

NOTES: Fish Passage Working Group #5

Meeting Held: 09.26.18

Notes prepared by Consensus Building Institute

Next Meeting: Thursday, Dec 6, 11:00-2:00 @ Ukiah Valley Conference Center

Meeting in Brief

The assessment tool (or scoring matrix) supports high-level qualitative evaluations of different fish passage options, independent from one another. The scenarios undergoing evaluation are not the working group's final recommendations; rather they represent a starting place to iteratively explore options.

The working group created a management parameters template on upstream and downstream migration to create enough specificity on assumptions to be able to score scenarios.

The working group formed a scenarios sub-group to finalize the scenario assumptions and a scoring sub-group to analyze and score each scenario using the assessment tool.

At the December meeting, the working group will discuss scenario scores, focusing on the different perspectives where scores diverge.

Next Meeting: December 6, 2018, 11:00-3:00, in Ukiah

(No November Meeting)

Action Items

ACTION ITEMS (and Status Updates – Fish Passage Working Group | 9/26/18)

Assignee	Timing	Task
Josh	Early Oct	Update descriptions in the revised filtering assessment tool
CBI	Early Oct	Coordinate Scenarios Sub-Group meeting
Scenario Group	Late Oct	Provide specific assumptions and a brief written narrative for each scenario
CBI	Early Oct	Coordinate Scoring Sub-Group meeting(s)
Scoring Group	Late Nov	Complete Scoring evaluation of scenarios

Scenarios Sub-Group Members: Steve Thomas, Jon Mann, Darren Mierau, Scott McBain, Craig Addley, and Paul Kubicek

Scoring Sub-Group Members: Josh Fuller, Scott McBain, David Manning, Craig Addley, Paul Kubicek, Damon Goodman, Allan Renger, Darren Mierau, and Larry Wise

Filtering Assessment Tool

[View [revised filtering assessment tool](#).]

Attendees reviewed and provided feedback on the revised filtering assessment tool. Prior to the September meeting, a subset of working group members had modified the tool by “test-running” a hypothetical scenario. Working group members noted several key steps to effectively use the assessment tool:

- Criteria parameters need to be clearly defined for evaluators to know what factors to consider as they score how well a scenario supports fish passage for a particular targeted species.
- Specifying certain management components to create one scenario provides for all scorers to envision and evaluate (e.g., location and length of natural channel, use of fish weir, etc.).
- The scorers avoided comparing the fish passage approach to another approach (e.g., scoring a trap and haul approach to current operations), and instead are trying to score the approach independently.
- Rather than average scores across members, documenting all individual scores allows other working group members to observe the range of scores.
- Widely ranging scores often indicate major data gaps so scorers are taking detailed notes on the scenario’s assumptions, uncertainties/unknowns, and different perspectives.

Discussion

The group discussed the appropriate use of the filtering tool. Working group members cautioned against using the filtering assessment tool as a decision-making tool (too many unknowns still exist). Rather, the tool supports high-level qualitative evaluations of different fish passage options, independent from one another. It helps take a “temperature gauge” of scorers’ confidence in the success of the management options, given the available information. The tool also helps create a historical record of the group’s thinking and considerations given the information available at this time.

Working group members acknowledged that they may need to rely on others’ expertise for particular topics (e.g., lamprey or engineering considerations); however, members have the opportunity to ask questions to better understand these issues before scoring.

The group acknowledged the tool can help iteratively refine scenarios; however, a few cautioned against narrowing options prematurely. Certain components, such as downstream passage, have a wide range of possible methods but also large information gaps. Attendees reemphasized the importance of documenting the various fish passage options (pros, cons, scenario assumptions, and information gaps).

Attendees offered the following additional comments on the assessment tool:

- Consider both habitat quality and quantity of high-quality habitat.
- Consider if there is sufficient and adequate habitat to support critical life stages of the target species (e.g., juvenile rearing habitat).
- Determine whether managers want the ability to sort, tag, and/or exclude exotic species.

- Consider factors such as life cycle cost of technologies/equipment (e.g., fish screens have shorter life span than a concrete channel), energy requirements, and driving conditions (e.g., snow on the road can prevent vehicle transport of fish in the trap and haul option) as part of operation and maintenance costs.
- Need to a cost-scoring scheme. Working group members are invited to provide suggestions.
- Consider evaluating impacts on steelhead juveniles separately from smolts.
- Evaluate the level of human intervention and handling as part of “passage efficiency” and minimizing migration delay.
- Evaluate functionality over a range of flows as part of evaluating “hydrologic effects.”
- Consider revising the “hydrologic effects” definition. Scorers should not compare the level of impairment to the natural hydrograph if they are to evaluate approaches independently from one another.

Next Steps

Josh Fuller will revise the assessment tool per the working group’s input for the scoring sub-group to evaluate specific fish passage scenarios.

Scenarios Overview

1 Fish Passage	2 Trap & Haul	3 Partial Dam Removal	4 Remove Scott and Modify Cape Horn Dam (CHD)
OPTIONS Fish Ladder (Mead & Hunt) Natural Channel Fish Surface Collector (downstream) Fish Elevator	Short Term (10-15 years) Pilot for learning Bridge measure Long Term Needs evaluation	Lower Scott Dam 1) Meet PVID demand and envt flows 2) Retain accumulated sediment	Remove Scott and Modify CHD Remove Scott and CHD With Diversion: Provides another baseline for flows and fish No Diversion (see Lake Mendocino Supply Reliability study and UC Davis Study)

Developing Scenarios Specifics

[View [scenario assumptions](#) developed during 9/26/18 meeting discussion.]

The assessment tool requires clearly described scenarios; therefore, the working group created a scenarios template with certain management parameters.

Management Parameters

- Flows
- Upstream migration to Scott Dam (management options to support fish reaching the top of the dam)
- Other infrastructure to support passage (e.g., exclusion weir or fish ladder)
- Handling (sorting, tagging, exclusion, etc.)
- Upstream management options to help fish get over Scott Dam
- Upstream migration through the reservoir
- Reservoir outmigration
- Downstream passage (fishway)
- Reconditioning management

The group suggested other parameters to possibly include (either at a later date or if the sub-groups recommend inclusion):

- Management options to support upstream and downstream passage over Cape Horn Dam
- Extra handling (e.g., invasive species management)

The working group aims to create at least one specific scenario for each approach. These scenarios are not the working group's final recommendations, rather they represent a starting place to iteratively explore and refine management options.

The working group formed two sub-groups: 1) a scenarios sub-group to finalize the scenario assumptions, and 2) a scoring sub-group to analyze and score the scenarios using the assessment tool. Attendees requested the scenarios sub-group develop brief written narratives describing the scenario assumptions.

The scoring sub-group will present the scoring outcomes at the next working group meeting. Given time constraints, Attendees agreed the meeting discussion should focus on divergent opinions. An attendee recommended using a similar template/approach as a summary table in the [McMillen Jacobs Associates Report](#) (Table 4-16, page 38) to list the divergent perspectives.

Scenarios Sub-Group Members: Steve Thomas, Jon Mann, Darren Mierau, Scott McBain, Craig Addley, and Paul Kubicek

Scoring Sub-Group Members: Josh Fuller, Scott McBain, David Manning, Craig Addley, Paul Kubicek, Damon Goodman, Allan Renger, Darren Mierau, and Larry Wise

Other working group members are welcome to join the sub-group webinars (contact CBI for meeting information).

Next Steps

Timeline:

- **Scenarios Sub-Group** will meet (ideally before the Oct 17 Ad Hoc meeting) - finalize the scenario assumptions and develop cost scoring scheme for filtering tool if possible.
- **Ad Hoc Briefing** - Oct 17
- **Scoring Sub-Group** will meet as needed to score the scenarios that the Scenarios Sub-Group provides.

- **Fish Passage Working Group** will meet Dec 6, @11a to review/discuss the scenario scoring outcomes.