

## Meeting Minutes/Follow up Thoughts

### STEWARDSHIP PLANNING WORKGROUP

**Date:** April 18, 2005  
**Time:** 9:30 AM – 12:30 PM  
**Place:** Santa Clara Valley Water District  
**Room:** A-143  
**Next Meeting:** May 16, 2005, (Details to be provided as soon as possible)  
**Website:** [http://www.valleywater.org/\\_WMI/Stewardship\\_plan](http://www.valleywater.org/_WMI/Stewardship_plan)

### Attendance List

External Stakeholders	SCVWD Staff	Consultant Team
Luisa Valiela, US EPA, SPW co-chair	Sarah Young, SPW co-chair & Project/Contract Manager	Clayton Creager, Tetra Tech, Prime Contractor
Jessie Denver, City of San Jose	Jason Christie, West Valley Program Support Unit Manager	David Early, DCE
Libby Lucas, CA Native Plant Society	Sara Duckler, Watershed Planning Unit	Isabelle Min, DCE
Kristy McCumby-Hyland, City of Sunnyvale	Ryan Heacock, Environmental Planning Unit	
Richard McMurtry, Regional Water Quality Board	Brian Mendenhall, Watershed Planning Unit	
Trish Mulvey, CLEAN South Bay	Terry Neudorf, Guadalupe Watershed Support Unit	
Alice Ringer, WMI and SPW support	Louisa Squires, Watershed Planning Unit	
Pam Sturner, San Francisquito Watershed Council (by phone)		

### Action items

#### Tetra Tech Team

1. Consult with Jeff Micko and Scott Akin to get their input on the vision statement for water supply for Alamos.
2. Draft visioning chapters taking into considerations of issues/discussions raised. Due May 6.
3. Draft a proposal for the ranking process/methodology for SPW members to review before the next meeting.

### Stakeholders

1. Submit specific comments on the draft Vision Statements ASAP to Isabelle Min ([isabelle@dceplanning.com](mailto:isabelle@dceplanning.com)) for incorporation into Draft Visioning Chapters.
2. Richard McMurtry to submit text for gravel augmentation as one of the potential projects.
3. Libby Lucas to submit a specific project idea for water quality, to suggest that the Regional Board assess the problem of Chloramine entering the creeks through the stormwater system.
4. Hold the date for the May 16 SPW meeting, which could be an all-day meeting.

### I. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and a sign-in sheet was passed around. The Co-Chairs (Luisa Valiela and Sarah Young) started the meeting.

### II. Meeting Objectives

Sarah Young first clarified that this is a part of the staff-level visioning exercise, based on the refined approach as outlined below.

WMUs	Approach to Visioning
Stevens Creek	Visioning Workshop Held Feb. 2 as Basis for GIS-based Illustration
Alamos/Calabazas	Interviews/Meeting Apr. 18 as Basis for GIS-based Illustration
Baylands/San Francisquito related Units	No Visioning
Other Units	Draft Visioning Statements

Sarah further clarified that the draft visions developed through the Watershed Stewardship Planning provide a good foundation for better informed decisions to be made by the appropriate authorities, when opportunities arise.

The three working drafts are the result of the Visioning Workshops, Interviews (some still being conducted), some of the consultants' reflection on historical and existing conditions and some field work data. They are provided to seed the discussion for Consultant Team's consideration in drafting the visioning chapters to be released on May 6. She then turned the discussion to David Early.

### **III. VISION STATEMENTS**

The working drafts proposed by the Consultant Team for Alamitos, Calabazas and Stevens Creeks were handed out. SPW members provided comments along the following questions:

1. Do the vision statements (the statements in bold) cover all topics needed for that WMU, or are there additional topics that should be added?
2. Is the list of potential projects sufficient?
3. General comments to revise the vision were also provided.

### **GENERAL SUGGESTIONS FOR DEVELOPING VISIONS FOR ALL WMUs**

1. Need a coherent vision statement. There was discussion on whether the vision should propose to balance the multiple topics and objectives. There was agreement that the vision should present all of what we think should happen for the WMU, but should be coherent and should not setup an unsolvable conflict. Implementation is where we include discussion of the balance.
2. Use a parallel architecture for all vision statements. Consider creating a matrix of all categories for the 3 WMUs to show the specific vision for the WMU for each category. If the WMU does not have a specific vision for a certain category, simply indicate 'not applicable'. This way, not only readers can get a sense that all categories are considered in the process, they can also get a sense about specifics for each WMU.
3. Consider including the following categories:
  - a. Watershed Health
    - Stable, sustainable fish populations
    - Stable, vegetated banks
    - Water quality (addressing pollutants of concern)
  - b. Water Supply
  - c. Flood Protection
  - d. Open Space and Recreation
4. Include a well-edited, more complete, one-page synthesis of key historical and existing features/issues of the WMU as a way to explain the context of the visioning. Also, it needs some wordsmithing (e.g., less use of the word 'natural' in the Stevens Creek background info).
5. Use the term "example projects" rather than "potential projects", since the list is not an exhaustive list.
6. Some vision statement details are specific project ideas, and should be moved to the list of projects.
7. Consider adding a vision statement that includes flora and fauna beyond the stream banks.

### **A. ALAMITOS VISION**

**Suggestions on Background** (paragraph on first page):

1. Include the extensive streamside trail system, as part of the existing conditions for this WMU.
2. Address to what extent the reservoir is preventing coarse sediment replenishment (in addition to preventing fish passage).

**Suggestions for Additions**

1. Add/Incorporate a statement regarding gravel.

2. Include temperature as part of what's needed for fish populations.
3. Existing water supply uses are maintained.
4. Human infringements are controlled.
5. Include something about natural stream courses (such as acquiring open space and re-engineering it to allow natural stream morphology).

### **Comments on Statements Related to Dams**

The topic of dams really should be about fish passage or fish habitat. The real vision should be to have maintained and enhanced fish populations. How that will be done or what's needed to make that happen could consider the following options:

1. Removal of fish barriers
2. Provide Adequate coarse gravel
3. Provide adequate flow or shading for appropriate temperature to support coldwater fishery
4. Manage or remove non-native species
5. Incorporate other environmental attributes (similar to FAHCE requirements)

**Suggestion:** Rewrite the first vision topic to be about fish populations. Include native vegetated banks and trail setbacks here as an attribute for fish habitat, but also make it a separate vision topic (redundancy is ok).

### **Suggestions on Statements Related to Banks**

1. Include native vegetation.
2. Trails should be set back to allow vegetation to act as a filter.
3. Vision should be for healthy (self-sustaining or regenerating), continuously vegetated banks.
4. Compile a plant list for each of the 15 WMUs to include in the Stewardship Plans (coordinate with the WRPC since they are also developing plant lists).

### **Suggestions on Mercury**

1. Change the vision to reduce mercury (not free of mercury); i.e., reduce the biological availability of mercury.
2. Consider how to best address mercury while balancing other interests (for example, how to harmonize competing interests of fish passage restoration and fish predation with mercury dynamics).
3. Need to discuss the Lake Almaden issue more clearly.

### **Suggestions on Open Space**

1. Add "allow for natural stream courses".
2. Keep water in the development (onsite retention basins), as part of better stormwater management.
3. Address open space for non-urban use (protected habitat) as well as open space for land uses (regulation of private open space).
4. Alternatively, simply call it creation of new open space and public access opportunities.

### **Suggestions on Recreation**

1. Consider discussing the minuses of multi-use trails (such as it being a hazard). Or, since there are options for multi-use trails that are not a hazard, include those options.

### **Suggestions on Flood Protection Related Issues**

1. Use the term flood protection (not flood control). Use the phrase 'maintain and improve'.
2. Consider adding a bold statement on removing FEMA flood insurance requirements. The vision should include finding a way to eliminate this WMU from the FEMA-mapped zone requiring flood insurance. The streamside property owners here are strongly against having to pay for flood insurance. The vision should be a significantly reduced flood risk for developed areas: one way is to eliminate the FEMA-mapped areas, another way is raise the elevation, and another way is to modify the channel to adequately convey the 100-year flood.

### **Suggestion on Water Supply Related Statements**

1. Calero Reservoir is maintained for water supply. Consult with District staff to get input on the vision statement on water supply.
2. Clarify what Almaden Reservoir currently functions as (water supply vs. flood protection).
3. Address mercury in the Almaden-Calero connection.
4. Add to the bold sentences: Maintain reservoirs as source of local water supply. Stream as PERL area. (??)
5. Add to the bold sentences: Conjunctive use (e.g., adding water upstream for habitat, then withdrawing it downstream for water supply).

### **B. CALABAZAS VISION**

#### **Suggestions for Additional Vision Topics/ Vision Revisions**

1. Expand on the first topic to say 'Expand the natural function of hardened earth channels'.
2. Add a vision topic for flood protection. Enhance the bullets in the existing vision topic and move it to the new vision topic for flood protection, or repeat them in the flood protection topic.
3. Refer to grade control/engineered structures generically.
4. The fishery component is marginal. However, are there other species that should be included in the vision?
5. Add the rest of the categories that were in the Alamitos Vision.
6. It was explained that tidal influence is not included in the vision, because discussion of tidal influence will be in the Baylands chapter. So the Baylands chapter will address the fluvial issue.
7. The trails vision should include something about linkages and coordination with other cities/agencies working on trail systems (e.g., County trails). However, it should acknowledge the constraints of agencies working on private property ownership issue.
8. Add a vision for geomorphic stability (prevention of bed erosion).
9. Delete the word 'extensive' in the topic on trails.

### **C. STEVENS VISION**

#### **Suggestions for Additional Vision Topics/ Vision Revisions**

1. In the last project listed for the topic on natural earth channels, include overwintering habitat.
2. The topic on geomorphically stable channels should be added as a topic for the Alamitos and Calabazas Vision.
3. Add to the list of projects: Conduct a gravel augmentation project (Richard McMurtry will provide the text).
4. Include in the vision a geomorphic analysis of the Permanente Bypass Channel with respect to flow (including sediment removal issues, flood protection issues).
5. Add coordination between Cities on trails.
6. Information on fish ladders will be included in the fine-scale section of the Stevens Stewardship Plan.

## **IV. RANKING METHODOLOGY**

Sarah clarified that the Plans are planning tools for District staff, for future budget discussions and grant applications or partnership. There is a general appreciation of ranking process from the Coyote Plan, which ranked items for each of District's 4 Objectives, while recognizing the limitations of the approach, mainly attributed to its complexity, and not able to distinguish between programmatic and site-specific projects.

It may not be of great value at this stage to come up with a system trying to quantifying all interests or benefits areas (especially in absence of a formal monitoring program).

The group provided the following comments for the Team's considerations:

1. Recognize there are other prioritization schemes, including:
  - District's Trails program prioritization process
  - District's IWRP for water supply
  - District's Environmental Enhancement Program
  - District's upcoming Watershed Monitoring Program
  - Upcoming IRWMP's prioritization for watershed projects
2. Recognize that projects need to be ranked at different geographic scales:
  - a. At the WMA -level, the ranking process:
    - Could be either qualitative or quantitative (e.g., high, medium, low, or some kind of grouping)
    - Does not need to produce a SINGLE list that would actually prioritize for implementation (but could be multiple lists). But it should give some ideas for what's most important or relative sequencing (things that need to happen first) within each WMA.
    - Does need to rank which data gaps needed to be filled first, second, or later (e.g., grouping)
  - b. At the WMU -level, the ranking process:
    - Could incorporate elements of Coyote Plan model which allows projects with multiple benefits to be come out (quantitatively or qualitatively) favorably
    - Could weigh each benefit or interest differently from WMU to WMU
    - Provide a more comprehensive, and objective system for ranking major capital projects with.

Libby Lucas came up with a specific project idea related to water quality, and committed to submit (see Action Items).

### **Next Steps**

The Project Team will reflect on the discussions, and provide a working draft to seed the upcoming discussion on the ranking process/methodology before May 16 SPW meeting/workshop on ranking.

### **IV. West Valley Existing Conditions (Chapters 7-10)**

This review is mostly for factual edits so we can get a head start on making those. For bigger issues that need discussion, we will discuss these big issues as part of the review in June. Factual edits and comments on big issues should be submitted to Alice Ringer (aringer@valleywater.org).

### **V. Schedule**

The Ranking Workshop and SPW meeting will be combined into one meeting/workshop, on May 16. It may be a full day meeting. The schedule for the draft project ranking will be revised. For the Stevens Creek field day, it was decided that rather than hold another fieldwork day on Stevens Creek just for stakeholders, the Co-Chairs will look for other opportunities for observing fieldwork (possibly in June). This will give the Project Team the maximum time available to complete the draft Plans. The revised Schedule has been posted to the SPW website.