

# California Fish Passage Forum

September 27, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Sacramento, California

**Attendees:** Ruth Goodfield (NOAA), Frank Meraz (Caltrans), Bob Pagliuco (NOAA), Bill Foster (NMFS), Steve Brumbaugh (DWR), Damon Goodman (USFWS), Stewart Reid (Western Fishes), Brett Holycross (PSMFC), Tom Schroyer (CDFW), Stan Allen (PSMFC), Jon Mann (CDFW), Anne Elston (PSMFC), Charlotte Ambrose (NMFS), Jonathan Ambrose (NOAA), Randy Beckwith (DWR), Jon Stead (AECOM), Jahnava Duryea (NMFS), Jean Castillo (NMFS), Brian Elliott (NMFS), and Lisa DeBruyckere (CFPF).

**Remotely:** Melinda Molnar (Caltrans), Stacie Smith (NMFS), Holly Eddinger (US Forest Service), Candice Meneghin (Caltrout), Janine Bryan and Todd Deligan (WHOOSH), Megan Sheely (NMFS), Anna Halligan (TU), Dave White (NOAA), Marcin Whitman (CDFW), and Rick Wantuck (NOAA).

**Forum work plans:** Each of the committees discussed their [updated work plans](#). The following are a few additional comments and discussion associated with the plans:

- The Governance Committee met three times in 2017. The committee will be advancing barrier prioritization when FishPASS is completed.
- The Science and Data Committee reported that Anne has been receiving PAD updates since sending an announcement requesting updates in May. Anne has been working with others to incorporate other agency assessments – a new release will occur in October.
- The Outreach and Education Committee asked for discussion about whether the Forum was the appropriate venue to convene a group focused on engineering, biology, and permitting. Caltrans, NMFS, and CDFW are hosting a *Bridges and Biology* workshop in February 2018. The workshop will create opportunities to train engineers. The workshop will include discussions about wildlife crossings and aquatic issues. A bat expert will talk about bat roosts and bridges. And the intent is to have Washington DOT and Washington DFW to present on fish and aquatic remediation projects. There will be several case studies from San Francisco – Oakland Bay bridge – avoidance and minimization measures. The workshop will also include geology and geotechnical investigations. The Outreach and Education Committee also discussed the project to produce a short annual report documenting Forum partner fish passage accomplishments. **Action item:** By December 1, Forum members will send Lisa their draft fish passage barrier remediation accomplishments for 2017. Lisa will then compile and share the draft document with Forum members for comments and edits. Forum members can send the information to Lisa in any format.

**Case studies:** Manly Gulch would make a good case study, as would several projects associated with lamprey fish passage. Lisa will obtain a few project suggestions from Damon on lamprey barrier projects. **Action item:** Anne will send Lisa some projects from the PAD.

**Forum budget:** There is \$76,093 unallocated in USFWS-NFHP funds, and there is \$53,000 coming from the USFWS for the user-friendly interface for FishPASS. Multi-state grant funding can be used for research, such as the jump test project. We have \$48,000 in MSGF unobligated, and we need to spend about \$30,000 by the end of 2017. **Action item:** Stan will get a budget from Ross Taylor for the Forum to considering funding monitoring on the Salt River. Jon Mann also suggested the Forum consider funding an assessment of Pinole Creek, a project funded by the Forum last year. An evaluation of the rock ramp and its effectiveness for fish passage (as part of FRGP) wasn't included in the original scope of work. The proposal from Mike Love is \$30,000 to build a digital elevation model of as-built condition and build a model to determine effective performance. The scope of work is to develop baseline survey work (arrays and flows) – next six months – work on follow-on evaluations of different flow levels.

**Action item:** Jon Mann will send Pinole Creek proposal to Lisa to share with the Governance Committee to evaluate rock ramp and its effectiveness for fish passage.

<b>1072.17 ; 1072.18</b>	<b>Budgeted</b>	<b>Spent</b>	<b>Remaining</b>
Personnel	\$ 23,607	\$ 3,712	\$ 19,895
Rents	\$ 1,000	\$ 133	\$ 867
Supplies/Software	\$ 1,000	\$ 0	\$ 1,000
Sub-Contracts (*)	\$ 260,681	\$ 20,000	\$ 240,681
Travel	\$ 6,270	\$ 0	\$ 6,270
Sub-Totals	\$294,074	\$ 23,844	\$ 240,681
Indirect	\$ 14,214	\$ 3,854	\$ 10,360
Totals	\$ 308,288	\$ 27,697	\$ 280,590

End Date: 9/30/20 (new 5-year agreement that started 8/8/16)

\*Sub-Contracts in Place:

- Western Fishes (Pacific Lamprey;17-44) \$20,000 (completed)
- Trout Unlimited (Pennington Creek; 18-08) \$40,000
- Creative Resource Strategies (Lisa; 18-07) \$36,000
- CA State Parks (Benbow Dam; 18-25) \$58,499
- Gold Ridge RCD (Upper Green Valley; 18-26) \$30,089

\$164,588

Unallocated \$ 76,093

New MSCG funding with WNTI in 2018 was approved. The funding will be received in early 2018.

<b><u>1009B.16; 1009B.17</u></b>	<b><u>Budgeted</u></b>	<b><u>Spent</u></b>	<b><u>Remaining</u></b>
<b><u>Personnel</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 15,793</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 15,793</u></b>
<b><u>Mtgs/Workshops</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>
<b><u>Supplies</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 3,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 3,000</u></b>
<b><u>Sub-Contracts</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 36,892</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 36,892</u></b>
<b><u>Travel</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 1,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 1,000</u></b>
<b><u>Sub-Totals</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 56,685</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 56,685</u></b>
<b><u>Indirect</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 8,872</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 0</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 8,872</u></b>
<b><u>Totals</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 65,557</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 3,350</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 62,207</u></b>

End Date: 12/31/17

Ecotelligence, LCC (Jesse O’Hanley; 18-04) \$12,600

Western Fishes (Pacific Lamprey;18-46) \$10,000

Capital Outlay (Jump Test Equipment) \$ 3,350 (Complete)

**\$14,292 Remaining in Sub-Contracts**

NOAA had end-of-year funding that they offered from DC to fish habitat partnerships. PSMFC hired Jonathan Trilly, who will be working with Dana McAnn, Stacie Smith, and Mary Larson to monitor small dam removal in S.

California. Three additional dams are targeted for removal this winter (dynamite) on Cleveland National Forest on Tribuco/Silverado watersheds – we will combine our monitoring with them. **Action item:** Stacie will send Lisa a few short paragraphs on the project for the next Forum newsletter – 7 dams and 3 sites have 2 years of data, and we’ll be adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> year, and 3 additional sites. We’ll only get pre-data for the ones being demolished this year.

<u>1009B.16</u>	<u>Budgeted</u>	<u>Spent</u>	<u>Remaining</u>
<u>Personnel</u>	<u>\$ 9,354</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$9,354</u>
<u>Supplies</u>	<u>\$ 500</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 500</u>
<u>Travel</u>	<u>\$ 1,504</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 1,504</u>
<u>Sub-Totals</u>	<u>\$ 11,358</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 11,358</u>
<u>Indirect</u>	<u>\$ 1,871</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 1,871</u>
<u>Totals</u>	<u>\$ 13,229</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 13,229</u>

**End Date: 06/30/18**

**Fisheries Technician hired 9/26/17**

**Forum 2017 projects:**

- Benbow Dam Proposal – year 2 of the proposal.
- Pennington Creek – will not go to ground this season. They’re using our funds to invest in the working components prior to implementation. They ran into permitting constraints. NOAA Restoration Center can adjust the budget so everything is in full swing in 2018.
- Upper Green Valley Creek – is in construction.

2016 project just finishing up is Manly Gulch.

**2018 Funding Announcement:** Forum members discussed the 2018 funding announcement and recommended we develop a template for the budget that includes some of the basic categories in federal budgets, and highlights the requirement that RFP responders include their total project budget as well as how they will expend the Forum portion of their budget. **Action item:** Lisa will add a budget template for annual funding to the application form.

**Bylaws:** Forum members discussed two options relative to the bylaws and elections – either change the bylaws to reflect a new consensus-based approach to filling the Chair and Vice Chair positions, or follow the bylaws and discuss potential nominations. Members voted to change the bylaws to have the Forum Chair and Vice Chair serve 2-year terms instead of 18 month terms, and to stagger those terms by asking Bob Pagliuco to serve one year as Chair beginning January 1, 2018, and take nominations for a Vice Chair, who would serve from January 1 2018-January 1, 2020. Three months prior to January 1, 2019, the Forum will vote on a new Chair. Bob’s time spent during that first year would not be counted toward a 2-year term. If the Vice Chair opts to be considered for, and is voted as the Chair in mid-term, or if the Chair or Vice Chair resigns, the Forum will hold a special election to fill the newly vacated position. A quorum of members was present and voted on what is described in this paragraph. There were no dissenting votes. One individual, Bob, abstained from voting on whether the Forum supported his one-year tenure as Chair. **Action item:** Lisa will revise the bylaws to reflect the changes in terms and voting.

**Action item:** Lisa will send out an email call for nominations. Candice Meneghin expressed her interest at the meeting, but will be discussing the topic with her supervisor before making a final commitment to be considered. Once the deadline concludes for nominations, Forum members will vote via email for the new Vice Chair.

The Forum also voted unanimously to change the bylaws to add “lamprey, sturgeon, and other native anadromous fish species” to page 2, Section 3, first paragraph. Members discussed that this change to the bylaws would be in

alignment with the Forum MOU, and would better reflect the Forum's interest in anadromous fish habitats and species in addition to salmonids.

**FishPASS:** Forum members discussed FishPASS, and voted unanimously to invest in a user-friendly interface.

**Action item:** Brett and Van will amend the FishPASS user-friendly interface RFP Scope of Work by October 15 for review by the Forum, then PSMFC will shoot for a November 1 release of the RFP. There was discussion about how the Forum would administer the SRF workshop in April 2018 given that the beta version of the FishPASS will not be completed by that time. Members decided to convene a small working group to package several watershed runs for the workshop, and potentially offer 1 demonstration run similar to the type of testing Forum members did several months ago (to actually show how the model works). **Action item:** Forum members will test FishPASS again before the SRF workshop. **Action item:** List will send the list of SRF workshop attendees a notice letting them know what watersheds we'll be testing, and how we'll be managing the workshop to ensure expectations align with workshop design. **Action item:** Lisa will work with SRF to redefine the language in the upcoming workshop to more accurately reflect the workshop design given the fact that the user-friendly interface will not be completed by then.

Brett and Anne shared their plan to trace 50% of the state's anadromous watersheds by June 2018, and then all of the state's anadromous watersheds by October 2018.

There was discussion about the conference call Brett is coordinating on November 3 to obtain input from Forum members and others to incorporate NorWeST into FishPASS. **Action item:** Lisa will add Stacie to the email invite for the November 3 workshop.

**Strategic Framework:** Forum members discussed the process to update the strategic framework in 2018. Members supported answering a set of questions associated with the future of the Forum, and then Lisa will draft the strategic framework, share and discuss it with the Governance Committee, and then share the draft with Forum members for their review and edits. The following questions and answers capture the essence of the discussion.

1. A SWOT analysis – what do Forum members see as our strengths, challenges, and opportunities?

### **Strengths**

- Convening fish passage practitioners for education (e.g., Eel River Delta event, upcoming SRF workshop);
- We connect with others through our relationships and backgrounds;
- Data and science collaboration (PAD);
- Distributing limited funds across multiple projects – diversifying our investments into a variety of projects;
- The way the Forum framed the importance of effectiveness monitoring and how we set up those processes to ensure monitoring exists, and to track monitoring;
- We're able to take a diverse look at fish passage because of the composition of our diverse membership – good mix of administrative types, engineers, biologists;
- There is a diversity in the geographic scope of our membership;
- The timing and opportunity of funds we disburse is in a different cycle than other funds, which allows us to play an integral role in supplementing engineering costs, etc. – these projects would not move forward otherwise.

### **Challenges**

- We all have full-time jobs and sometimes we forget to think about the Forum connections and our day-today jobs.

- We may not have members with the amount of influence we once had. Perhaps we can think about an Executive Committee as part of the Forum and engage the decision makers at the appropriate time – trigger points, such as updating the MOU;
- Getting more engineers engaged and informed in fish passage efforts;
- Of our 10 signatories, only two are non-governmental – a lot of work we try to do is help practitioners – they could help guide us in terms of their needs;
- We seem to distribute limited funds, but we haven't diversified where we place our funds.

## Opportunities

- Help people with prioritizing fish passage barrier remediation (FishPASS) – resources are limited, but we can help guide how people invest?
- Monitoring, planning, and assessment are the most difficult things to get funded – perhaps this is a niche we can fill.
- Affiliation could increase our level of potential grant funding (e.g., FishPACS) – could create a higher NFHP ranking for us, which would allow us to receive more funding.
- Expand our focus to instream flow (once fish passage is addressed).
- Tracking progress in removing barriers – how much progress are we making?
- Improving the PAD – there is much more that can go into that database – explore passability.
- Linking the PAD with future prioritizations.

### 2. Does our geographic scope remain valid, or should it be modified?

Revise the map to include historical anadromy.

### 3. Do we want to make updating the PAD a more significant ongoing project for the Forum?, i.e., make a more dedicated annual effort to facilitate a process to update regional components of the PAD? If the answer to the above question is yes, and feeding off several conversations occurred during our summer meeting, does the Forum want to consider seeking funding for and providing funding support for assessments – versus/in addition to individual fish passage barrier remediation projects?

Reach out to user groups with a survey – do you use it, if so how; how could we improve it? We could send out the survey when we do the annual update. Include a question about if they are providing updates.

There are a lot of unknown barriers in the PAD – of the unknown barriers, the potential anadromous area is just a portion of that. Create a focused effort to assess barriers that are most impactful to fish.

Gap analysis – Forum members could get people to help Anne review it. Reinitiate that process. There is an opportunity in PAD to track the chronology for each project.

### 4. Is Forum membership representative of the full potential of the Forum, or should we propose an approach/strategy to bring more entities into the Forum?

More nonprofit participation is desired.

### 5. When FishPASS officially launches in 2018, what next steps would you like to take to:

- a. Engage fish passage practitioners in its use (in addition to our scheduled April SRF workshop)?

- b. Use the tool for Forum use – what are you thinking its utility is for the Forum? Is it to develop priority barrier lists by region/watershed?

We may not be 100% ready for this workshop – we have found glitches each time we have tested FishPASS. We need to make sure the watersheds we run are failproof. Workshop – we’re making FishPASS for the practitioners – gather input to ensure we’re catering to who is using.

6. Our Eel River event was considered successful by both the Forum and local stakeholders/partner organizations. Can and should we be doing more of it, and including setting aside some of our annual operational dollars for these kinds of outreach events?

The Eel River event was opportunistic – these kinds of events have been a placeholder in the Outreach and Education Committee work plan. We may not be able to identify the specific events well in advance, but could consider opportunities, and play a role on an ad hoc basis. Include in strategic plan.

7. Do all nine objectives in our current strategic plan remain valid or should they be modified/replaced? Forum members recommended the following changes to the Forum’s nine objectives:
  1. Remediate barriers to effective fish migration.
  2. Facilitate coordination and communication among agencies, agency staff, and other entities that may propose, review, or promulgate fish passage ~~criteria~~ **projects** within California.
  3. Identify, assess and prioritize the removal of fish passage barriers.
  4. Disseminate guidelines and design criteria for replacement of barriers.
  5. Coordinate funding mechanisms to remove fish passage barriers.
  6. ~~Promote~~ **Support** state and federal permit coordination and efficiencies.
  7. Facilitate plans to monitor and evaluate fish passage restoration effectiveness to ensure accountability.
  8. ~~Promote~~ **Encourage** existing state/national policy and actions that support fish passage improvement in CA.
  9. Implement education and outreach activities, targeting both the public & fish passage practitioners.
8. Would you like to better engage with other FHPs that have similar interests? In what ways?

The lamprey FHP focuses on fish passage as the primary threat – it’s a natural connection between us and them. The lamprey FHP has many connections with tribes as well. **Action item:** The Forum will consider convening with the Lamprey FHP in spring.

We may have common interests with other coastal FHPs that may want to do similar assessments as us – symbiotically and synergistically work with them.

PMEP continues to focus on estuary work, and they are working on a new strategic plan. Much of their estuary work ties into the Forum. Our tidegate passage issues overlap with them.

Is there a joint project we could explore with the NFHP reservoirs partnership?

### **Presentations:**

The Forum heard [four presentations](#) focused on the lamprey database and lamprey monitoring at low head weirs (D. Goodman and S. Reid), preliminary results from the Forum-supported juvenile fish passage project associated with swimming/leaping ability thresholds (R. Wantuck/D. White), the Manly Gulch fish passage project (A. Halligan), and the potential reintroduction of Chinook salmon above Shasta dam (J. Ambrose, R. Beckwith).