

**California Advisory Committee
on Salmon and
Steelhead Trout**



**July 25, 2019
Meeting Notes**

Note-Taker: Darren Mierau, Jen Carah, Adriane Garayalde

Members Present: (4) Darren Mierau (Chair), Matt Clifford, Redgie Collins, Kevan Urquhart, Vivian Helliwell (by phone);

Members Absent: Mitch Farro (Vice-Chair), Bob Bork, Gayland Taylor, Mike Orcutt, Ted Grantham, James Stone

Quorum Established: NO

JCFA Consultant Present: Tom Weseloh

CDFW Staff Present: Jonathan Nelson (by phone); Ryan Kurth

Public: No public comments.

NEXT MEETING: October 24, 2019 in Sacramento, CA

ACTION ITEMS

CAC

- The CAC should consider sending a letter to Director Bonham requesting the Restoration Leader Report be released to the Public. Darren will draft letter for next CAC Meeting consideration.
- CAC could make a recommendation that DFW reengage with the CMP management team.
- CAC to look at Public Resources Code 62.17.1 and consider potential changes to PRC.
- CAC to look at the SRAMP program, which funded 50 CDFW employees. Came out of DFW/NMFS MOA.

NMFS

- NMFS will identify Central Valley hatchery compliance monitoring obligations relative to their priorities and update in Jahns spreadsheet.
- NMFS also committed to adding more detail for each project including estimated costs.
- NMFS Will ID partners in spreadsheet
- NMFS will provide cost estimate for genetic monitoring for Central Valley
- NMFS will send spreadsheet to CDFW
- Bulletin 180 –Tommy proposed to get together with DFW and ID next steps and get back to CAC about how they could help.

AGENDA IN BRIEF

General CACSST Business

- Steelhead Card
- Restoration Leader Ad Hoc Group
- FRGP PRC Status Update

CA Coastal Monitoring Program

- Overview of CMP Monitoring
- Developing a Framework for a Statewide CMP Program
- Discussion on Present and Updated CMP Program
- Legislative and other Funding Pathways

California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout



Agenda Item #1

Steelhead Report Card

- Angling permits fund program. Last projects thru FRGP did not necessarily meet focus of program. Did not distribute funds in last FRGP grants. More than \$1M has accumulated, with CDFW annual spending authorization of about \$300K.
- Thinking of new ways to allocate funds. CDFW is considering high priority monitoring funding. Steelhead Committee looks forward to considering funding options.

Restoration Leader

- 2018 group initiated by Director Bonham. Worked on grant programs. Darren, Matt, Monty, Kellyx, Galan, Steph, Julie, Dana were on ad hoc committee. Topics - Grant administration, prioritization of projects, engineering and permitting issues. Committee made recommendations and report was submitted to Director Bonham in December 2018.
- Would like public release of report. Hopefully, the report will be released as part of a bigger program.
- Tom suggests that the CAC consider using their statutory authority to send letters to Director Bonham and the JCFA recommending public release of the report.
- Darren will draft report for next CAC Meeting consideration.

Peer Review Committee

- Matt Clifford is now PRC Chair. PRC is a citizens advisory committee to provide oversight and recommendations to CDFW on FRGP program. Historically, they did a review and scoring of FRGP grant applications, but new DOC Guidelines identified this as a potential conflict of interest. Could not be solved. Committee now does not do grant application reviews, and instead defaulted back to original Resource Code defined role of advising CDFW on grant program activities.
- Remaining PRC Members (Clifford, Mierau, Urquhart) developed new Charter for PRC and are revising this into PRC Bylaws.
- Have held three meetings under new Charter (Oct-2018, Jan-2019, May-2019). At the May 2019 meeting they compiled a list of recommendations for the Department. Active/robust committee to talk about issues around FRGP. Now working on more outreach to those would like to attend meetings.
- September 4th is next meeting in Sacramento. Agenda is posted with phone in capability. Open to hearing from a broad variety of people.
- Review of membership. Slots are open with nominations at CDFW. No tribal representation at this time.

Agenda Item #2

Coastal Monitoring Program Overview

Darren Mierau Introduction

CalTrout, TU, TNC "Coalition" has desire to support a statewide monitoring program set of priorities, and seek funding to conduct annual CMP monitoring. Coalition is developing a strategy to propose legislation or other funding mechanism, seeking to secure approximately \$15-20 mil annual for high priority population monitoring.

California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout



The intent of CAC meeting is to begin a process for (1) defining a robust Coastal Monitoring Program with priorities supported by NMFS, CDFW, the Coalition, and other stakeholders, (2) seek funding to support this program in the near-term, and (3) identifying a process for updating the CMP to meet other/future needs.

Coalition is willing to assist with these objectives.

- Our groups are working on critical restoration issues throughout the state
- We're doing lots of science and policy work
- To know if we're making a difference, and to guide our planning and prioritization, we need monitoring information
- Tracking population status and trends towards recovery goals is important, as is feeding that information back into our recovery efforts, beginning with more regional strategic planning, with monitoring linked to these plans

As Chair of the CAC, Darren thinks this is a really important topic and the CAC can and should play an oversight role.

How the CAC and Coalition proposed to engage with NMFS vs CDFW...

- we need to have in-depth discussions with CDFW regions and Fisheries Branch, and knowing Shaffer was unavailable for this meeting, we decided to focus on NMFS perspective
- we will be taking NMFS perspective and input and then engaging with Department to solicit their input and help move plan forward
- therefore, at this meeting we (the CAC) want to hear NMFS vision for a CMP, both in terms of how to manage the current program with adequate funding, as well as their perspective on changes to the program, such as modernizing monitoring, linking strategic planning to implementation and implementation to monitoring outcomes, or other objectives
- Next we intend to engage with CDFW to integrate with their perspective, balancing what we all think can be achieved legislatively...

Bulletin 180 Objectives as originally conceived:

The goals and objectives of the CMP are to develop broad and intensive monitoring strategies and techniques that: [California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods]

1. Create a monitoring framework that includes all coho salmon, Chinook salmon and steelhead in coastal California;
2. Provide regional (ESU-level) and population abundance estimates for both status and trend of salmonid populations;
3. Estimate productivity trends from status abundance data;
4. Provide estimates of regional and population level spatial structure of coastal salmonids;
5. Consider the diversity of life history and ecological differences in the three species of interest; and
6. Create permanent LCM stations that will allow deeper evaluation of both freshwater and marine fish-habitat relationships and provide long-term index monitoring.

CAC is looking for Fisheries Agency experts to weigh in and inform our groups of what their current thinking is...

California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout



- what are regional priorities for NMFS; CDFW; is there overlap in these priorities?
- what are the preferred monitoring methods, how do we structure a plan to allow flexibility to meet multiple objectives or take advantage of new technology?
- how do we tie monitoring into regional planning to ensure we're learning from the recovery investment that's ongoing, i.e., more intentional experimentation + monitoring?
- how will data be analyzed to inform management decisions and made available in a timely manner to managers in a usable form?
- what administrative structure would encourage collaborative decision-making on monitoring priorities?

Jen Carah (TNC): CMP Program Priorities Introduction

(see presentation in pdf)

Dr. Tommy Williams (NMFS): Viability Framework for Recovery: Viability Monitoring

(see presentation in pdf)

TOPICS

- Salmon and Steelhead Viability Framework for Recovery
- Viability Monitoring and Adaptive Management
- Monitoring Focus to Inform Progress on Recovery

NOTES

- CMP focused on regional estimates initially
- Viability/recovery criteria are pop level targets
- Now that core/focus/supporting populations have been IDed, we can better target monitoring
- How do fish respond to restoration; methods need to respond to recovery status of the fish
- Need to fill geographic gaps
- Methods for monitoring fish at diff life stages need to be flexible
- There are issues with spatial and temporal extent of sampling to cover all species
- Juvenile sampling methods differ among species
- Methods for redd discrimination need to be improved
- How do we better communicate about progress toward recovery outside of abundance (presence, distribution, diversity)?

Jeff Jahns (NMFS): Focused Discussion on Present and Updated CMP Program

(see presentation in pdf)

TOPICS

- NOAA Fisheries California near-term priority salmonid monitoring - July 2019

NOTES

- Maintaining long term datasets is a priority; but funding has been a limitation
- Made a list of near-term priorities – considering limited funding; 2 tables; considered # of years that have been monitored; want 2 LCMs per diversity strata; as well as what's needed to track supplementation programs

Dr David Boughton: Updating Fish Bulletin 180

(see presentation in pdf)

TOPICS

- Closer integration of CMP and Recovery Plans

California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout



- Incorporate Flexibility and Operational Efficiency of Methods
- Closer integration of CMP and Adaptive Management, Population Modeling

NOTES

- Need to:
 - better understand proportion of trout vs steelhead
 - Further integrate CMP with recovery plans
 - Incorporate flexibility and operational efficiency of methods
 - Closer integration of CMP and adaptive management, population modeling
- On Central/South Coast – they want 7 LCMs (smolt production); adult abundance for 20 backbone pops (counting stations/redd surveys); spatial dist/density, genetic indicators for biogeographic groups of populations (dry season surveys)
- Rotating panels, spatially balanced; stratified targets of estimation; 2 phase sampling in arid areas; short or long reaches as appropriate; double-sampling as appropriate; LCMs in backbone populations, etc
- Need to consider diff methods dependent on specific local conditions: ARIS/DIDSON; PIT tags; weir
- Recipe – identify targets of estimation (spatial domains); then identifying indicators; then collecting data; then life-cycle analysis

Discussion –

CMP management team is needed. Need a process to facilitate conversations. CAC could make a recommendation that DFW reengage with the CMP management team.

Kevin Shaffer would say we don't have a coastal monitoring program. Jon says we have pieces of one, but don't have direct funding from the department for this. Need to have resources to administer a program at the department.

NMFS thinks partners need to be brought in on conversations on monitoring.

The challenge is funding the priorities. We need a way to go to funders and have an agreed set of priorities and cost. Need a process in place to address dynamic issues in a timely manner. There needs to be a forum to have better dialogue on needs and priorities in a broader context. A need to have this facilitated to help agencies work through this. Re-start CMP process and meet periodically with facilitation to do longer range planning and prioritization.

Charlotte – Let's bring partners in monitoring into the conversation.

Tom – Legislature wants to have the data available with report summaries, which are easy to publicly access, especially if there is a need to consider additional legislative funding for monitoring.

Carlos – some dam operators have mitigation obligations. If a hatchery is one of them, in principle and it should be governed by a hatchery genetic management plan (HGMP) which lays out processes and monitor effects of hatchery on natural populations. Required to provide that info to assess those affects. They should be proposing a monitoring plan as part of HGMP process. This often happens

California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout



incompletely. Good in Russian, but not in Klamath, etc. They should be monitoring things called out in the CMP. (Smith, Russian, most of central Valley, Mad, Santa Clara, etc....)

CMP is more for status and trends. How about effectiveness? Look at how these can be coordinated, so practitioners know where to focus and what types of projects are most important.

CMP is baseline to any other monitoring.

Folks commented that other partners in CMP need to be involved in this (SWCA, other water agencies, PSMFC)

DFW wants the CAC to consider the Central Valley. Include priorities from Central Valley. That was message from CDFW to NMFS. Monitoring is a focus. There is compliance monitoring. Consider genetic monitoring component. Management is confounded by not being able to tell juveniles apart. Current genetic monitoring is not coordinated, and methods aren't combinable. Working on a coordination method and just need funding.

NMFS will identify Central Valley hatchery compliance monitoring obligations relative to their priorities and update in Jahns spreadsheet. They also committed to adding more detail for each project including estimated costs.

Recent 2-year effort to evaluate green sturgeon and winter run chinook monitoring and recommendations have come out and some already implemented. Genetic monitoring has been implemented on a project by project basis inconsistently (can't combine the data even) – improving this in the Central Valley was a recommendation. As was steelhead monitoring program. Not funded.

Should communicate with fisherman's groups about hatchery marking and monitoring

Bulletin 180 – would be good to get a group together to formally review this. Bring on a consultant to oversee it? Take lessons learned from last 15 years. Support may be needed for staff time and travel. Tommy proposed to get together with DFW and ID next steps and get back to CAC about how they could help.

Matt – Strategy to have a stable funding mechanism for CMP. Establish as an essential component to fisheries recovery work. Also monitor the results of projects funded. Unknown number of funders available. Have long term plan. Right now the need is short term to keep establish programs running so there are no data gaps or loss of trained staff.

Darren – what does the package need to be? Are we utilizing Bulletin 180? Yes, to start, then look at update as we move ahead. Scientific management for recovery guidance. Fish are a key to monitoring climate impact/adaptation.

Program costs and funding needs

Coalition Plan-A - legislated funding

Commented [DM1]: From Kevan Urquhart: In reading Darren's notes I reflected on the fact that not all Dam Operators necessarily have any specific mitigation obligations at all, as Carlos Garzas of NMFS assumed, unless they have a hatchery subject to the ESA & HGMPs, in the terms of a FERC license, or as part of an ESA Sec. 9 or F&G Code 5937 case that was brought against them. Another slim possibility might be that it is a more modern dam subject to a good LSAA/F&G Code 1600 permit. The latter are probably rare as most/many dams were built before F&G Code 1600 was created in the late 1960's and long before they LSAA process was upgraded by being required to be compliant with CEQA in the 1990's. Thus many irrigation/M&I water storage dams may have no specific obligations for monitoring or mitigation at all.

None of the three dams on the Carmel River [two of which were removed in 2015] had any. I believe NMFS just finished negotiating an ESA Sec. 9 settlement with Cal-Am for the final one. I'll have to ask Amanda if it can be released to the CAC as an example.

Perhaps the chair can ask CDFW & NMFS to report back at the next meeting on what legal leverage their agencies have to compel dam operators to cooperate in monitoring [e.g., CMP], other than what I've outlined above.

**California Advisory Committee
on Salmon and
Steelhead Trout**



Other funding opportunities and contingencies

Program Administration options

Charlotte - Priority 2 funds available to intensively managed watersheds. CDFW uses to fund monitoring outside of the competitive process.

Look at how to use funds in direct funding.

Change legislation SB271

PRC language 6217.1

Language can be changed relatively easily.

Coalition wants to have ask ready for next cycle.

Tom – for bill, need a lot more specific info to meet author and committee needs. For budget ask, not as much detail is required if the budget subcommittees are supportive.

Darren asked where “project” definitions originated.

Bob Coey cited Public Resources Code (PRC) 6217.1 and noted a link to the PRC is on the CAC web site.

Tom cited Public Resources Code 6217.1 requiring 87.5% must be spent on project grants, with 12.5% on administration. Within the 85%, 65% is required to be spent on “restoration projects” unless the percentage is waived by recommendation of the PRC. Tom suggested if the CAC was unhappy with the current definitions that the CAC should revisit them.

Tom also suggested looking at the SRAMP program, which originally funded almost 50 DFW employees dedicated to steelhead research and monitoring. SRAMP was part of the DFW/NMFS MOA, which also included improvements to hatchery management including steelhead mass-marking, protective regulations for recreational steelhead fishing, establishing a steelhead monitoring program, a Watershed Protection Program including review of CA’s Forest Practices via SRP, and more.

Legislative folks want a list of folks attending the meeting and their contact info. And also want digital copies of all materials handed out.

CDFW Updates

None

Legislative Updates

None

California Advisory Committee
on Salmon and
Steelhead Trout



CAC Next Meeting Dates

October 25, 2019 in Sacramento, CA