

Pilarcitos Creek Restoration Workgroup Meeting
Monday September 10, 2007, 13h00 – 15h00
Coast side County Water District
766 Main Street, Half Moon Bay

Attendees: Adam Parris (PWA), Bob Feldman (CCWD), Carolann Towe (RCD), Cathleen Brennan (CCWD), Chris Mickelsen (CCWD), Ellen Levin (SFPUC) by tel, Jack Foley (SAM), Jane Lavelle (SFPUC), Jim Salerno (SFPUC), Joe Guistino (CCWD), Julie Casagrande (San Mateo County), Kellyx Nelson (RCD) by tel, Meredith Manning (MROSD), Mike Liquori (Sound Watershed Consulting), Patrick Rutten (NOAA) by tel, Susan Danielson (Surfrider and Project Blueprint), Tim Frahm (PCAC and Farm Bureau), Tim Ramirez (SFPUC)

Agenda:

1. Open comments
2. Draft Watershed Assessment: revisions to date and next steps- PWA
3. Data Gaps: status and next steps- PWA
4. IWMP Goals and Objectives- PWA
5. September 29th public workshop
6. MOU signatories- Kellyx

Workgroup Meeting Summary:

Open Comments

No open comments

Draft Watershed Assessment: revisions to date and next steps- PWA

Adam Parris thanked the group for getting comments back to him, he received comments from PCAC, PUC, CCWD, NRCS, State Parks, POST, Fish and Game and Carolann Towe. Input consisted of editorial corrections, added info, good questions and requests for additional info. CCWD noted that two wells are being decommissioned. Tim Frahm provided a summary of progress and projects which had occurred to date relative to the original plan and suggested looking into impacts of land use in the watershed. Carolann Towe provided water quality data and some editorial corrections.

Adam assured the group that the revised draft will be thorough, complete and scientific but PWA will need to postpone the finalized draft until after the fish habitat assessment and electrofishing. End of October is the proposed deadline. KNelson asked for clarification on what PWA intended to present to the public at the workshop. AParris suggested the draft watershed assessment with the editorial errors corrected as the only revision. No new data will be added. TRamirez requested nothing new be posted until updates were complete. TFrahm asked if there was value to the group in compiling all the comments received by PWA and distributing to the workgroup/public review, as he felt other members of the group may have follow-up comments etc. AParris agreed to compile and distribute.

Data Gaps: Status and next steps PWA

AParris informed the group after the last meeting he had conferred with Don Alley and Jerry Smith who have recommended not doing electrofishing this year due to the pervasive dry conditions. PWA recommends going ahead and doing everything else that was on the list. This however, leaves about \$15k in unused funds. He asked how the group wanted to spend this money. His suggestion was to spend some of it for PWA's time spent on the next workshop and some on further assessments later on in the timeline. For e.g.

- ◆ effects of land use on winter hydrograph
- ◆ historical geomorphological changes in the watershed
- ◆ changes in land use

TRamirez inquired whether these were already called out in the data gaps memo. AParris answered that the geomorphic channel assessment was possibly and that there is also a summary of the impacts of roads although this is different from the road inventory. In other words, these aforementioned additions were not specifically called out.

AParris stated that these suggestions are as a result of sequencing and proposes these as priorities because they can happen in the watershed in the time frame. TFrahm noted that the data gaps memo was missing a table, AParris replied that he had sent that table out afterwards and would recirculate the table and requested that workgroup members take a look at it and check off any activities that were already being performed by respective groups or agencies.

AParris will send a proposal to the workgroup within the next two weeks with PWA's suggestions for how to spend the remaining funds. This will be approximately 2-3 weeks before the October meeting to give the group time to review and make a decision at the October meeting.

The proposed timeline is:

- ◆ Watershed Assessment Update will be completed first
- ◆ Data Gaps memo will then be second in importance and will include who is doing work, if any is being done.
- ◆ Goals and objectives will be third

KNelson suggested to AParris that he be persistent with Krissy Atkinson of Fish and Game to find out if they are gathering any data, as Krissy is working part-time and not able to attend Workgroup meetings. Someone in the group mentioned that DFG is out the whole month of September so we should not hold up any documents for this reason.

IWMP Goals and Objectives- PWA

Mike Liquori stated that the intent of this discussion was to flush out sentiment on the vision statement and goals and objectives. His intention is to go through at least the first few of the objectives. He feels this is necessary to get a good sense of where the group is before the public meeting.

PWA proposed the following vision statement:

"The Pilarcitos Watershed will be managed to support ecosystem functions adequate to

Sustain its native water-dependent biotic resources while continuing to provide benefits to the community at large."

KNelson asked why PWA was not using the same language as was already provided in the MOU or scope of work, keeping it consistent with other documents in the process and keeping the language as specific as possible. BFeldman agreed that all language and concepts should be consistent. TFrahm suggested using the purpose of the workgroup or plan document and MOU language. PWA agreed to look these through and combine. By a show of hands MLiquori canvassed the group and all were in favor of using language already established as per the MOU.

KNelson also noted that the reference to the water code 79078 and how it applies to this document should be spelled out for the lay person.

MLiquori informed the group that he would describe the goals and then have the group break up into smaller groups to review and revise the goals.

Goal 1: Steelhead trout have adequate access and spawning and rearing habitat for sustainable population levels.

JGuistino: does this mean every inch or just where feasible. i.e. be more specific about spatial distribution.

JSalerno: should be "access to adequate"

TRamirez: questioned Pat whether he is comfortable with the key word sustainable. Pat will think about this - he is questioning the word adequate.

Goal 2: Stream channels are in dynamic equilibrium with their sediment and water supply.

TFrahm stated he is not clear what the difference between goal and objectives are but the objectives were previously developed by the Workgroup. TRamirez stated that the target is a coastal stream as is it supposed to be. MLiquori agreed.

AParris stated that the MOU came after the proposal and was not reflected in the grant. PWA is trying to determine which documents to use. TRamirez suggested that the Scope of Work that is the most recent reflection of the group, would be the appropriate document. This was determined to be the version of the Scope that is attached to the January 25, 2007 MOU.

Copies of this document were made by CCWD and distributed for all present to refer to.

BFeldman stated he thinks the goals should be more aligned to the Scope of Work.

TRamirez stated at the end of the day the draft plan we come up with we are going to build off of so it should conform to the system we have to live in. This is important to remember when we get to the funding part.

ELevin added that the plan should provide the setup for future funding. She is seeing more and more circumstances where grant proposals that involve multiple benefits and incorporate a water supply element are important to the funders. State legislators are moving in a direction where water supply is an essential element of planning and funding.

BFeldman felt that the term "dynamic equilibrium" is too esoteric for the general public. MManning asked if "dynamic equilibrium" is a condition which references historic or current sediment and water supply and suggested putting a date or a point in time as a reference point.

KNelson compared the list of objectives in the Scope of Work to the goals and objectives proposed by PWA to confirm that everything was included.

KNelson felt the goals and objectives were vague and/or jargony in places. She and ELevin said that the goals and objectives need to be very explicit. KNelson felt the language in the goals was not very accessible to the public. TRamirez, BFeldman, and SDanielson agreed.

General discussion of Goals and Objectives

ELevin suggested it is important and would be more appropriate to have goals that are more easily digestible to the public and questioned what exactly goal #3 was trying to say...be more explicit.

TFrahm recommended in introduction #2, last paragraph - drop in the objectives from the Scope of Work attached to the MOU. It represents the most agreement amongst Workgroup members. KNelson agreed and noted that most MOU objectives are covered in PWA document but look different.

AParris confirmed for ELevin that this goal is about water supply but it is not addressed directly and is only implied. Again it needs to be explicit. i.e. ag use, domestic water supply etc.

MLiquori suggested PWA take page 4 #C3 of the MOU and reframe A through K as goals and be specific with regard to the objectives to achieve these goals.

SDanielson commented that there needs to be a quantifiable measure of the objectives so they can be evaluated. e.g. the #'s of fish or dates etc.

BFeldman commented that the Vision statement should be from page 3 #VI first paragraph.

MManning stated goals should be broad and are a statement of desired future conditions. In C.3.F, "issues" can be replaced with "goals" and there is a clear list of goals for the IWMP. Merits further discussion.. TFrahm suggested reworking this goal and objective section and representing at the next meeting.

ELevin provided the following definitions:

Mission: describes the fundamental purpose

Visions: statement defining what the activity is to achieve

Objectives: succinct statements that define desired outcomes for achieving project missions and visions. They are benchmarks to achieve goals.

Strategies: specific measurable actions taken to make progress towards achieving objectives

Key performance indicators: measure the effectiveness of each strategy

MLiquori suggested another level/type of criteria be added called resource objectives. MLiquori stated PWA will produce a list of goals with objectives that have specific measurable components and then draft a list of projects with examples that tie back to the goals and objectives.

PWA will revisit the goals for the public meeting and write them to be more specific and explicit. They will also bullet out points to address that are

- ◆ Aligned to the mission
- ◆ More public/user friendly

KNelson pointed out that the strategies and indicators are later deliverables in our contract with PWA and, though they are not in this document, they are part of the overall plan.

ELevin said that, beyond objectives, the IWMP should define strategies which are actions to achieve outcomes. The current goals are too heavily focused on ecosystem restoration rather than balancing all beneficial uses in the watershed.

September 29th public workshop

SDanielson expressed concern that we are less than 19 days away and still there is no flyer and the public has not yet been notified. She also pointed out that there are a number of conflicting events on the same day.

KNelson noted that the County staff person assigned to develop a mailing list for APNs in the watershed is on maternity leave and we cannot notify landowners via mail before the workshop. KNelson asked SDanielson what she needed from the group to move forward on this.

SDanielson stated that an image still needs to be developed as well as language and content and something to invoke interest in the public to attend the workshop.

After discussion of alternatives, including holding the event as a table at the Pumpkin Festival it was decided to postpone the event. The new date is Saturday 27th October.

CATowe requested SDanielson review any public calendars she has access to, to make sure there are no large community event conflicts for this day.

MOU signatories- Kellyx

KNelson informed the workgroup that the MOU has a number of signatories listed who have not signed the document and may not be aware that their names are on it, as the inception of the list was names of desirable signatories. She requested Workgroup approval to remove those who had not signed from the list as it is a public document and gives the impression that those organizations have endorsed the MOU. She noted that anyone can still be added to the MOU. The group agreed and also agreed to continue to pursue the various groups as appropriate so that they may still become signatories if desired. Patrick will talk to the sanctuaries. Tim and Kellyx will talk to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Carolann and Kellyx will talk to the Fisherman's Association.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held, October 27, 2007.

TRamirez stated we were trying to achieve a plan in an extremely short time which usually is done over years and JLavelle added that for this reason she felt the group was not meeting often enough and needed to meet at least monthly. KNelson agreed and pointed out that by default we have recognized this by setting up monthly meetings or call-ins from July through October. The group agreed to a conference call on Wednesday, September 19th, from 1-3 to further discuss the goals and objectives.