



September 4–5, 2013 California Fish Passage Forum Meeting Minutes Arcata, California

Present via conference call and two meeting locations (Sacramento and Arcata): Kevin Shaffer (September 4), Tom Shroyer, Stan Allen, Bob Pagliuco, Tim Ash, Donnie Ratcliff, Anne Elston, Marc Commandatore, Michael Kellett, Bill Pinnix, Robin Carlson, Peter LaCivita, Michael Bowen, Melinda Molnar, Kurt Zimmerman, George Edwards (CDFW), Vicki Frey, Mike Wallace (September 4), Lisa DeBruyckere

Executive Summary of Decision and Action Items and Future Agenda Requests, Committee Recommendations

Decision Items

1. Forum logo: Forum members unanimously voted to not trademark/copyright the logo because of the cost and time involved, and the low likelihood of any entity attempting to use portions or all of the logo.
2. Project selection scoresheet and ranking forms: Forum members unanimously voted to accept the scoresheet (version 3.0) presented and amended at the meeting (9/5/2013), leaving open any options to amend and update it in the future.
3. TNC Salmon Snapshot website: Forum members unanimously voted to not officially endorse the TNC Salmon Snapshot, but to provide permission to TNC to link the Salmon Snapshot website to the Forum website, with appropriate context. Forum members also recommended providing a hyperlink to the Salmon Snapshot website.
4. Forum Support of Videos and Publications: Forum members unanimously supported to accept the internal procedure for how the Forum deals with outreach products internal to the Forum, but voted to wait until December to discuss how the Forum would process requests for external support (USACE and Caltrans representatives asked for additional time to consult with their legal counsel before voting on the process the Forum would use to support videos and publications external to the Forum).
5. Forum 2013 Briefing Document: Forum members unanimously voted to accept, with edits, the Forum 2013 Briefing Document, acknowledging the document will be updated as information changes.

Action Items

The following action items are carried over from the previous meeting:

- *The Outreach and Education Committee will consider establishing a working group on changing climate and its relationship to fish passage.*
- *Anne, Tom and Kevin will select a CDFW individual to beta test a Central Coast watershed using APASS and notify Donnie.*
- *Kevin needs to contact California Natural Resources Agency to ask if, as a signatory, they are going to provide a representative to the Forum (or remove themselves from the MOU).*
- *Science and Data Committee will make a recommendation about linking important California fish datasets to Climate Commons web page – what links to what datasets?*
- *Donnie will send Lisa a template she can use to contact ODOT for implementation cost data (total project cost and implementation cost) for fish passage projects.*
- *Lisa will work with partners on joint press release for two projects (one has been done).*
- *Tim will draft an email that Bob and Kevin will use to send to Rick Wantuck, George Hisey, and Marcin Whitman – re: a pattern of rationale; list of variances that have been approved, describing any commonalities among those variances. Tim and the Engineering Work Group will look at examples to the variance process and highlight which ones worked and why (to serve as information for those that seek to understand the variance process. Bob will follow-up*
- *Donnie will first approach Mary Larson about a South Coast individual to beta test a South Coast watershed using APASS.*
- *Javier will explore the development of a new Forum working group re: effectiveness and validation monitoring protocols/tools. This will help us promote fish passage success stories.*
- *Marc will explore a replacement for Sara Denzler.*

Forum Members:

1. Members will consider what other entities might be involved in the forum and will bring their ideas to the December 2013 meeting.
2. Members will redline/strikethrough/amend the MOU verbiage for the December 2013 meeting, Lisa will coordinate responses and share with the Forum.

Outreach and Education Committee:

1. Kevin will touch base with Vicki and other members of California state government to represent their interests at the upcoming PMEP November 19-20, 2013 summit.
2. Tom or Kevin will contact the California Natural Resources Agency to determine their desire to participate in the Forum.
3. The Committee will develop an initial outline and agenda for a Forum Climate Change Working Group, include estimated time contribution to achieve deliverables, and share it with the Forum members for review and input.

Governance Committee:

1. Both the PMEP and CFPF Governance Committees will discuss next steps, including some potential roles for Science and Data Committees, to bring attention to the complexity of fish passage and the importance of estuaries.
2. The Governance Committee will add to its agenda a topic to discuss potential ways to financially support County attendance in Forum activities.

CFPF Coordinator:

1. Lisa will ask Andrew Jensen to give a presentation (at the December Forum meeting) on research relative to bridge design and specifications on fish passage and lighting impacts.

2. Lisa will send Forum members the list of PMEP summit attendees. Lisa will ensure Mike Wallace receives an invitation to the PMEP summit.
3. Lisa will obtain updated numbers and maps from Anne for inclusion in Forum 2013 Briefing Document and strategic framework.
4. Lisa will post the CFPF poster and Coastal Fish Habitat Partnerships poster on the FHP websites and will announce via email.
5. Lisa will contact Robin Knox, set up a conference call with all three FHPs (CFPF, PMEP, and WNTI), and set the stage for potentially submitting a joint grant proposal to the Estuary Restoration Act Fund between December 2013 through February 2014.
6. Lisa will work with Marc to contact Mark Lubell at UC Davis to determine what amount of funding would be needed to conduct research, and what specific draft questions would be addressed re: human dimensions work and fish passage interests in California. Lisa will then follow up with potential fundraising opportunities.
7. Lisa will coordinate the presentation of a webinar (or actual presentation) at the PMEP spring meeting on using APASS and optimization modeling in venues beyond fish passage (e.g., strategically prioritizing projects to fund).
8. Lisa and Bill Pinnix will convene interested members of the PMEP Science and Data Committee to evaluate the 43 projects submitted for the \$4.2M NOAA Coastal Habitat Restoration Grant and determine if, and how, APASS could be helpful to optimize selection of projects. Potentially, model runs could be shared as a side activity at the summit.
9. Lisa will send a Doodle requesting locations and meeting dates.
10. Lisa will send Forum members an editable version of the MOU. Lisa will draft language that adds to the MOU an amendment process (to more easily amend and update the MOU in the future), encourage participation in the Forum, and define work groups and committees/potential caps.
11. Lisa will work with Donnie to create a template that will meet the reporting requirement needs of both the USFWS and NFHP-funded projects.
12. Lisa will send the list of 11 NOAA Habitat Restoration Grant projects to Forum members to compare these projects to the PAD database – perhaps aligning opportunities for both partnerships to work in the same place.

Kurt Zimmerman:

1. Kurt will discuss (with his organization) a potential alternate for CalTrout as well as special expertise to help staff the working groups (alternate could originate from anywhere in the state, not necessarily S. California).

Bill Pinnix:

1. See CFPF Coordinator #8 above.

Donnie Ratcliff:

1. See CFPF Coordinator #11 above.

Anne Elston:

1. See CFPF Coordinator #3 above.

Marc Commandatore:

1. See CFPF Coordinator #6 above.

Vicki Frey:

1. Vicki will look into displaying PMEP and CFPF posters at upcoming CDFW symposium.

2. Vicki will display CFPF and Coastal FHP poster at San Diego conference in November (if she attends).

Others:

1. Michael, Tom, Anne, Tim, and Marc volunteered to be part of a work group of the Science and Data Committee to develop specific strategies to make recommendations to align FRGP with information needed to update the Passage Assessment Database.

Updates

1. Bob Pagliuco informed members about the NOAA West Coast merger, a request in the President's FY13 budget to consolidate NOAA's NW and SW regions. Although the budget aspect of this is still in continuing resolution, the region is moving forward with the merger. Will Stelle, the regional administrator out of Seattle, also has an office in Sacramento.
2. Donnie Ratcliff informed members that the Branciforte Creek Dam Removal project, funded by the Forum in 2013, is up and running.
3. Stan Allen noted the NFHP Board meeting is in Charleston, SC on October 22-23, 2013, and it has a marine focus. PMEP will be highlighted. He also noted the September PSMFC meeting is September 22-25, 2013, and posters from each of the West Coast FHPs and coastal FHPs will be available.
4. Peter LaCivita noted the USACE has several projects in San Francisco Bay that include cost shares with local sponsors to do habitat improvement and restoration work. The Wildcat Creek project just receiving funding; it has a fish ladder and habitat improvement component.
5. Tim Ash recently attended a meeting of District 2 Fish Passage, a multi-agency group. He heard a presentation on research and work on a bridge and specifications on fish passage and lighting impacts. He suggested the Forum hear that presentation at its December meeting.
6. Michael Kellett announced the Cleveland National Forest has a fish biologist – Heather Dyer – from USFWS (San Juan and Tribuco Creeks will be her focus).

Future Agenda Requests

1. Andrew Jensen will be asked to give a presentation (at the December Forum meeting) on research relative to bridge design and specifications on fish passage and lighting impacts.

Agenda Item: Committee and Working Group Updates

Governance Committee

- Multi-state conservation grant – The disbursement of funds to PMEP and CFPF from Multi-state conservation grant was discussed, and it was noted that both FHPs agree to split whatever funds are received 50:50.
- Caltrout and S. CA engagement in the Forum - Kevin contacted Marin County, FishNet4C, 5 counties, and representation from 7 southern counties. They discussed possibly meeting with county board members 2x/year. But county representatives need funding to participate – salary funding. **ACTION ITEM:** The Governance Committee will add to its agenda a topic to discuss potential ways to financially support county attendance on Forum activities. Kurt will talk with his organization about a potential alternate from CalTrout as well as special expertise for the working groups – alternate could originate from anywhere in the state (not necessarily S. California).
- Ranking projects for Forum funding, **Decision item:** Motion: Accept the score sheet (version 3.0 as it exists and as amended today – 9/5/2013) with potential to update it in the future. Seconded. Unanimous.

- Forum membership - Do we have a target representation of Forum members? (geography, type of organization, etc.) – How does the Forum accept new members? Identify ideals for representation and potentially reach out and make invitations. **ACTION ITEM:** Next meeting – homework – bring to meeting ideas for representation and possible entities.
- Salmon Snapshot website – **Decision item:** Recommendation to not endorse and to provide permission to use link to our site with appropriate context. The Forum also recommends linking to the Salmon Snapshot. Motion: Forum not endorse SS, seconded, unanimous.
- APASS update - Donnie and Lisa shared a one-pager on APASS that includes timelines and deliverables for some key next steps, especially those that involve Outreach and Education Committee or S&D Committee deliverables.

Outreach and Education Committee

- Review draft “Forum Support of Videos and Publications” document. Could potentially use this process to review, endorse, and post products on our website. Does the Forum need to endorse anything? This internal process may make sense for a website or other products, but for some products, it may not be appropriate. Keep the document internal. FHPs are receiving more and more requests to endorse products. Disclaimer at bottom of website. Postpone decision – send edits to O and E Committee and bring to next meeting. Forum members will send me suggested edits in next month or two. Some members are not comfortable with the concept of supporting products not posted on our website (products external to the Forum). **Decision item:** Accept internal procedure for how the Forum deals with products internal to the Forum; seconded. Unanimous. Wait until December to discuss further requests for external support. Peter LaCivita and Tim Ash will talk to legal counsel regarding support.
- Review Forum 2013 Fact Sheet and process to update Fact Sheet. **Decision item:** Fact sheet was accepted with edits, with knowledge we can update as information changes. Seconded. Unanimous.
- Creation of Forum Climate Change Working Group –Forum members were asked if they have individuals in their respective agencies that have expertise and resources to serve on this group. Before entities ask within their agencies, purpose and meaning, potential agenda needs to exist so they can determine what contribution they can/want to make. **ACTION ITEM:** O&E Committee will develop initial outline and agenda for Forum review and input; how much estimated time it might take. Provide clarification on the question – hope is that we would develop recommendations for what the Forum would be doing – our own actions taking climate change into account; how CC is affecting migration and passage. Making sure our priorities and actions are aligned with what’s happening re: CC. Two potential products – how CC is affecting fish passage in CA (fact sheet); we could add a CC element to the score sheet. Potential in the future to discuss incorporating CC elements into APASS. Species distribution and design criteria, etc.
- Quarterly updates for projects the Forum endorses and/or funds. **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa will work with Donnie to create one template that will meet the reporting requirements needs for USFWS and NFHP purposes.
- There were no specific tasks the Science and Data and Governance Committees would like the Outreach and Education Committee to complete at this time.
- The Quarterly Coastal FHP newsletter and Forum submission of articles for that newsletter was discussed.

Science and Data Committee

- Progress on investigation of habitat quality data alternatives – will evaluate three potential alternatives:
 - Intrinsic potential data
 - Stream temp data
 - Bioassessment data (macroinvertebrate data)

- About to receive most current bioassessment data set from CDFW; has more sites this time and we've changed the methodology (will roll up scores on HUC12 or 14 level and assess barriers)
- Will roll up stream temp data to small watershed level and assign broad habitat quality score to areas
- Mad River watershed will be tested; barriers for this area
- Initial information in coming months (Dec Forum meeting)
- We'll be figuring out how to help assess PAD data gaps
- Update on NFHAP habitat assessment data inventory – in spring, spreadsheet was circulated from NFHP re: what habitat assessments are occurring in the U.S. with the hopes of assimilating that data ultimately at the national level; NFHP is available to help ensure that as data is collected, it will be provided to them (metadata and form) so that it can easily be assimilated and used at the national level.
- Are there other tasks the Forum would like the SD Committee to be thinking about or adding to the workplan? Are budgets being developed with the workplans? The more we can work on getting some funding tied to PAD and APASS work . . . About \$8,000 available late this fall for additional PAD work.
- Marc's request from last meeting – Forum members review and send information to Marc/through new working group.

Agenda Item: Joint meeting with members of the Pacific Marine and Estuarine Fish Habitat Partnership

- Representatives from the PMEP (Korie Schaeffer, PMEP Vice-Chair) and CFPF (Tim Ash, CFPF Governance Committee member) gave presentations on an overview of each partnership, describing recent accomplishments, current projects, and future initiatives.
- Each partnership discussed current and future opportunities to work together:
 - The multi-state conservation grant funding will be in place in November, and there will be opportunities to work together on future grant funds.
 - CDFW is hosting a science symposium in Sacramento in October, and there may be opportunities to display FHP posters. **ACTION ITEM:** Vicki Frey will look into it and see if it's possible to display FHP posters. **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa will put both posters on both websites and will announce via email.
 - Marc Commandatore noted there will be an Environmental Science workshop at DWR September 18-19, 2013. Marc will be talking about fish passage at large dams, and would display FHP posters at this meeting.
 - Vicki Frey may be attending a bi-annual conference in San Diego in November on marine/coastal/estuarine issues, and she could potentially display PMEP posters. **ACTION ITEM:** Vicki Frey may attend. If she goes, she can potentially display posters.
 - There will be upcoming opportunities to submit grant proposals on behalf of both partnerships on themes of interest to both FHPs – including breaching levees, converting lands in and around estuaries. The next opportunity is the Estuary Restoration Act Fund available December 2013 through February 2014. There could also be mutual interest in connectivity and fish passage, holistic watershed restoration, bundling projects re: watershed/estuary. **ACTION ITEM:** All 3 partnerships will put this on their agenda for future discussion – three estuaries in California (opportunities). Get ahead of the funding curve in May (Estuary Restoration Act) (WNTI, too – Smith River). Multi-agency efforts. Pescadero/Carmel might be good opportunities. Lisa will contact Robin Knox.
 - Marc Commandatore discussed talking with UC Davis Mark Lubell on interregional differences in the West relative to fish passage and migration as well as differences within California. Asking some social/human dimensions questions, such as “why do PNW

publics embrace fish passage and conservation versus differences in California?” In OR/WA, 7.25% of lottery sales in perpetuity go toward fish restoration. **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa will work with Marc to contact Mark Lubell at UC Davis and determine what amount of funding would be needed to conduct research, and what specific draft questions would be addressed. Lisa can then follow up with possible funding opportunities.

- Optimization is another opportunity to potentially work together. The APASS framework could potentially be used to strategically prioritize fish habitat restoration projects. **ACTION ITEM:** Forum could do a WebEx with PMEP in the spring of 2014 (or a presentation at the PMEP spring meeting) to show how it could be applicable to other types of work. PMEP could consider the attributes that drive APASS as part of its upcoming assessment work.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa will get new updated numbers from Anne for strategic framework.

Agenda Item: Case Study topics (both presentations are posted on the CFPF website)

- Mike Wallace of CDFW talked about estuarine biological sampling occurring in Humboldt Bay, and the habitat created/re-established as a result of breaching levees and removing tidegates.
- Michael Bowen gave a presentation on estuary restoration in the Eel River Delta, an estuarine restoration project that involves the restoration of more than 300 acres of tidal marsh.

Agenda Item: West Coast Estuary Assessments

- Correigh Greene and Korie Schaeffer of NOAA led a discussion about the three distinct, but complementary, fish habitat assessments underway on the West Coast by PMEP, NOAA, and TNC.

Agenda Item: A Summit to Advance Juvenile Fish Habitat in West Coast Estuaries

- PMEP members, discussed the upcoming November 19-20, 2013 PMEP summit in Seattle, Washington that will chart the course for a West Coast-wide assessment of juvenile fish in estuaries. **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa will send Forum members list of summit invitees. **ACTION ITEM:** Kevin will touch base with Vicki and other California state staff prior to the summit.

Agenda Item: Managing People and Fish in Southern California Estuaries

- Kevin Shaffer and Kurt Zimmerman led a discussion about the key challenges of managing fish habitat and the human population in S. California. There is room for collaboration among fish passage and sediment experts, and it would be beneficial to encourage that collaboration. In S. California, it's as much a social issue/water management issue; it will be important to prioritize and identify locations where the biggest problems occur (e.g., Russian River, Carmel River, Lake Earl). A proposed project would be to look at the coast and identify estuaries and lagoons in which you identify the problems, the length of time the problems have existed, the specifics in each location, and then have partnerships weight the priorities. Where are estuary management and social issues recognized as needing attention in California? Full forum discussion? Working group discussion? Maybe a dual Forum-PMEP working group taking this on for California. We could map it visually. PMEP assessment could be a good first step, then do an overlay with the social issues. Once those estuaries are identified, what are the next steps? Where appropriate, the PMEP and the Forum could make a better informed decision about endorsing or supporting a project because this analysis has been done – versus looking at each project individually. This exercise could have a lot of practical applications. Russian River – ESA fish, haul-out area for marine mammals, MPA, etc. What can the Forum bring to the table that existing groups have not brought? Forum could take a retrospective look at things and weigh in on the estuary management plan and the real estate re: jetty removal, beach dynamics, technical assistance supporting certain elements of the plan. Are we looking for consistency among Forum members for how we look at artificial breaching? No. If we are going to talk about connectivity and focus on estuarine, marine, and into

fresh water, how things are managed (at river mouth) and the complexity of it is not fully recognized nor appreciated. Forum and PMEP can describe the issues from one region to another and let others describe how estuaries are managed. The biodiversity and function of the estuary – and its functional connectivity to different species – we can look at how they have been historically managed, and its current goals for connectivity, functionality, biodiversity, etc. We're a long way from the PMEP goals when we talk about striped bass and the number of ESA listed fish in their gut. We need to describe what we want out of an estuary first – thinking at this large scale. Both partnerships can give a broad statewide, objective view – describe a functioning estuary. **ACTION ITEM:** Start with Governance Committees of both partnerships to discuss next steps (then there may be subsequent tasks for SD Committees). We can help with communication re: what the issues are; bringing attention to the complexity and why it is a good thing can bring funding.

Agenda Item: APASS

- The status of the development of the next APASS tool was discussed, including key next steps for implementation and outreach. Written user manual about to be available as well as release strategies (for other FHPs, fish practitioners, and others). APASS/optimization model to prioritize species/habitat units quantified using acreage – could run it similar to APASS to optimize areas where we might get the most bang for our buck. Similarities between fish barriers and estuary habitat improvements. A challenge will be how we quantify estuary characteristics – we have to identify what is important – and if we pick something, how it will change. Anticipating outcomes of restoration activities will be difficult. At the summit, we can be thinking about APASS, and as we develop protocols and methodologies, we can consider APASS and what it could do to help us optimize. We could potentially use APASS to build in social priorities in addition to habitat priorities as we consider where to make strategic investments (PMEP). **ACTION ITEM:** Convene interested members of PMEP SD and SC to use the 43 projects submitted for the \$4.2M NOAA restoration grant and see if we can optimize selection of projects. Potentially share model runs at summit (as a side activity – show during breaks/during reception) – set up laptop and let attendees play with it.

Agenda Item: Passage Assessment Database

- Anne Elston gave the Forum an update on the PAD and noted that we need to update PAD data set – how?
- Log jams – how do we address them?
- Other funding sources – UNKNOWN barriers (large number) – develop a strategy to address unknown barriers – perhaps begin with watersheds and subwatersheds with biological priorities as defined by agencies
- Marijuana growers in N. California diversity stream water for production – opportunity to address this issues as fires occur in these areas.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Does FRGP require photos/other useful information for updating the PAD? Sometimes reports don't. Forum endorsement does include PAD ID request, but it isn't required in FRGP. **ACTION ITEM:** Michael, Tom, Anne, Tim, Marc volunteer to be part of a work group (SD Committee minus chairs). Specific tasks to be discussed during next Science and Data Committee conference call.

Agenda Item: Legal Advice on how the Forum Conducts Meetings

- Kevin Shaffer talked with CDFW legal counsel regarding how the Forum conducts meetings and noted:
 - The Forum was initiated by the California Natural Resources Agency.
 - Does the Forum need to follow California law, specifically Bagley-Keene? No. It only needs to follow BK if the Coastal Conservancy contributes financially to the Forum.

- That said, CDFW and CNRA legal counsel are suggesting the Forum try to follow all of the basic tenets of public meetings:
 - ✓ Post agendas in advance.
 - ✓ Have meetings in public places that are accessible.
 - ✓ Make decisions with a clear voting record and transparency.
 - ✓ When decisions are made electronically and in-between formal meetings, document the voting record and make that available via our website.
 - ✓ If a Forum member is not present at a meeting, but is calling in, but their alternate is present, consider giving your alternate voting authority.
 - ✓ Should the Forum always have alternate sites to meet? No, that's not necessary. It's good if we do, but it's not necessary.
 - ✓ Forum members need to realize that changes to the agenda will occur right up until the meeting. Look at the website version of the agenda for the latest changes.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Tom or Kevin will loop back with California Natural Resources Agency and determine desire to participate. **ACTION ITEM:** Are there other entities that should be involved? Ask Forum members to submit ideas. **ACTION ITEM:** Redline/striethrough/amend verbiage in existing MOU for December 2013 meeting – then share with Forum members for discussion about next steps. Forum members will submit suggested amendments by October 15 (Lisa will send members editable document). Add to document an amendment process to the document is a living, breathing document that is more easily and efficiently amended. Encourage participation in Forum and define work groups and committees/potential caps.

Agenda Item: Forum Administrative Issues

- Status of funding for the Forum Coordinator – Lisa DeBruyckere provided an update on funding for the Forum coordinator, noting that a total of \$17,678 had been expended, and \$29,000 was remaining.
- Forum endorsement requests received to date and status of those requests - Lisa DeBruyckere noted the Forum endorsed a project - Sharber/Peckham Creek Fish Passage Project - proposed by the 5 Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, that will remove a migration barrier to Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast coho salmon, Upper Klamath and Trinity River Basin Chinook salmon, and Klamath Mountains Province steelhead trout. The project would restore access to about one mile of spawning, over-wintering and rearing fisheries habitat.
- Trademark/Copyright Forum logo - Robin Carlson and Lisa DeBruyckere gave the Forum their recommendation to not trademark nor copyright the Forum logo because of the time and expense involved. **Decision item:** Forum members voted not to trademark/copyright - unanimous.
- Forum MOU/bylaws – Should we create an MOU Workgroup? Does the Forum want to create another MOU or should we let the existing one simply expire? What would Forum members have to do to let the MOU expire and just operate on bylaws? Would member agencies rather set in motion an MOU or something more flexible?
 - NOAA – consider letting the MOU expire given existing relationships and the fact it doesn't include recognition of the FHP – but if others want an MOU, NOAA would participate in that process. Would be willing to serve in Chair/Vice-Chair positions. Doesn't believe it is necessary for all signatories have to serve in Chair/Vice-Chair.
 - Caltrans – estimate the Forum could operate under bylaws – arduous process to create the MOU, with few returns, other than recording for future manager participation responsibilities. Tim will look into potential for Caltrans to commit to Chair/Vice-Chair. Doesn't believe it is necessary for all signatories have to serve in Ch/V-Chair. Tim will discuss with agency.
 - DWR – Discussed language changes needed in MOU (existing language is more coastal related, and DWR does not have much of a presence on the coast). Financial issues

associated with serving as Chair/Vice-Chair (time commitment). DWR wants to continue role with Forum – if new MOU is developed, minimal changes should be included. Marc will discuss with agency. Forum relationships are important to DWR – helps with fish, fish passage, and fish migration. There is a link to funding associated with an MOU.

- Coastal Conservancy – Managing the Forum requires a lot of bird dogging, tracking work products, administering – existence of Forum coordinator can help with that workload.
- Rotational chairs will enhance a shared understanding of the workload associated with operating the Forum.
- Potential motion to let the MOU expire and create bylaws that reflect the vision and ideals of the group, incorporating the FHP perspective.
- USACE - Bylaws and MOUs help justify participation in Forum activities. In CA, there are 3 USACE districts. To maintain involvement, it is important to have something on paper. But it would be good to expand involvement by other 2 districts in CA.
- Caltrout – Not averse to serving as Chair/Vice-Chair, but ill equipped to do that right now – just re-engaging at this point. MOU versus bylaws – both coalitions Kurt chairs in S. California operate without MOUs and bylaws; like the idea of some documentation setting forth roles and responsibilities and the structure associated with that documentation.
- USFWS – Vested interest in Forum and FHPs – direct ties between agency fish passage programs and FHPs – we are wide open to whatever works for the group – the MOU is not a driver for USFWS. USFWS leadership recognizes something formal is needed – don't want to undercut potential participation if other members need the formality of an MOU. USFWS is open to Chair/Vice-Chair, but doesn't seek to drive the Forum with an agency agenda. Might need assistance with other activities if took on Chair/Vice-Chair.
- Bylaws procedurally instruct groups on how they assemble and meet; most Forum entities need a mechanism that goes beyond that – commitment to a mission. Perhaps at the staff level seek an amendment and circulate that for approval. Charter option.
- Any document that justifies the existence of the organization would work. The Forum has to maintain some official front.
- PSMFC – we need something formal so individuals have something to point to to justify their participation – what form it takes is debatable. All federal agencies signed an agreement to participate and support NFHP. EPA started participating at national level in NFHP.
- USFS – Consider the political realities (2016 federal administration change, followed by a state administration change). Marc captured the significant role of rapport and functionality of group. What would catalyze an agency administrator to refill a position for representation on the Forum? That affects the function of the group. An MOU or something similar is the threat of continuity that we need.
- DFW – Need a binding document that shows we're all participating together.
- Document would be a commitment to play well together; is it something that needs to be approved by Executive level or management level, and if so, is it something that would likely be executed more quickly if new, or old and amended? Explore options of getting something signed at lower levels, and if that's not an option, amend the existing MOU, show the changes, and get those signatures.
- At what level are signatories comfortable having the document signed? For some agencies, it is easier to renew something – strikethrough, underline, etc. Address heavily coastal issues (Marc's concern). Show leadership track changes.
- Since the document was executed, NFHP emerged. Executives in agencies should be aware of that.
- Has been some excellent observations about existing agreements between DoD and Commerce and NFHP; that could be captured in a revised version of this MOU (Whereas

section . . .) – “Whereas agencies have signed onto NFHP. . . existing agreements among . . . “ May be fairly minimal revisions. **ACTION ITEM:** Tom or Kevin will loop back with California Natural Resources Agency and determine desire to participate. **ACTION ITEM:** Are there other entities that should be involved? Ask Forum members to submit ideas. **ACTION ITEM:** Redline/strikethrough/amend verbiage in existing MOU for December 2013 meeting – then share with Forum members for discussion about next steps. Forum members will submit suggested amendments by **October 15** (Lisa will send members editable document). Add to document an amendment process to the document is a living, breathing document that is more easily and efficiently amended. Encourage participation in Forum and define work groups and committees/potential caps.