

## Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Project Fine Sediment Management Study Group

### Questionnaire for March 30 meeting

Please respond to the following questions, and circulate your responses to the Study Group members, and to Norma Camacho and Mary Selkirk, by COB, Friday, March 18, 2011.

Name & Affiliation: Department of Fish and Game

Based on the consolidated flip-chart notes from the February 2 and 24 meetings:

1. Are there any other **major** constraints (or concerns by your organization) to the three major management options, *other than those listed on the notes*?
  - LBV: Due to the recent presence of least Bell's vireo (LBV), protocol surveys may be required. An analysis of the impacts associated with the project and project-related activities over the life of the project should be fully described in the CEQA document and CESA permit application. A CESA permit may be required if the project or any project-related activity will result in Take of LBV. The Incidental Take Permit requires full mitigation proportional to the Taking, and guaranteed funding for mitigation and long-term management.
  - Additional CEQA documentation may be required in the form of a subsequent, supplemental, or addendum to the CEQA document as determined by the lead agency.
  - A feasible and implemental dam removal project should be determined prior to construction of the other project elements, such as levees.
  - CEQA documentation must fully disclose the project description, impacts and minimization, avoidance and mitigation measures, if the CEQA documentation is to be utilized by a Responsible Agency for the issuance of an Incidental Take Permit or Lake or Stream Alteration Agreement.
  
2. Are there any other **major** data gaps or information needs, *other than those listed on the notes*?
  - Protocol survey data for LBV over the entire project area
  - Current and detailed flora and fauna surveys at all of the proposed disturbance/project areas
  - Design of an adaptive management plan (e.g. long-term maintenance) for the slurry disposal sites
  - Determination of expected sediment load under typical flow events (5, 10, 25, 50, 100-year), including the duration of each event and compilation of data relative to steelhead and aquatic species exposure levels.
  - Location of slurry pipeline and its subsequent development and use as a regional trail and its long-term impacts to habitat and species.
  - The need and implementation of the desilting reservoir above Robles Diversion and long-term maintenance and abandonment after sediment transport is completed.

3. In your opinion, what are the **top three** data gaps or information needs that must be answered in order to develop a viable consensus solution to managing the fine sediments in Matilija Reservoir as part of the Matilija Dam removal project? *Please be as specific as possible and list them in descending order as you would prioritize them.*  
(1= first choice, 2=second, 3= third).
1. Design details (location, amount, placement, etc.) of temporary and permanent sediment storage
  2. Downstream (of reservoir) effects (e.g. turbidity, duration, etc) of fine sediment input into channel.
  3. Recent and complete flora/fauna surveys within the proposed disturbance/project site.
4. In complete sentences---but in either bullet-item or paragraph format---please draft a **summary request for proposal/scope of work**, including expertise needed, to respond to the top data gaps or information needs that you have identified in Question 3 above.
- Develop engineering designs to 65% level, demonstrating the placement of fine sediment:
    - Illustrating the location of temporary and permanent storage;
    - determining the materials needed for the construction of both temporary and permanent storage;
    - develop plans to maintain both the temporary and permanent storage.
  - Hire or employ an avian biologist to perform protocol-level surveys for LBV and prepare proper documentation/reporting.
  - Hire or employ a qualified botanist, fisheries biologist, and wildlife biologist to survey in complete detail the flora and fauna, during appropriate times of the year, within the proposed disturbance/project site during project planning and prior to project implementation.
  - Develop and model or conduct an analysis to determine the expected sediment load under typical flow events (5, 10, 25, 50, 100-year), including the duration of each event and compilation of data relative to steelhead and aquatic species exposure levels.
  - Develop and evaluate the slurry disposal pipeline alignment and its subsequent development and use as a regional trail and its long-term impacts to habitat and species.
  - Develop and analyze the need for the desilting reservoir above the Robles Diversion and the necessary long-term maintenance to ensure proper function. Develop a restoration plan for the desilting reservoir location after sediment transport is completed, similar to a reclamation plan.
  - Analysis of the need for a subsequent, supplemental, or addendum to the CEQA document.
5. Looking forward, post Study Group: Do you have any other suggestions about *how* we should continue to develop solutions to the major data gaps on the fine sediments?

Many of the surveys needs and data gaps have been identified throughout the lifetime of this project and related meetings. It would be useful to move forward with filling the gaps in order to build consensus and finalize a design.

It would be valuable for Regulatory Agency staff to meet with ACOE and VCWPD to have a working meeting to evaluate the design elements and walk thru the proposed construction implementation to highlight the positives and negatives of the proposals.