



CALIFORNIA FISH PASSAGE FORUM

Science & Data Committee Meetings

Present: Holly Steindorf,

Absent:

Meeting attendance:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NApL93PWEhVy2thUfWbRoe0ILJVullm5_YTjQfazKil/edit?usp=drive_link

4/3 Agenda

- Finalize 2024 Work Plan
- Updates on committee work, funding cycle, and intranet changes
- PAD updates
- Solicit presentation ideas
- Update on statewide effectiveness assessment
- Review outreach calendar

4/3 Meeting Minutes:

Work Plan

Committee reviewed the 2024 forum work plan on Google Drive. Goal of finalizing agreement of the tasks owned by the science and data committee and providing any outstanding comments on the work plan overall. The group discussed each task owned by the Science & Data Committee.

Task 1.6. Continue PAD plan for Regions 2 and 1.

We are on target to finish this in 2024. Region 2 is in expert review, and Region 1 is in advanced QA/QC. Region 1 webinars will be done by June, those are the last of the expert review webinars.

Task 1.7. Maintain and make edits as needed to the mobile version of the Fish Passage Incidental Report (V3).

Maintain, yes, make edits- maybe. While Ann has received suggestions for edits from users over the years, mainly at CDFW, these edits are not immediate or crucial to the function of the survey. Van notes that the limiting factor for its use is coordination required to manage user accounts. The survey is credentialed access only, and once in, users can edit the fields of the survey. To limit the number of users, and associated administrative work in assisting with login, the committee discussed supporting access to the survey for distinct projects. Anne mentions that the CDFW SHaRP is partnering with a local RCD to identify tide gates on the Eel River in May

and April, could they use this on their tablets (6 tablets) to expedite the process? Van and Ann are going to discuss this more offline to see if this is something we can support, logistically.

Task 1. 8. Maintain contact with SARP to incorporate Forum data into the National Barrier Prioritization Tool.

The SARP tool has access to the feature service so they are updated when the PAD is updated, and they can incorporate new pad data independently. The baseline fish habitat layer is incorporated as a filterable option. There are no new updates or asks of the Forum for this task at this time. We will continue to maintain contact and develop the relationship with Sarp as forum members identify ways we can enhance the quality, resolution, and relevance of the national barrier prioritization tool for our geographic scope.

Task 1. 9. Explore functionality for the service center model for FISHPass

Holly is in communication with several of the original members of the FISHPass working group and intends to reach out to members such as Damon Goodman, Brend Holy Cross, Alex Jones, etc. to ensure we have everything we need to run the model in a service center capacity when the time comes. Before the online functionality, the model was run by Anne.

Van outlined to the Committee the benefits of the service center model approach. Waiting to be approached by people who have a distinct project/area who could use the program, build a partnership, and use their factors/specifics to tune the model for their needs is a better ROI than maintaining an open program that has a lot of caveats, and as such is difficult to apply broadly to a large set of circumstances/variables. Running the model/tracing does take a lot of work, so another benefit is if someone comes to us, so we can build a relationship for a smaller focused geographic scope, that is a better fit to our capacity.

Sandi mentioned that it may be a good opportunity to partner with a practitioner/agency who could use the optimization tool at the 4/5 webinar. Holly will solicit verbiage to put on a slide to offer this option at the webinar.

Task 3.3 Host Regional Prioritization and Networking event with each CDFW management Region.

Andrew mentions that he would like a central place to discuss alignment and prioritization for different agencies/ organizations. Should the Forum be this platform? To the 48 participants of the pad Region 2 webinar on 3/20, we posed a question asking if folks would be interested in two times per year prioritization synthesis meetings, and if those meetings would fill an unmet need, the results were overwhelmingly positive. Bob points out that prioritization is a sensitive subject. Bob is in support of the idea if we were invited to collaborate on a synthesis meeting project by CDFW instead of us forcing a discussion about disagreements in prioritization between organizations. We will continue discussing this in the governance committee to determine if the Forum should proceed with this idea.

The committee agrees that these tasks are worded appropriately, and achievable for 2024 in their current state. The 2024 Work Plan for the Science and Data Committee is final.

Science and Data Committee Meeting Agendas- Working Document- California FISHPassage Forum

Not mentioned in meeting Holly forgot to bring up in the meeting that now that the 2024 work plan is finalized, an agenda item for next meeting will be considering our 2025 work plan, so we can finish it before the end of FY24.

Updates on committee work, funding cycle, and intranet changes

The Forum Project Review Committee recommended seven out of eight projects to **NFHP** for funding. Our funding request and accomplishments report is submitted to NFHP for the next funding cycle, FY25. Our allocation from Congress for FY 24 is pending, should be arriving within the next month or so. The Forum Education and Outreach Committee put together a poster, which was presented at SRF last week. We are hoping the poster can go to the Cal-Neva AFS meeting later in April. Holly will follow up with Ruth to see if we can get the poster to AFS. Van is willing to print another if need be.

PAD updates.

The Region 2 expert review webinar on 3/20 was a success. We had 48 attendees, which included many people from Region 2, but a lot of folks from Region 1, and outside those regions, and even outside the state. Seems like there is interest in the PAD expert review process, and engagement on the forum listserv.

We got 28 responses to the expert review watershed self-identification survey. Region 2 is an active expert review, and Region 1 is in QA/QC.

Solicit presentation ideas.

Holly solicited the Committee for presentations on projects for future committee meetings. Gena mentions that the team working on the state parks portion of the Adobe Creek project may be able to present, after some cultural considerations have been worked out that are preventing communications at this time. Bob mentions that in a few months when he is less swamped, he may be able to provide a presentation on the Klamath Dam removals, which will be good timing in the summer when the deconstruction is more active. Sandi mentions she will search internally at CalTrout for someone to give a presentation at a future committee meeting.

Update on statewide effectiveness assessment.

Sandi gave an update on the statewide effectiveness assessment prospectus. With feedback from fish passage experts at CDFW and NOAA NMFS, the scope of the project has been narrowed to focus on roughened channels and hardened ramps, and some technical fishways. Sandi has consulted with Mike Love to continue developing the work plan and budget. The budget has increased from around 150K now to 250k, with the addition of site visits at the recommendation of Mike Love. Now that the prospectus is well developed, next step is looking for funding sources for this project. Funding through the Forum FY26 funding cycle is too delayed, so we will try to find funding sources available sooner. A cost share from multiple organizations, both federal and nonfederal by demonstrating need and support may be a good way to go. Gena mentioned WCB as a potential source of funding.

From WCB: <https://wcb.ca.gov/Grants>

Science and Data Committee Meeting Agendas- Working Document- California FISHPassage Forum

“WCB uses a single continuous grant application process for all proposed projects. A flowchart of the process is shown below, and is described in more detail in WCB’s General Grant Guidelines (PDF)(opens in new tab). The process begins with a Pre-Application (Word); however, Applicants can consult with WCB staff at any time, including before submitting a Pre-application. Applicants do not need to determine which WCB Grant Program or Funding Source to apply to; rather, WCB staff will determine that during application review. The review and selection of applications will depend on staffing capacity and the number of applications under consideration at any one time.”

Bob mentions that They are getting some funding for Klamath Dam removal monitoring from the North Coast water quality board funding. Sandi will contact Bob about that option.

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/grants/

Holly mentioned she will consult with Joan, coordinator for PMEP about funding special projects, as they have been successful in funding a few special projects for PMEP in the past, including the Pacific Coast Eelgrass report, which was funded from US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Review outreach calendar.

Review and add to the form shared outreach calendar to add upcoming events to which we can coordinate form outreach efforts.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1tZQ9SJv0sj40CxgL_T6MSG6vF3ZUwgBWmEop81JMmHQ/edit

Action Items:

- Holly to get feedback on verbiage on offering FISHPass optimization in partnership with a practitioner at the 4/5 Webinar.
- Van and Anne (and Holly?) to coordinate options for supporting CDFW ShaRP using the mobile version of the Fish Passage Incidental Report (V3) in their tide gate inventory on the Eel river.
- Anne, Neal, Holly and Andrew to plan and administer the next PAD Expert Review Webinar.
- Governance Committee to continue conversation about possible 2x yearly multi-organization Prioritization list discussion/networking meetings.
- Sandi and Bob to connect about North Coast Water Quality Control Board Funding Option.
- Committee members to consider other funding options for