



CALIFORNIA FISH PASSAGE FORUM

Governance Committee Meetings

Present: Holly Steindorf, Sandi Jacobsen, Stan Allen, Natalie Stauffer-Olsen

Absent: Tim Loux, Bob Pagliuco, Andrew Hampton, Holly Eddinger

Meeting attendance:

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

3/7 Agenda

- Discuss 2024 Forum Work Plan
(https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WlpJLz13dpL20xc5nxv5Hiviudc4aP5FABAvCPVFWyA/edit?usp=drive_link)
- Review proposed FY 25 Project list, ranked by review committee.
- Update from Sandi on Effectiveness Assessment
- Set dates for inviting other signatories to the Forum.
- Idea of putting Forum poster together for SRF and Idea of steering committee meeting in November in Sacramento with included outreach event.

3/ 7 Meeting Minutes:

Work Plan

The Governance Committee reviewed the 2024 forum work plan. Based on partial attendance for this meeting, the work plan will need to be reviewed by the larger governance committee before it is finalized, goal is to finalize within the next few meetings, and use the 2024 work plan to define our work for the year. One of the points that came up in the work plan is Task 1.2 - Find a new chair for governance committee. Something to consider for the forum would be structuring the governance such that a forum chair and/or committee chairs are a rotating chair position which has a defined term length. This could help get more varied involvement into forum work and solve the issue of no one wanting to step up as chair because it is "a lifetime sentence". We should consider this goal at future governance committee meetings. Let's discuss if we would want to move forward with it and see if that requires a change to the bylaws.

FY25 Ranked List

The first project on the recommended list is the forum coordination and operations budget. Based on feedback from other FHP coordinators and some consistent challenges with capacity which limits the impact of FHP's, the coordinator recommends requesting the full increased amount for forum operations in FY25. The coordinator will draft a document outlining some of the ways that money could be used. Possible uses for the additional up to the additional 45K could be:

Governance Committee Meeting Agendas- Working Document- California Fish Passage Forum

- Data Maintenance and Management (Clear allocation for PSMFC Data staff for continuation or development of datasets or tools),
- Outreach (Outreach events, communications specialist/consultant, attendance at conferences, In person-workshops)
- Coordination Hours (more coordinator hours to facilitate the things on this list) Additional coordination personnel (i.e. communications specialist),
- Travel (More or more involved in in-person meetings, Partners support for meetings and events, Partners reimbursement)
- Special projects (Repeat of barriers to title connectivity, partial funding for effectiveness assessment, resources, documents, et cetera).

Holly will discuss these ideas with the governance committee. Given the March 31st deadline for project submissions, a decision will need to be made soon about how much the Forum will request for operations funding In FY25. The consideration will be with an increase in funding we will have to consider our match for the coordinator role. Holly is keeping track of member hours for forum work.

Out of 8 restoration project applications, the review committee advocates recommending six for funding. One project was not considered due to an undeveloped application and nonexistent budget justification. Recognizing the limits of our likely funding levels, the last ranked project was removed due to low technical and design merit, and high budgetary overhead. Out of the remaining 6 projects, all are recommended for funding. See the below descriptions of projects and reviewer comments for specific project details. The total requested sums to \$660,828.96, well above our likely funding levels from NFHP. The review committee considered our likely funding levels (estimated at \$350,000) and recommends funding the first three ranked projects at full request, and partially funding projects 4 and 5 if NFHP funding levels are as anticipated, totaling \$380,000. Holly has confirmed that project 4 (Sturgeon Passage) is able to accept partial funds, still waiting to hear back from project 5 (Mid Klamath). The justification for this is that both projects may be able to accept partial funds based on the nature of the project, they rank about equally in score (Project 4 scoring higher due to match). Table 1 shows the ranked project list with match ratio, full requested amount, and consecutive total request.

Table 1: Funding Summary Table

| | Project Name | Ratio | Requested Funds | Cumulative Totals |
|---|--|-------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1 | CFPF Operational Support | 1 | \$125,000.00 | \$125,000.00 |
| 2 | Adobe Creek Barrier Assessment, Design and Permitting | 2.2 | \$132,000.00 | \$257,000.00 |
| 3 | Dutch Bill Creek Market Street Weir Repair Fish Passage Improvement Project | 1.2 | \$77,733.07 | \$334,733.07 |
| 4 | Designing for Sturgeon Passage in the San Joaquin River at Eastside Bypass Control Structure | 39.9 | \$57,984.19 | \$392,717.26 |
| 5 | Mid-Klamath Rearing Habitat Assessment and Enhancement Project | 0.08 | \$58,003.00 | \$450,720.26 |
| 6 | Angel Creek Fish Barrier Removal Project | 1 | \$168,149.00 | \$618,869.26 |
| 7 | North Fork Schooner Gulch Culvert Replacement | 0.25 | \$41,959.70 | \$660,828.96 |

TOTAL \$660,828.96

For the document with more detailed project descriptions and reviewer comments, see appendix at the end of these notes. The coordinator recommends getting comments from the governance committee members not present at this meeting, and barring objections, sending this list to the steering committee for comments and final approval, given that the deadline for project submission to the NFHP board is March 31st.

Effectiveness Assessment

Sandi provided an update on these statewide effectiveness assessment proposal and work plan. This updated information can also be found in the meeting notes for the 3/6 science and data committee meeting. The work plan has been reviewed by John Mann at CDFW and Jean Castillo from NOAA NMFS. Both indicated that there is support for this assessment, which could be useful in each agency's efforts to update their stream crossing guidelines or stream bed restoration guidelines. The work plan is reworked and includes a narrowed focus (changing focus from a large variety of engineered stream bed structures, just to roughen channels and technical fish ways) based on feedback from the above as well as an updated budget. Ready for a review from the Governance Committee. A more in-depth review could be a good agenda item for our next governance committee meeting. Holly will send out the revised work plan scope and budget with the Governance Committee meeting notes.

Inviting Signatories to the Forum

Holly inquired if we are ready to move forward with inviting signatories for the forum, this group's answer is yes, though we recognize That final approval for which signatories and who will be sent the invitation would benefit from full governance committee approval. Holly will start drafting an invitation letter for Sandi to use to invite additional members to the forum.

SRF Poster

At the education and Outreach Committee meeting ruth Goodfield mentioned putting together a poster outlining the work of the forum for use at poster sessions in conferences. Ruth offered to man the poster at the upcoming SRF conference. Pitch this idea to the group, full support. Will start drafting poster.

Steering Committee Meeting

Based on feedback from the jotform, October through December seems to be good months for travel, having a steering committee meeting in the middle of this, in November could be a good time of year for an event. Sacramento was a popular suggestion; Holly sees no reason to think further afield if hosting in Sacramento allows more signatory members to come. Pairing this with a more developed outreach event including a site tour geared not only toward agencies and practitioners, but also to community members and families, could be great. Group is in support.

Action Items:

- Governance committee members to review 2024 work plan for scope, anything missing etc.
- Governance committee to review ranked 1FY25 project list and provide comments within a week, so Holly can send list to steering committee.

- Holly to draft justification of increased operations funding, as operations funding increase would be put into March 31st project submission.
- Holly to draft an invitation letter For Sandy to use to invite additional signatories to the form.

Appendix

Project Descriptions

Project 1: CFPF Operational Support

Based on feedback from other FHP coordinators and consistent challenges with capacity which limits the impact of FHP's, the coordinator recommends requesting the full amount for forum operations. In FY25. The coordinator will draft a document outlining some of the ways that money could be used. Utilizing that money to increase forum functioning capacity and impact. Possible uses for the additional up to the additional 45K could be:

- Data Maintenance and Management (Clear allocation for PSMFC Data staff for continuation or development of datasets or tools),
- Outreach (Outreach events, communications specialist/consultant, attendance at conferences, In person-workshops)
- Coordination Hours (more coordinator hours to facilitate the things on this list) Additional coordination personnel (i.e. communications specialist),
- Travel (More or more involved in in-person meetings, Partners support for meetings and events, Partners reimbursement)
- Special projects (Repeat of barriers to title connectivity, partial funding for effectiveness assessment, resources, documents, et cetera).

Project 2: Adobe Creek Barrier Assessment, Design and Permitting

Lead: Sonoma County Public Infrastructure

Description: The project will develop preliminary designs and permits to replace the box culvert/bridge on Adobe Creek to provide volitional fish passage for all life stages, eliminate stranding of juveniles and provide access to upstream summer rearing areas. This project is a priority 1 action in the CCC steelhead Recovery Plan PR-CCCS-5.1.1.5

Reviewer Comments: This is a straightforward barrier removal with clear justification and well-presented budget. Yields 65% plans and permits for engineering design and permits. Good community engagement/education and use benefits. Upstream and downstream habitat on Parks property. The proposed project is identified as a high priority in the NMFS Steelhead Recovery Plan. Local support is strong. It will only open 0.4 miles of stream habitat for juveniles and adults.

Project 3: Dutch Bill Creek Market Street Weir Repair Fish Passage Improvement Project

Lead: Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District

Description: The Gold Ridge RCD will implement the Dutch Bill Creek Market Street Weir Repair Fish Passage Improvement Project to address a barrier identified in the California fish passage assessment database (PAD) as ID# 712087 at the former Dutch Bill Creek Barrier Elimination Project site constructed in 2009, in the Russian River watershed in Sonoma County, California. The goal is to reduce the jump height and improve fish passage to upstream critical habitat for endangered coho salmon and threatened steelhead trout. The first phase will develop an engineered design for the repair and prepare permit applications.

Reviewer Comments: This project has strong team experience and provides good benefits, looking at map can provide potential 3.39 miles additional access. Deliverable: one design barrier remediation. At 40 cfs, 1.2 ft jump height, exceeds the 1 ft max, but not by much. on CDFW barrier list. Question on lower barriers. Match >1:1 with WCB. No pre-project monitoring. Overall, good planning project - they imply that they will complete 95% design (final design) but don't state it. 2 downstream barriers may limit the benefits until they are remediated.

Project 4: Designing for Sturgeon Passage in the San Joaquin River at Eastside Bypass Control Structure

Lead: USFWS

Description: We are interested in answering questions to inform design modifications to the Eastside Bypass Control Structure (EBCS) and associated downstream rock ramp, and to validate sturgeon usage before project construction. This project will compile movement data of an anadromous state Species of Concern, together with habitat and environmental variables to improve native fish passage. In conjunction, the proposed monitoring study presents an opportunity to possibly document new habitat usage by sturgeon in the Restoration Area and further inform integrated management of San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP) Restoration Flows for the benefit of multiple species.

Reviewer Comments: Funded in 2023 (and probably in 2024 depending on NFHP award amount). Anecdotally we are one of their study sources of funding for this project. Match that they count is from the full implementation of the redesign of the east side bypass structure, not just for the monitoring component. This project is just for the sturgeon Telemetry monitoring component with a plan of monitoring 24 stream miles. Would be interested in funding this part way rather than not at all.

Project 5: Mid-Klamath Rearing Habitat Assessment and Enhancement Project

Lead: Salmon River Restoration Council

Description: Seasonal low flow barriers in key tributaries in the mid-Klamath and Salmon River subbasins will be manually reconstructed using hand tools to allow for juvenile and adult fish passage. The proposed project will improve salmonid fish passage into 30 to 40 tributaries. The objectives are to maintain and improve access to existing habitat by removing or manipulating seasonal barriers and

improving connectivity to coldwater refugia. This is designed to ensure fish passage during critical periods of rearing and migration. Fish passage improvement work will be complemented by habitat enhancement activities such installation of brush bundles and placement of woody debris.

Reviewer Comments: Watershed Education program and MKWC's youth programs. Mobilizing a small adaptable crew of well-trained technicians on the ground during the summer season allows SRRC and MKWC to use real time data to guide our restoration decisions and track fish health and activity. We encourage them to apply, though with NFHP funding levels we may not be able to fund this project in full, would like to see if they will accept partial funds if cannot award the full amount.

Project 6: Angel Creek Fish Barrier Removal Project

Lead: Sonoma County Public Infrastructure

Description: The project will replace three undersized and/or damaged culverts. The downstream existing 24-inch corrugated metal culvert is undersized and perched approximately 2 feet above the channel bottom, resulting in a barrier to upstream passageway for salmonids. It will be replaced with a properly sized culvert that will incorporate fish passage design criteria including gradient, bottom with, and upstream and downstream resting pool and other rock treatments. This barrier removal project is a component of a larger restoration design for instream habitat enhancement along 1,000 feet of Angel Creek, upstream of this crossing, and replacement of two additional undersized/damaged 3 ft diameter culverts that feed this creek. The habitat enhancement component will include habitat features such as large woody debris, appropriate pool and riffle placement, and other salmonid friendly design techniques. Endangered Central California Coast coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and threatened steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) are regularly observed in Mill Creek and have been documented in Angel Creek within the last ten years. Removing these barriers would allow access to a previously unreachable section of this watershed for these salmonids and other aquatic species. The project will include pre-project monitoring of aquatic habitat including juvenile salmonids, with the goal of assessing pre-project distribution and relative abundance of juvenile fish.

Reviewer Comments: This project remediates three undersized culverts that cause partial barriers to salmonids during the dry season and restores 1000 feet of in stream habitat between those culverts. This area is a core release stream for the Russian River Captive Broodstock program. Direct benefits are only 0.2 miles and 0.5 acres of reconnected habitat . Does include a two year monitoring. High quality 65% design project for 3 crossings in important Russian River tributary but lacks permit compliance step for designs so will not result in shovel ready status project. Lacks detail on how determined budget for engineering subcontractor.

Project 7: North Fork Schooner Gulch Culvert Replacement

Lead: North Fork Schooner Gulch Property Owners

Description: This project intends to improve fish passage by developing final (100%) engineered designs for a road crossing on North Fork Schooner Gulch. We landowners have properties off of Schooner Gulch Road, a County owned road in Mendocino County, CA. We live on a ridge between Schooner Gulch and North Fork Schooner Gulch. Our access is a private road off of Schooner Gulch County Road that crosses North Fork Schooner Gulch. In 2016, a severe storm washed out the 4 foot diameter culvert on our access road, leaving us no vehicular access to seven private properties. Replacing the road crossing on NF Schooner Gulch will provide access to 0.7 miles of salmonid habitat, primarily benefiting threatened North Coast Steelhead Trout. CDFW monitored the stream in 2018 and observed several age classes of steelhead within the first 0.15 miles of stream.

Reviewer Comments: This is a resubmission of a project submitted in 2024. Based on NFHP award amount, they may not get funded in 2024. The applicant is a private landowner. Project is to have final engineering design, retired EPA and US Army Corps of Engineers are listed as support personnel. Questions from Review Committee on their design. Why do they need such a long culvert for such a strong small stream? There is a possibility of realignment? Based on small match and other projects having greater technical expertise, this project ranks low. However, this means that they are likely not funded from the forum and given the applicant it may be hard for them to find funding elsewhere. How have they returned access to the residences that were cut off? Maybe a better fit for other funding sources?