoration Report (ERR) is, however, questionable for the current FY. Jeff Miller inquired as to whether the ERR could be initiated with “outside” funds instead of relying on Corps funding only. Bill DeJager responded that he was uncomfortable with the idea of committing to the study without having secured federal funding to ensure it could be completed without interruption.

Representatives of the ACWD, ACFCWCD, USACE, and CH2MHill met at the Corps office in San Francisco to discuss details of the §1135 proposal. As the total USACE contribution to the project would be limited to a maximum of \$5 million and project costs are anticipated in the \$9 million range, other sources of funding will be needed. One possible source would be through initiation of a USACE §206 project in addition to the §1135 in the channel. Though the two programs are not intended to overlap on the same project, the §1135 could potentially be targeted at USACE structures in the channel, while §206 could be used to rework non-Corps structures. Bill indicated that the timeline for a §206 project would be similar to that of the §1135.

Eric mentioned that the proposal to the Corps was accompanied by letters of support from both the Coastal Conservancy and Alameda Creek Alliance. Jeff Miller added that several other interested parties had also promised letters of support if needed (including local supervisors and congressional representatives).

Eric told the Workgroup that the ACFCWCD and ACWD are now in the process of working on conceptual designs and cost estimates with CH2MHill. Laura added that the timeline for construction to be initiated may be delayed by a year if progress on the ERR is delayed due to budgetary constraints. There is, however, the chance that funds allocated to other Corps

projects may not be used each year, thereby freeing up funds that could then be allocated to Alameda Creek.

3. Conceptual Designs for Fish Passage Facilities and Diversion Screens

Darryl Hayes of CH2MHill gave a presentation to the Workgroup outlining his findings to-date on the passage issues in the §1135 project area. Darryl has met with the participating local sponsors, USACE, and has toured the project area with Jon Mann of NMFS. His recommendations for passage facilities and diversion screens were developed with the following assumptions in mind:

- 1) The existing structures will need to be retrofitted without greatly sacrificing the flood control capability of the creek;
- 2) Only the flow needs of the passage facilities themselves were considered in conceptual designs, not the water needs downstream of the lowermost inflatable dam;
- 3) Historical peak flows in the channel are well below design capacity (52,000 cfs design flow vs. <25,000 cfs maximum recorded flow).

At this point in time, Darryl has identified three types of passage structures that may be used within the project area:

- 1) vertical slot
 - self regulating
 - low maintenance
 - good for fluctuating water surfaces
 - requires minimum 3' pool at entry and exit points
 - approximate 1' drop between pools
 - flows of 5-35 cfs normal
- 2) pool and weir
 - requires gate control
 - not suitable for unregulated flows
 - flows of 5-50 cfs normal
- 3) Alaska steppass with false weir
 - good for steelhead
 - high maintenance
 - compact size

- can be operated under low flow conditions

At the lower rubber dam, Darryl developed a conceptual design including an Alaska steepass in combination with a vertical slot structure. This design would function under a number of flow regimes. At the middle rubber dam / BART weir location, Darryl presented a plan that included a low flow channel below the dragon's teeth, excavation for a pond below the weir, a vertical slot structure at the weir, and a pool and weir structure at the middle rubber dam. Like the situation at the lower dam, this will also allow passage at a number of different flow regimes. At the upper rubber dam, Darryl presented designs for a pool and weir structure with a curb wall below the dam to impound water below the structure.

In response to a question, Darryl indicated that a single structure that would provide passage around the BART weir and the middle and upper rubber dams is a possibility. However, one structure that would also bypass the lower dam is problematic in that steelhead have shown the ability to pass the lower inflatable dam and could therefore miss the entry point to the passage structure on their in-migration.

For the issue of diversion screens, Darryl developed his concepts using criteria for avoiding steelhead fry entrainment. All screens were assumed to have automatic cleaning systems as regular maintenance of diversion screens is required.

Based on the concepts presented above, Darryl developed the following cost estimates:

Structure at lower rubber dam	\$1.5 million
Structure at BART weir / middle rubber dam	\$2.9 million
Structure at upper rubber dam	\$1.4 million
Diversion screening	\$4.2 million

Darryl then opened up the floor for questions. Pat Coulston informed the Workgroup of his impression that the first three items above (passage structures) are required to open up the watershed for a steelhead run; the fourth item (diversion screening) is the most expensive item and would only serve to make the run better. He expressed his opinion that he doesn't want to see the project stall if this additional cost serves to place the overall project in jeopardy. Gary Stern indicated that he believes the screens are an essential component of any restoration plan; he inquired if there would be any cost difference if the screens were designed for smolts instead of fry, or if some of the diversions could be combined to eliminate the need for some of the screens. Darryl indicated that structural changes required to eliminate diversions would probably outweigh the costs of the screens themselves.

Paul Salop asked if the costs for screening had incorporated the possible re-operation of the water supply operations (i.e., some diversions closed off during migratory periods). Darryl indicated that the \$4.2 million figure included screens at each diversion. Eric added that part of Chuck Hanson's Scope of Work is to determine what operational changes can be made and that includes which if any diversions can be taken out of use during these periods. Ted indicated that there are programs through Calfed to support diversion screening, but that they had not yet been applied outside of the Central Valley. Eric added that the ACWD and ACFCWCD will continue working with USACE to look into additional funding opportunities, and that Darryl is in the process of investigating other funding mechanisms through Calfed.

4. Update on Grants Applications

Andy Gunther informed the Workgroup that we should receive the responses to grant proposals submitted to both the CDFG California Coastal Salmon Recovery Program and the Watershed Assistance Grants within the next month. Additionally, since the last Workgroup meeting, the County had also submitted one proposal to the Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program. The Coastal Conservancy grant was developed to cover expenses associated with genetics sampling, smolt trapping, and \$500k to assist with construction (the latter amount would not be available under the third FY of the grant). Carla Schultheis added that the ACFCWCD had also requested funds from the Conservancy to support the rework of the creek mouth and levees.

5. ACWD / SFPUC Proposed Special Studies

At the August Workgroup meeting, one of the discussions centered on a proposed joint study funded by the ACWD and SFPUC to investigate flow requirements, migration timing, and miscellaneous issues for a potential steelhead run. Eric indicated that, based on feedback received from Workgroup members, a Scope of Work had been finalized for Chuck Hanson. Both the ACWD and SFPUC have approved funding for the study, and fieldwork is expected to begin shortly on what is anticipated to be an eighteen-month study.

6. Steelhead Festival

Andy informed the Workgroup that funding to support the 2001 Steelhead Festival had been included in two of the grant submittals. The 2000 Festival was largely organized by Jeff Miller and attracted several hundred runners in 5k and 10k events and had displays from various

agencies involved in the watershed. Andy suggested that restoration plans could potentially be a display item at the 2001 event. Andy requested that anyone wishing to volunteer to serve on the Festival steering committee should contact Jeff. Richard Wetzig and Laura volunteered to serve on the steering committee.

7. Update on Stonybrook Creek

Manny da Costa informed the Workgroup that Mike Love is nearing completion of the field work portion of his analysis of road crossings and fish passage issues in Stonybrook Creek. In general, he has found culverts to be undersized and that large sediment loads (boulders and larger substrate) have built-up over time upstream of the culverts. He estimates \$200k to \$300k per culvert to rework them. Manny added that of the culverts in the channel, most are the responsibility of the ACFCWCD, but that at least three remain in private hands.

8. Agreements / Action Items

- 1) Comments on Darryl Hayes' presentation should be forwarded to Darryl, Laura, or Eric.
- 2) Anyone with knowledge of additional grant / funding opportunities should contact Paul.
- 3) Anyone wishing to volunteer for the Steelhead Festival steering committee should contact Jeff Miller.
- 4) Anyone wishing to attend the watershed tour (see Items for Next Meeting below) or with contacts they would like to invite should contact Laura.

9. Items for Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Workgroup was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, December 8th at 9:30 am at the ACPWA Turner Court offices. The schedule will consist of a morning meeting to discuss relevant items, and an afternoon tour of the watershed for Workgroup members or other interested parties. Possible agenda items for the morning meeting include: 1) update on the §1135 process; 2) discussion of the ACFCWCD sediment source identification project; 3) an update on the ACWD and SFPUC monitoring activities; 4) update on grant requests; and 5) discussion of fish transport and applicable permits.