CALIFORNIA FISH PASSAGE FORUM

Science & Data Committee Meetings

Present: Holly Steindorf, Bob Pagliuco, Marisa Parish Hanson, Van Hare, Holly Eddinger, Andrew Hampton, Emily Siegel

Absent: Sandi Jacobson, Tim Loux, Anne Elston, Mark Guard, Gena Lasko, Ted Masters

Meeting attendance: Meeting Attendance (Google Sheets)

10/2 Agenda

- 2025 SRF Rapid Assessment Protocol Workshop
    - Brief Status of the workshop (Holly)
    - Identify 3 support people (committee)
    - Recommendations for 2 additional workshop instructors (committee)
- Fish Passage Incidental Report
    - Accessing the online report (Survey 123) and transferring data- What is the best process? (committee)
    - Suggested changes to the lamprey questions from PLCI (Holly)
- Adjustments to Future S&D Committee Meetings
    - December Meeting right before Steering Committee Meeting? (vote)
    - Change January Meeting from 1/1 to 1/8 (move 1 week)
    - Change March Science and Data Committee from 3/5 to 3/12 (move 1 week)

10/2 Meeting Minutes:

2025 SRF Rapid Assessment Protocol Workshop

The 2025 Rapid Assessment Protocols workshop "Using Rapid Assessment Protocols to Gauge the Passability of Barriers to Anadromous Fish Passage, Including Hands-On Experience at Barriers Around Santa Cruz" has been accepted by SRF and published to the site. Kristin Schroeder (retired SC county) will help identify barriers within SC with varying degrees of passability which safely accommodate SRF van parking and workshop participants. Ross will get us a scope of work and budget, which the governance committee will review and approve.

Ross has agreed to lead the workshop and run the classroom portion, but will need support during the field portion, especially since the plan is to split up the workshop (30 attendees) into smaller groups to rotate through field sites.

We need: 2 support persons (facilitation, logistics, orienting attendees) and 2 field instructors (to run the field portion in parallel to Ross and take field group through barrier assessments)

Support Persons: Tentatively, Gena has agreed to be a support person. Emily and Marisa cannot commit right now but would be willing to support if they are attending. They will know more as the date approaches.

Instructor Support: Bob suggests Damon Goodman, since they have worked together in the past. Marisa would like to meet Ross in advance and go over details but would tentatively be comfortable acting as a field instructor.

Next Steps: Holly will ask Ross who he would prefer as instructor support and coordinate his attendance at our November Science and Data Committee Meeting on 11/6 for our next push of planning.

Fish Passage Incidental Report (Online Version Access)

There was some naming confusion about the product which we are talking about. The object of this discussion is the FISH PASSAGE INCIDENTAL REPORT, which Holly has been calling First Pass interchangeably. Van specified that FirstPass is also the name of the form used internally by Caltrans for their assessments. This may cause some confusion.

The FISH PASSAGE INCIDENTAL REPORT has been most heavily used for distinct projects (Damon Goodman project with Lamprey in the central valley, and Damon Goodman and Ross Taylor project with FISHPass in the Smith River) and used to get ground-truthed barrier data into the PAD.

There are a total of 441 records in the Fish Passage Incidental Report Online Version. Anne could share how many records have come to her through scanning and sending the paper report. The report was last updated in 2020. Van shares that most of the records are from USFWS, CDFW or from the above projects. The coordinator asked about a change in platform for the online survey. Van confirmed that Survey123 is the bets platform as allows report integration with other GIS data in PSMFC.

Gena has used the paper report in Parks, and Mark has used the online report in CDFW. At a check-in with the coordinator and committee chairs, Gena mentions that having a way to enter and export that information digitally would be helpful for those using the paper report. The coordinator posed the question: Would it be beneficial for the Forum to provide increased access to the Fish Passage Incidental Report Online Version? The committee identified some drawbacks, and the next steps for answering that question.

Pros of increased access to online report	**Cons of increased access to online report**
Periodic requests for access indicate there is some demand for access to the report, though not a lot.	Access could result in an influx of poor-quality submissions which have to be reviewed
Online data input is useful and convenient for those doing assessments	May be outside the original purpose of the report
Online access may increase usership of the report	Expend effort and don't have increased usership of the report

A committee suggestion was to implement an access request system that specifies the users must be with select agencies and have training in assessment. An example would be managers at CA State Parks

having access to the report and coordinating their field crews utilizing the report using their own devices.

The committee agrees that discussion with more committee members is needed before the value of increasing access can be determined. The committee specifically would like to hear perspective from Mark Guard at CDFW (reported use of the online report), Gena Lasko (reported use of the paper report) and Anne Elston (PAD data manager- on leave until end of October).

To reduce confusion between the Incidental Report and FirstPass (Caltrans), the coordinator suggests we remove the "first pass" subheading and only refer to the report as the "Fish Passage Incidental Report" on both our and CDFW websites. This change could occur at the same time with adjustments to the lamprey questions, discussed below.

Next Steps: discuss the above pros and cons with additional committee members including Marka and Anne, decision pending those discussions.

Fish Passage Incidental Report (Suggested Changes to Lamprey Questions)

The coordinator has received some feedback about the Lamprey Section of the Incidental Report though PLCI. The coordinator provides the feedback as originally written at the end of these notes for committee knowledge. The committee agreed that incorporating feedback from PLCI is important for both scientific accuracy and partnership.

Next Steps: The coordinator will relay this feedback to Damon Goodman, who was instrumental in developing this section of the report. The coordinator encourages committee members to email any suggested changes to the questions based on the feedback below. With committee feedback, and Damon's perspective, the coordinator will facilitate making edits to the form, sending a new version to the committee for review, and after finalizing, publishing the updated report wherever it is found, including updating the online version on Survey123.

[Added after the meeting] The coordinator has received recommendations from Monica Tonti at CDF W for expanding some of the definitions in the form. These suggestion changes are included at the end of the document.

Adjustments to Future S&D Committee Meetings

- December Meeting right before Steering Committee Meeting? (vote)

The committee voted to cancel this meeting.

- Change January Meeting from 1/1 to 1/8 (move 1 week)

The committee agreed to move the January meeting to 1/8/25 from 10am-11am

- Change March Science and Data Committee from 3/5 to 3/12 (move 1 week)

The committee agreed to move the March meeting to 3/12/25 from 10am-11am

Referenced Information

Fish Passage Incidental Report Feedback on Lamprey Questions

Abel Brumo, Senior Fish Biologist at Stillwater Sciences.

"the 'initial lamprey assessment section' of that form has some serious issues that could result in a user opting not to consider lamprey in their passage assessment. See below in blue for a summary of these issues."

Is one of the following true?

□ A natural structure (e.g. waterfall, cascade, log-jam).

□ Natural bottom thru culvert or under bridge.

□ Structure submerged during most flows.

- *A structure could be submerged at most flows, but still present a passage barrier at some range of flows (partial barrier) due to velocity in an undersized culvert exceeding lamprey maximum swim speeds (or velocity at which they can "burst-and-attach"). I could see guidance in a rapid assessment form that says 'no further Lamprey Passage Assessment needed' here if (1) the culvert outlet was inundated at most migration flows AND (2) it was deemed to be properly sized (meaning that it is unlikely to present a velocity barrier).*
- *Also, there's ambiguity in what submerged means here. Does this mean is the culvert outlet submerged?*

□ Diversion without instream structure blocking upstream passage.

□ All stream reaches upstream of gradient > 2% and lacking fines. Note: Lower gradient reaches could exist considerably upstream and provide habitat.

- *In my educated opinion, this should not be part of a rapid assessment protocol for a specific site, since field and/or desktop analysis would be needed to determine upstream gradient and habitat conditions. Unless there is clear evidence for no lamprey habitat upstream of a given site, then surveyors should assume there is.*
- ****Also, importantly, adult Pacific Lamprey can hold and spawn in reaches that are >2% slope and that have no fine sediment habitat (for larvae).*

□ Barrier site outside the current and historical range of Pacific Lamprey, Note: https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?al=ds69 and may be present in smaller tributaries of drainages identified in this distribution layer.

- *I believe I've spelled this one out to you and various others previously -- but since the BIOS 'range' data set is a course Statewide portrayal of range (only shows distribution in 4th order and larger streams regardless of known or highly-likely distribution in many, many more small streams), it is very misleading to include here. The form says "may be present in smaller tributaries of drainages identified in this distribution layer", which is precisely the reason why*

that layer should not be used in this context and should be removed as a bullet from this rapid assessment form.

Fish Passage Incidental Report-Feedback on Detail in Definitions

Monica Tonty, Environmental Scientist | Fisheries Restoration Grant Program, CDFW

"I like that the Fish Passage Incidental Report (First Pass Data Sheet Version 3) has definitions below the form, but I think some could be more detailed for newbies like me. The definitions that I think could be more detailed are below. I also included examples for alternative language from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Fish Passage Inventory, Assessment, and Prioritization Manual. The survey123 form doesn't have any definitions – you could consider putting in a page at the end that just contains the definitions or using the "hint" s123 feature."

	Variable	**current definition**	**WDFW manual definition**
Dam	Dam Height	Provide the dam's dimensions in feet if possible	Measure the dam height from the lowest point at the base of the structure vertically to the crest of the dam.
Dam	Dam Width	Provide the dam's dimensions in feet if possible	Length is the total measurement of the structure or fill that acts to impound water. Measure the length of the dam from the points where the structure or fill (e.g., an earthen berm) meets either bank. Length is typically measured perpendicular to the flow (Figure 5.4).
Culvert	Culvert Width	Provide the culvert dimensions. If multiple culverts, enter the size of the largest one.	Span - Measure the horizontal culvert dimension inside the culvert at a point that is perpendicular to the streamflow. Consider the following conditions when measuring span: - If the widest point of the culvert is embedded below the surface of the streambed, measure span at the widest point possible above the streambed and describe in the comments. - If the span measurements are different at the outlet and inlet, record the smaller of the two measurements and describe in the comments. - If the inlet or outlet of a culvert is skewed, remember to measure perpendicular to stream flow, and not directly across the culvert inlet or outlet (Figure 3.6)

Culvert	Culvert Height	Provide the culvert dimensions. If multiple culverts, enter the size of the largest one.	Rise - Just inside the culvert outlet and inlet, measure the vertical culvert dimension from the invert to the soffit. If streambed material is present, use a probe to reach the invert. If the invert is rusted-out/missing, or the invert cannot be accessed due to the presence of deep bed material within the culvert, measure from the soffit to the streambed and explain in the comments. For bottomless arch culverts, measure from soffit to the streambed directly below the soffit. If the rise measurements are different at the outlet and inlet, record the smaller of the two measurements and describe in the comments.