Project Briefing





AGENDA

- Review Study Purpose & Timeline
- Review input from public outreach & previous Board Executive Committee Mtg
- Update on Project Analysis
- Next Steps
- Discussion





Regional Parks: A bold proposal at the time

George Gibbs Jr., **Olmsted Brothers**

PARK RESERVATIONS

FOR EAST BAY CITIES 1930

Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., **Olmsted Brothers**

Ansel F. Hall, National Park Service

FEASIBILITY STUDY PURPOSE



ENHANCE NATURAL PROCESSES & HABITAT

- Enhance Native Species Habitat
- Provide Fish/Salmonid Passage
- Prevent Sediment Accumulation

MAINTAIN PUBLIC DESTINATION

- Maintain Level of Public Access
- Maintain / Provide a "Destination"
- Maintain Lake as Open Water

STUDY TIMELINE



Fall 2020/ Summer 2021	 Feasibility Analysis Inventory & Analysis, Conditions Assessment Staff to Staff Agency Stakeholder Outreach
Summer/ Fall 2021	Concept Evaluation • Staff to Staff Agency Stakeholder Outreach • Board Executive Committee Review • Public Workshop #1
Fall/Winter 2021, 22	 <u>Study Findings</u> Agency Stakeholder Outreach (RWQCB, Tribes) Board Exec Recommendation (Concepts 3, 4) → Workshop #2
Spring/Summer 2022	 Board Consideration Board Exec Recommendation (Preferred Concept) → Workshop #3 Board Review and Consideration Proceed with developing Preferred Concept

CONCEPT 1 – LAKE TRANSITIONS TO MEADOW



Emphasizes nature's ability to reclaim human-made infrastructure.

EXISTING FIRE ROAD EXISTING BOARDWALK EXISTING FOOT TRAIL

Investment reflects the need to maintain the spillway's safety.

\$1.3 -

\$0.8

LEGEND Total Cost

Cost

Concept 1

Lake to Meadow

Maintenance & Monitoring

Construction & Administration

Cost (50-yr Timeframe)

Design & Permitting Cost

\$2.0

\$1.2

\$0.5

CONCEPT 2 – MAINTAIN LAKE + FISHWAY



Maintenance & Monitoring Cost (50-yr Timeframe) Construction & Administration Cost

Design & Permitting Cost

Emphasizes preserving the existing user experience and aesthetics of the lake.

Invested in constructing a fishway and periodic dredging reflects a modest effort to improve fish habitat.

PROPOSED BOARDWALK PROPOSED FOOT TRAILS PROPOSED BRIDGES PROPOSED TRAIL PULLOUTS GRADING LIMIT EXISTING FIRE ROAD EXISTING FOOT TRAIL DECOMMISSIONED FOOT TRAIL DECOMMISSIONED FOOT TRAIL

CONCEPT 3 – RESTORE WILDCAT CREEK



Total Cost Maintenance & Monitoring Cost (50-yr Timeframe) Construction & Administration Cost

LEGEND

Concept 3

\$1.1

\$7.8

Design & Permitting Cost

Emphasizes restoring natural habitats for critical species recovery and removing dams that do not support essential societal needs.

Investment reflects an interest to minimize long-term maintenance liabilities.

PROPOSED BOARDWALK PROPOSED FOOT TRAILS PROPOSED BRIDGES PROPOSED TRAIL PULLOUTS GRADING LIMIT EXISTING FIRE ROAD EXISTING BOARDWALK EXISTING FOOT TRAIL DECOMMISSIONED FOOT TRAIL

CONCEPT 4 – LAKE + BYPASS CHANNEL



Cost (50-yr Timeframe) Construction & Administration Cost

Design & Permitting Cost

Emphasizes both native fish passage requirements and the recreational and aesthetic value of the lake.

Investing in perpetual flow-split operations and maintenance indicates our commitment to an open water visitor experience.

EXISTING FOOT TRAIL
 DECOMMISSIONED FOOT TRAIL

PROPOSED FOOT TRAILS

PROPOSED BRIDGES

EXISTING FIRE ROAD

EXISTING BOARDWALK

GRADING LIMIT

CONCEPT 4 – LAKE + BYPASS CHANNEL



DIVERSION STRUCTURE





DEBRIS RACK (clearing sediment) FISH SCREEN (screen fouling) FLOW CONTROL (water level monitoring)

POTENTIAL DESTINATIONS FOR WALKS

Project team to work with Tilden Nature Area staff for place-making



REVIEW BOARD EXEC MTG #1



September 14, 2021

- Support for both Restoring Wildcat Creek (Concept 3) and Lake + Bypass Channel (Concept 4)
- Recreational/Aesthetic Value of Lake
- Recognize Opportunities to Improve Wildlife Habitat
- Role of Dams in West and Trend to Naturalize Watersheds



REVIEW PUBLIC MEETING

October 14, 2021

- Support for Concepts 3 and 4
- Sense of urgency for action
- 42 respondents to survey





Public Survey Highlights

0

It is important that the project: Maintains or provides a 23 11 "Destination" for walks Enhances habitat 39 for native species Prioritizes Fish/ Salmonid Passage Focuses on restoring the 26 12 historic Wildcat Creek Provides an open 17 12 13 water lake area NUMBER OF RESPONSES

Agree Undecided Disagree

REGIONAL WATER BOARD INPUT

February 3, 2022

Support Restore Wildcat Creek (Concept 3)

• Viewed as pure restoration, no mitigation expected

Could accept Lake + Bypass Channel (Concept 4)

Anticipated permit requirements:

- Compensatory mitigation
- Daily and Perpetual monitoring and maintenance of diversion for fish passage and annual reporting.





PROJECT BIOLOGISTS

- Rainbow trout are priority
- Lake is a net detriment for rainbow trout
- Fish screen required
- Similar wildlife habitat available nearby
- Birding along boardwalk is undisturbed



Concept 3: Restore Wildcat Creek

	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
RAINBOW TROUT HABITAT	Best option for trout habitat Fully Naturalized Channel	
OPEN WATER	Prevents predation of trout	No open water
POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS	High – simpler project Numerous restoration examples	
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE	Self-Sustaining Natural Processes Restored Does not introduce complex additional infrastructure	
PERMITTING CONSIDERATIONS	Viewed as pure restoration No mitigation likely	
PUBLIC INPUT	Public support for creek restoration Trout Unlimited Regional Water Quality Control Board	
CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCY	High – matches natural habitat and increased baseflow	

Concept 4: Lake + Bypass Channel

	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
RAINBOW TROUT HABITAT	Good	Potential for fish stranding if not maintained properly
OPEN WATER	Yes Preserves aesthetic amenity	Needs perpetual management Provides habitat for invasives
POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS		Moderate Design & Maintenance is complex Water quality uncertainty
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE		Managed System Daily Operations & Perpetual Maintenance Required
PERMITTING CONSIDERATIONS		Mitigation will be required O&M Legally Binding and perpetual
PUBLIC INPUT	Moderate public support	
CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCY		Less flow in channel

Project Briefing





STUDY TIMELINE



Fall 2020/ Summer 2021	 Feasibility Analysis Inventory & Analysis, Conditions Assessment Staff to Staff Agency Stakeholder Outreach
Summer/ Fall 2021	Concept Evaluation • Staff to Staff Agency Stakeholder Outreach • Board Executive Committee Review • Public Workshop #1
Fall/Winter 2021, 22	 <u>Study Findings</u> Agency Stakeholder Outreach (RWQCB, Tribes) Board Exec Recommendation (Concepts 3, 4) → Workshop #2
Spring 2022	 Board Consideration Board Exec Recommendation (Preferred Concept) → Workshop #3 Board Review and Consideration Proceed with developing Preferred Concept

Project Briefing



