

**Alameda Creek Fisheries Work Group
Flows Subcommittee**

April 3, 2007 1:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Teleconference

Draft Meeting Summary

Participants:

Eric Cartwright, ACWD
Thomas Niesar, ACWD
Stuart Moock, representing PG&E
Matt Caton, Zone 7
Jeff Miller, ACA
Brian Sak, SFPUC
Tim Ramirez, SFPUC
Manny da Costa, ACFCWCD
Gary Stern, NMFS
Andy Gunther, CEMAR
Bill Trush, McBain & Trush
Monty Schmitt, NRDC

Announcements, review agenda

None were offered.

Program Manager's Report (Gunther)

Andy noted that as per the discussion on March 1, the project schedule was adjusted to have the draft report delivered by McBain and Trush on April 15, and then have a review and discussion of the draft on May 1. He noted that the report will place recommendations for flow studies within a conceptual framework for steelhead restoration, as flow timing, duration and location are dependent upon a conceptual framework for how those flows will contribute to steelhead restoration.

In addition, the report will also note that based upon data that has been reviewed to date, it appears that Alameda Creek will support a population of fall-run Chinook Salmon. Given the evidence that some chinook have already been observed in the lower creek, restoration planning should consider their presence in the future.

Early data collection projects (Gunther/Trush)

Andy pointed out that members of the Subcommittee had requested that as part of the developing the scope of work for Phase 2, the Consultant should identify if there are key spring time measurements that could be made during the spring of 2007 before Phase 2 officially begins. Consequently, McBain and Trush produced the memo that accompanied the meeting agenda. The memo contained recommendations for turbidity, temperature, flow, and data management.

Bill Trush pointed out that the limited data on turbidity in Alameda Creek suggests turbidity will impact fish growth, and growth of fish is very important for survivorship and return. For example, Niles Canyon could be an important reach for juvenile growth even if it does not provide over-summering habitat, but turbidity would need to be reduced. It is also possible that high flow years, which would be considered “good” for fish, could be compromised due to high turbidity.

Manny noted that Laurel Collins, SFEI, and others employed by the County have been collecting and reviewing sediment data in Alameda Creek. He is presently trying to coordinate these efforts, and has a meeting scheduled for April 11 to discuss these ongoing projects. Andy suggested that Manny distribute the memo attached to the agenda so that his team can see what’s being recommended, and Bill Trush offered to join that meeting via teleconference if it would be valuable.

It was noted that high turbidity of water is a problem for fish, flood control, and water supply. Jeff noted that it would be valuable to have the somebody follow up with USGS to make sure that the turbidity monitoring would continue. Manny indicated he would investigate the feasibility of bringing USGS staff in Hayward into the April 11 meeting.

Bill noted that temperature measurements contain some “holes,” particularly earlier in the spring. Brian Sak noted that SFPUC data collection doesn’t normally start until later due to logistical considerations, but he could work on getting out sooner. Bill noted that while collected spring data is important, we should make sure to get our hypotheses clarified regarding how the data would be used even if it means getting out later this year.

Brian noted that it should not be a problem to get temperature loggers out at the recommended locations (Bill requested that Brian give him any comments with regard to the recommended monitoring locations). Manny offered to provide loggers from the County’s supply to augment the SFPUC supply if necessary. Experimental releases to influence temperature would be valuable, but at present water level in Calaveras is extremely low and SFPUC operations may not be willing to make experimental releases.

It was noted that there is not yet a common data base for work group members. Bill noted that it would be really valuable to have a standard protocol identifying locations by

standard stream distances from the mouth, and Brian suggested that all collected data be geo-referenced for standard storage. It was agreed that this issue should be part of the Phase 2 scope, both for compiling historic data and entering new data.

Brian noted that it is likely that the flow monitoring recommendations can be integrated into the ongoing monitoring SFPUC will be doing, and Jeff Miller offered to make ACA volunteers available to assist with this effort.

Update on BART Weir (Cartwright/Da Costa)

Manny noted that ACWD and ACFCWD will be meeting on April 6 with Gary Stern to discuss the project. These discussions will include presenting NMFS with the rationale for keeping the middle dam in operation, as opposed to previous concepts in which a new pipeline replaced the middle dam.

Items for upcoming meetings

The May 1 meeting will take place at Zone 7 at 1 PM. There will be an effort to arrange a tour of Zone 7 facilities prior to the meeting. The meeting will focus upon the draft report, and Andy requested that written comments be delivered prior to the meeting to give McBain and Trush a chance to present some responses at the meeting.

The teleconference was adjourned at 2 PM