



California Fish Passage Forum Meeting

Meeting Minutes

May 19, 2016
Webinar Meeting

Attendees: Michael Bowen, Jon Mann, Marc Commandatore, John Kleinfelter, Tom Schroyer, Anne Elston, Stan Allen, Bob Pagliuco, Candice Meneghin, Donnie Ratcliff, Frank Meraz, Javier Linares-Casenave, Frank Meraz, Melinda Molnar, Steve Brumbaugh, Carson Cox, Lisa DeBruyckere and guest Susan Cierebiej (Washington Department of Transportation).

Carryover action items from February 2016 meeting: All items were completed with the exception of the following:

- The Science and Data Committee needs to discuss membership, including Chair and Co-chair.
- Because of Kevin Shaffer's new assignment within CDFW, Tom Schroyer is the new Forum representative.

Decision items from May 2016 meeting:

- The Forum 2016 budget was approved.
- The shortened version of the monitoring case study document will be posted on the Forum website with a link to the lengthy version of the document. Lisa will discuss with Michael whether or not it is feasible for the Outreach and Education Committee to draft future case studies with review, editing and approval by the Science and Data Committee.

Action items from this (May 2016 meeting):

- Bob Pagliuco will craft language that demonstrates the alignment of the goals of the Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment with the Forum's strategic priorities (see page 3 of this document for draft language), and then Forum members will review this language and suggest edits to demonstrate relevance of this assessment to fish passage barrier remediation in California.
- Member organizations will check with the purchasing staff in respective agencies to determine if their purchasing staff purchase on Amazon.com and would be willing to designate NFHP as the recipient of 0.5% of proceeds generated by purchasing on Amazon.com. This program is called the Amazon.smile program: <http://smile.amazon.com/gp/aw/ch/about>
- Lisa DeBruyckere will produce an outline and draft budget to develop and print (limited number of print copies – mostly online product) a document that highlights fish passage work in California on an annual basis.
- The Outreach and Education Committee will add to its work plan the creation of 3-5 key messages to articulate how FISHPass could be useful for fish passage barrier remediation practitioners and others.

- Michael Bowen will attend a FEMA brown bag luncheon on May 25 and report back to the Forum any discussions associated with plans to address fish passage barrier issues after an emergency, such as an earthquake.
- The Governance Committee will discuss the Pacific lamprey project proposal at its upcoming June 9 meeting.
- The Governance Committee will discuss the date of the September Forum meeting in relation to the date that has been set for the Southern Steelhead Summit (last week of October) and will make a recommendation to the Forum for whether or not the Forum meeting should change and/or we can provide added benefit to the Southern Steelhead Summit.
- A small working group will advance FISHPass and key next steps to incorporate stream temperature data as well as a visual tool to spatially display outputs.
- The Science and Data Committee will provide a list of potential case study projects, and pending a discussion between Lisa and Michael Bowen, the Outreach and Education Committee could potentially draft these case studies for S & D Committee approval.

Action items from last meeting

Science and Data Committee - The next Science and Data Committee phone call should include a discussion about membership. Marc Commandatore and Steve Brumbaugh will discuss DWR membership in advance of that call.

CDFW - Kevin has a special assignment from his director – Tom is taking his place as the Forum representative, and Jon Mann is serving as his alternate.

Forum members - Donnie has been speaking with Reclamation about membership on Forum. The Forum used to have a FEMA representative - they were involved to create a set of products (if S. Cal. Streams/culverts get blown out, can we put in fish-friendly passage in their stead?). The Coastal Conservancy is having a brownbag with FEMA on May 25 regarding sea level rise adaptation, and development of non-regulatory maps outlining potential risk areas in the future. This will have a significant bearing on estuarine restoration projects, tidegate modification and the like. **ACTION ITEM:** Michael Bowen will take notes and report back to the Forum. The USACE checked with their Sac and S. California office – they'll continue to participate, but will not have an official Forum representative.

Proposed 2016 Budget

FWS NFHAP Funds Available	
FY16 Total	\$121,824
FY15 Remaining for project	\$30,580
Stay with FWS (Donnie)	
Calaveras RR	\$40,000
To PSMFC	
Manly Gulch	\$24,185
CFPF Coordinator	\$10,000
CFPF Partnership Support	\$10,000
FISHPass and PAD Support	\$37,639
Total	\$81,824
MSCG Funds Available	
Prior year funding (need to spend by 12/31/16)	\$8,445
Most recent funding (may be able to extend to 12/31/17)	\$36,835
Items to fund	
Juvenile Fish Passage Criteria Assessment Project - ACTION ITEM: Bob is crafting a set of bullets to demonstrate alignment with this project and Forum priorities- Forum members will review.	\$13,008
Dr. O'Hanley FISHPass	\$10,000
Total	\$23,008
Remaining	\$22,272

DECISION ITEM: 2016 budget was discussed and approved.

Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment (**ACTION ITEM:** Forum members will review this language and suggest edits to demonstrate relevance of this assessment to fish passage barrier remediation in California):

Bob drafted some language that connections Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment to check alignment with the Forum's strategic priorities:

- ***Improve coordination of existing agency programs, criteria and guideline efforts, and private sector activities across jurisdictions to improve the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of fish passage restoration efforts.*** The Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment is an important part of an ongoing revision of NMFS fish passage criteria in the West Coast Region. NMFS currently requires a maximum 6" jump at boulder weirs at fish passage projects. Projects with smaller required jump heights require more boulder weirs added to the channel downstream of the culvert to make up the difference in grade. As a result, projects built with a 6" jumps are significantly more expensive than projects that require 12" jumps because you need to excavate at least twice as much amount of channel and build at least twice as many boulder weirs. In some urban areas where there is a limited amount of space to work with due to existing infrastructure, a 6" jump requirement will often prevent the project from being implemented due to a lack of channel space to work within. The Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment will help determine if the maximum jump height for boulder weirs can be raised to 12" without significant negatively impacting fish passage, having the potential to save applicants and taxpayers millions of dollars every year in fish passage construction costs. Knowledge gained from the Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment would increase operational and regulatory efficiency at dams and diversions which would improve coordination of existing agency programs and improve the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of fish passage restoration efforts. In addition, this would also address action #9 in the CA Water Action Plan.
- ***Facilitate coordination and communication among agencies, agency staff, and other entities that may propose, review, or promulgate fish passage criteria within California.*** As mentioned above, the Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment has the potential to revise and promulgate fish passage criteria and guidelines within CA (and the Pacific Northwest). This effort will likely save fish passage restorationists and taxpayers significant amounts of money and reduce instream impacts by reducing the project footprints of fish passage projects.
- ***Disseminate guidelines and design criteria for replacement of barriers.*** As mentioned above, the Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment has the potential to revise fish passage criteria within CA (and the Pacific Northwest), which would be disseminated to restoration partners.
- ***Promote state and national policy and actions that support fish passage improvement in California.*** The Juvenile Salmon Fish Passage Criteria Assessment has the potential to revise West Coast fish passage criteria (State, Regional and National Policy), allow fish passage projects with significant infrastructure constraints to be remediated, and save significant amounts of taxpayer dollars.

Amazon Smile

PSMFC has a corporate Amazon account – they can use Amazon smile to order supplies through Amazon.

ACTION ITEM: Member organizations will check with the purchasing staff in respective agencies to determine if their purchasing staff purchase on Amazon.com and would be willing to designate NFHP as the recipient of 0.5% of proceeds generated by purchasing on Amazon.com.

<http://smile.amazon.com/gp/aw/ch/about>

NFHP scoring

NFHP designated one level 3 partnership in 2016 – there were several 2's and a few level 1's. The Forum scored a 1 because of projects that were not completed in one year. If an FHP scores a 1 in any criteria, the overall score cannot be greater than a 1. For fiscal year 2011-2013, FHPs needed to have more than 60% of projects completed by September 30 of 2014 and more than 80% for level 3. The Forum was a few months late for a few projects, which resulted in a 40% completion rate for that criteria. There was also concern expressed about the juvenile jump test and whether or not projects like that directly benefit fish habitat. We are adding a narrative about it being a benefit beyond research. There will be a more formal connection with the NFHP board before these scores are finalized in the future.

Governance Committee

The Governance Committee met on March 24 and reviewed potential 2016 projects, discussed the monitoring document that Ross Taylor produced, initiated the 10 Waters to Watch nomination, and discussed a Fall S. California event as part of the regular Forum meeting.

The Governance Committee met on April 28 to discuss NFHP funding and reaching out to applicants to inform them of status; to take steps to prioritizing the budget; and to discuss FISHPass.

On the morning of May 19, the Governance Committee had a conference call to review the budget.

Science and Data Committee

The Science and Data Committee has had one conference call since the last Forum meeting. They discussed group membership and the need for a Chair (Javier is acting Chair). PAD QA/QC – Anne has been working with PSMFC, adding and reviewing all the barriers in the northern portion of California (with Sharon Powers). Chris Wheaton with PSMFC will be the liaison between the Science and Data Committee for NFHP and the Forum (replacing Javier).

At the June NFHP Board meeting, the NFHP Board is anticipated to approve a new FHP West Coast lamprey partnership.

This Saturday is World Fish Migration Day – there is a link on the Forum's website. The Forum should consider doing something with more intent next year, given our mission. Perhaps the Forum could produce an annual document that deals with fish passage in California – contributed papers – engineering section – a section that describes what each agency is doing. **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa could take the lead in producing and outline and budget for a project that describes annual fish passage barrier accomplishments. More of a web-page internet based product that could be used with legislative staff. When we consider language for the document, we should consider the California Water Action Plan- language to speak in is not at the species level – it's at the water action level. The inaugural issue would be a good place to talk about lamprey passage and the importance of fish passage in light of climate change and drought issues.

Outreach and Education Committee

The Committee has been working with Steph and Candice to discuss a potential meeting in the Fall of 2016 in S. California. The S. California group is recommending a workshop the end of October, however the Forum has set its meeting for the first week of September. **ACTION ITEM:** The Forum Governance

Committee will discuss this at its upcoming Governance Committee meeting and make a recommendation to the Forum.

FishPass and Norwest

There was an April 28 conference call involving Bob, Donnie, Anne, Stan, Javier, Dan Isaak and Dave Nagel, Van Hare, Kate Sherman, Brett Holycross, and Jesse O’Hanley to develop an action plan to advance FISHPass. The surrogate for habitat quality is stream temperature. How do we get the temperature data into FISHPass to give some view of habitat quality? A small working group will be convened (Jesse, Donnie, Anne, Van, PSMFC) to work on identified issues to date (determine what is core habitat, etc.). Base model runs provide both current and estimated future condition based on climate change scenarios. Watershed experts will begin to look at FISHPass, but we need a visual tool to do that. Brett and Van believe there are easy solutions to put the outputs into a .kmz file. Lisa and Donnie developed a proposal to test FISHPass and start workshopping this with people. Long term, perhaps the Forum can promote targeted solicitations – 20 to 30 barriers that need projects. There’s a way to pitch this beyond the Forum – we need to have 3 talking points for all of us to market the use of it. (integrated with PAD, it’s a decision support tool). There is a lot of interest – we need simple talking points that concisely hit on the benefits and why people would use it. John Kleinfelter - Western Clatsop County HCP – fish and aquatic issues identified in their plan – have 35 fish passage issues in numerous diversions – they don’t have any way to prioritize the barriers. To get a permit, they need to ID what they are going to do and the number of projects they are going to complete. FISHPass could be a good solution for identifying priorities and showcasing FISHPass. Next steps: finish testing, get map-based view for results, and then revise proposal to set up workshops and use it with groups. CDFW, DWR and others want to run FISHPass through regional staff before workshops are conducted, etc. Other examples of case studies where FISHPass can be used include Hemphill Dam.

ACTION ITEM: Outreach and education committee will add the creation of talking point to its work plan while the small working group advances FISHPass.

Washington Department of Transportation

Susan Cierebiej, Washington State Department of Transportation Fish Passage Coordinator – WSDOT manages a 100-year highway system and about half of the them pose problems for fish (high velocity, shallow pools, shallow water depths in culverts, etc.). Average cost of a barrier replacement is \$3 million. Lineal habitat gains are driving which barriers they replace - \$30 million/year and 20 projects/year. See [Susan’s presentation](#) on the Forum website.

Pacific Lamprey PAD Project Proposal

A timeline has been added for completion of the project along with a cost estimate. The final proposal was submitted to the Forum Governance Committee. Pacific lamprey is now a focal species for the USFWS – the Pacific Lamprey FHP is expected to be recognized by NFHP at their next board meeting. Damon Goodman (USFWS – Arcata) is the Pacific lamprey expert biologist for the region. He is working with Stewart Reid to develop implementation plans for California. The Forum S and D Committee would serve in an advisory capacity. The lamprey layers would ultimately be integrated with PAD. Assessments will populate the database specific to lamprey. The timeline for the project is 18 months, and the budget is \$40,000, with an additional \$30,000 in kind. **ACTION ITEM:** The Governance Committee will discuss the proposal at the June 9 Governance Committee meeting to determine how to move this forward. The USFWS has a current agreement with Stewart, or PSMFC could contract with Stewart. Perhaps a portion of the funding could be used for work to be done between now and May of next year, then use 2017 funding to complete the project (because it’s an 18-month project).

Glenbrook Gulch Dam Removal Project

Leah Mahan crafted a 20+-page case study document on this project and then created a shortened version, which was redesigned into a five-page document. **DECISION ITEM:** Lisa DeBruyckere will add the shortened version on the Forum website with a link to the longer version of the document. **ACTION**

ITEM: The Science and Data Committee will provide a list of potential case study projects (review CDFW program projects that align with FRGP), and (they have highlighted them as case studies), and pending a discussion between Lisa and Michael Bowen, the Outreach and Education Committee could potentially draft these case studies for S & D Committee approval.