



Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Fish Restoration & Enhancement Program Board
 Meeting Minutes



Date: March 23-24, 2023

Location: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Headquarters, Classroom

Fish Restoration & Enhancement Program

Day 1 - March 23, 2023

Board Member	Staff/Guests		
Dave Grosjacques – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Mike Gauvin	Brent Hanners	Marty Olson
Tom VanderPlaat – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Steve Emerson	Kari Guy	Bryce Hansen
Yancy Lind – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Davia Palmeri	Ryan Couture	Brandy Nichols
Ray Monroe – Representing Commercial Troll Fisheries	Sara Reif	Steve Janego	Shaun Clements
Kay Brown – Representing the Public	Ann Lefler	Andy Spyrka	Mark Hereford
Susan Chambers - Representing the Fish Processing Industry	Craig Shumate	Kirsten Russel	

Call to Order & Introductions

Chair Y. Lind called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM. Board members introduced themselves and gave their area updates (below) and staff introduced themselves.

Board Member Updates

Y. Lind: Sportfishing was and looks again to be grim because of the droughts. None of the reservoirs are at the levels they need to be at for this time of year. Right now the largest return of steelhead is occurring since reintroduction was started. Good news is in the Klamath basin, fishing was good last summer. Spawning counts in the Wood River are at an all-time high.

D. Grosjacques: Umpqua system normally has good steelhead run, but it’s been nearly non-existent to date. The Rogue last fall half pounder fishing was not nearly as good as it has been in the past. Only caught 2-3 half pounders per day, normally you would catch 10. New Rogue South Coast plan mentioned. Rock Creek hatchery burned down as you all know, fish are being collected then moved, spawned, reared, and then transported for release again. Definitely want to get Rock Creek Hatchery back, but river is lower than before and hotter than normal.

T. VanderPlaat: Honored to be here. Currently co-president of NW Steelheaders, July will be 6 years and he is stepping down. Fishing has been awesome, catching sucks. 6-7 trips, caught only 2 fish. Going to focus on spring Chinook soon. Did some stream enrichment recently. Has been volunteering with the agency for years.

R. Monroe: Commercial seasons coming up. March 29 is next PFMC meeting. There are going to be no fisheries south of Cape Falcon is shutdown. Commercial and recreational. There’s a lot of fish in California though. Expect to see good recreational coho fishing. Looking forward to good September fish harvest though. Survivability of

fish in the estuary is apparently one of the main issues for Chinook. Farmers are planting a bunch of trees in the Tillamook area, helping riparian zones. Water in Tillamook is tested often and it's cleaner than in the past. In the past manure was kept near the river and there were still plenty of fish so there was some pushback from some about working on water quality. The facility at Cape Meares is unusable now due to the weeds. Other than that, all the docks we've put in are being utilized on a regular basis.

S. Chambers: Salmon situation in ocean is dire. From processor perspective, salmon is not one of the more abundant species that they process but it is relied upon for a diverse product offering to customers. Groundfish is doing really good. Rock fish is doing well. Black rock fish project funding has made a difference. Washington will have a decent season north of Falcon.

Director's Office Update

Davia Palmeri gave an update.

Brandy Nichols gave an agency budget update.

Fish Division Update

Shaun Clements gave an update.

Climate Resiliency Study

Scott Patterson gave an overview of the study results.

Habitat Division Update

Sarah Reif gave an overview of Habitat Division and what they are working on right now.

K. Brown would like the private forest accord added to the agenda for our next meeting.

Klamath Dam Removal

Mark Hereford gave a presentation on the Klamath Dam Removal.

STAC Mini Grant Request

Steve Janego gave a presentation to the Board.

T. VanderPlaat would like to know how many project applications STAC gets every cycle. What's the leveraged value? More data would help the board make an informed decision. More money means STAC needs to drum up more projects. STEP biologists are some of the most valuable staff in the agency. They work in the communities with the people. Need more capacity for the STEP bios to do more fish eggs to fry, more projects.

Budget Update

M. Olson gave an update on the R&E budget.

Y. Lind pointed out that we don't track marine vs freshwater and suggested that we should.

Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:23

Day 2 - March 24, 2023

Board Member	Staff/Guests		
Dave Grosjacques – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Mike Gauvin	Dave Banks	Marty Olson
Tom VanderPlaat – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Steve Emerson	Evan Leonetti	Bryce Hansen
Yancy Lind – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Ron Rehn	Kevin Stertz	Brandy Nichols
Ray Monroe – Representing Commercial Troll Fisheries	Jen Luke	Scott Marion	Mike Sinnot
Kay Brown – Representing the Public	Scott Patterson	Jeremy Romer	Gary Vonderohe
Susan Chambers - Representing the Fish Processing Industry	Mike Gray	Ryan Couture	Brent Hinnners
	Wyatt Bond	Craig Shumate	Jeff Ziller
	Jerry George	Lee Cain	

Chair Y. Lind called the meeting to order at 8:29 AM.

Meeting Agenda Approval

The Board reviewed the proposed meeting agenda.

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to approve the agenda, K. Brown seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to approve the September meeting minutes. S. Chambers seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Budget Update:

Brandy Nichols gave a budget presentation of the R&E fund revenue projections.

R. Monroe asked about how much money R&E gets from each license, Brandy said it's \$4 per recreational license. R. Monroe pointed out that commercial revenue has been decreasing because of reduction in number of commercial licenses and fishers. Y. Lind pointed out that it has been a long time since there was a surcharge increase from the recreational licenses, 2006 or so.

K. Brown pointed out that there were more license sales during COVID and asked if that was considered by the projection model, and Brandy said that it was. License sales are not expected to trend downward. Brandy explained that the bump in license sales seen in 2016 was an accounting change.

T. VanderPlaat expressed his displeasure with the agency lowering the age at which youth need a license from 14 to 12 years old. K. Brown asked what happens if we award all of the \$4M today. Brandy said that it is possible there would be a drop in license sales, but that the \$400K+ money we keep in reserves should cover most variations unless something drastic were to happen. D. Grosjacques had the same question, are we spending money that we don't have, is it risky? Brandy said she doesn't know enough about the pace of projects and the work that they do but that we wouldn't expect all the grantees to be asking for their reimbursements at the beginning of the biennium. The payments to the contractors don't all happen July 1.

Y. Lind talked about history and when the board decided to spend money as soon as there were opportunities to do so. Primary reason for restoration is hatchery repairs, enhancement is everything else. He continued, prior to

2016 the split wasn't even, board needed to prioritize projects, hatchery managers couldn't agree on what they wanted, this was when bundle grants came in. Hatchery leaders ranked projects themselves. 50% of the money goes to Scott Patterson to repair hatcheries. Approving more of the budget early on gives grantees the most amount of time to complete their projects. R. Monroe agreed with Y. Lind's summary. D. Grosjacques pointed out that since he has been on the board there has never been this large of a cycle 1 total ask. M. Gauvin added that there have been prioritization efforts implemented to help bundle district access projects around the state, also research projects. M. Gauvin touched on the board's request to see more external projects, as that is part of the reason there are more projects.

Y. Lind said that we should not let the amount of money keep the board from approving the projects. Instead, the board should look at whether the projects are good projects worthy of funding. R. Monroe expressed that if we award all the money in cycle 1, that's fine because the money would be well spent. R. Monroe said it's better to spend the money now than to later find ourselves having a bunch of money we have to spend. M. Gauvin pointed out that we used to have 8 cycles but now it's 4, so you will see a bigger ask each cycle.

Project Proposal Review & Recommendations

The Board reviewed the following project proposals.

23-001 Diamond Lake Monitoring/Invasive Species Removal

K. Brown pointed out that this has been going since 2016 and asked if R&E should expect this ask every year into the future. Evan Leonetti said he plans on removing chub for the foreseeable future and has been exploring other funding avenues. K. Brown asked if the district would be back next year to ask for money to do this again, and Evan said possibly. K. Brown expressed concern with funding these perennial projects. Scott Patterson provided some info about a strain of trout from West Virginia that may help by preying on the tui chub at Diamond Lake, but creel would need to be done in order to determine if the trout are catchable because they need to be.

Discussion

Y. Lind said the impacts are immediate and profound. K. Brown expressed her lack of support to perennially fund projects. D. Grosjacques commented that he saw the result in person when the tui chub population exploded. Water was green, no anglers, signs up that said not to swim because of the bloom. T. VanderPlaat said there is tui chub all over and that they are a problem in those areas too. Department needs to do something about it. Y. Lind said board always says this is the last time we will fund it. Board said they know people who go to Diamond Lake.

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to approve, Y. Lind seconded. Passed with all but K. Brown. 5-1.

23-002 Warrenton Rain Water Connection

T. VanderPlaat suggested that the applicants talk to the storm water program in Warrenton because there may be money available there. There could be another partner available for this project. Ron Rehn said they hadn't considered this yet. Explained that when they put a new roof on the school, the pitch of the roof was such that the water collection system was no longer gathering water. K. Brown asked why this was classified as enhancement and M. Olson said because it is educational, Y. Lind feels it is restoration. Y. Lind asked why the application indicated that this project will only impact 25 people, Wyatt Bond answered that there are 25 students directly involved each year. T. VanderPlaat said he thinks more people will benefit from this. The students recently raised over 100k for another phase of the project. K. Brown asked if the applicants would go talk to the city for the \$18K, Wyatt Bond said the mayor asked them to go to outside sources first, so they came to

ODFW. D. Grosjacques asked if there has been any problems with lack of rain in the past. Wyatt Bond said there is a backup water supply, but that they have never had an issue with lack of rainwater.

Discussion

50/50 split commercial/recreational benefit because project is educational. D. Grosjacques said as an educator, these hands-on projects stick with students. Y. Lind said he voted no on the other high school project but that this one is smaller so he's supportive.

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to approve, R. Monroe seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

23-003 High Lakes Angler Use and Fish Survival Evaluation

D. Grosjacques asked if there has been any kind of study similar to this in the past to compare to or if this is the first time it has been looked at closely. Jeremy Romer said there was an attachment with the project proposal that showed exactly that. It showed that even though there was effort put into creeling the high lakes, it was hard to contact the anglers because it was hard to get angler interviews. Reached out to Forest Service because they are out there a lot, but they are on other trails that anglers weren't using. So, part of the project is to ask anglers to self-report their efforts after angling and combine that with on the ground creel that can go with the self-reporting. K. Brown asked if the air stocking would end if this study showed there was not good survival or exploitation. Jeremy said that they only air stock every other year, and this is a stocking year. They will be stocking experimental fish this year and the helicopter contract ends in 2025. Helicopter alone is \$80k. This information from the study would inform the decision whether to continue air stocking. K. Brown pointed out that these expensive projects are difficult because we don't know how many people are benefiting dollar for dollar from these projects and efforts. Talked about how there may not be many people utilizing these fish, but those doing so may be very avid fishermen after a unique experience.

Discussion

D. Grosjacques said he thinks there are better uses for angler dollars and noted he is a high lake angler. T. VanderPlaat said there isn't a clear answer to what we would be doing with the information. Y. Lind said he has helped with high lake stocking and gone back to catch those fish and it was great. T. VanderPlaat wants to know how the data they are collecting would change what they are doing. K. Brown asked whether the info is needed in order to decide on keeping the helicopter stocking or not.

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to deny, D. Grosjacques seconded. T. VanderPlaat amended his motion to disapprove to disapprove the project with a note to come back with a more detailed study plan of action. D. Grosjacques seconded. Motioned carried 5-1 with Y. Lind voting no.

23-004 Astoria High School Hatchery Upgrade

K. Brown asked how this is connected, if it is, with the Warrenton program. Warrenton representative said they are not really connected. T. VanderPlaat asked if there were attachments as far as engineering plans. T. VanderPlaat is concerned if the department is going to be involved in oversight and design. Ron said that this is an outside contractor. T. VanderPlaat pointed out that if R&E funds it, ODFW would be connected to it and would be partially responsible. K. Brown asked if Bryce has seen the plans to review them or not and he said he has not seen the plans yet. Bryce said that it's a big project and ODFW engineering should look at it too. Bryce is not sure

how they are doing the project for the dollar amount when he thought it would be over \$1M. Ron said that dollar amount isn't indicative of quality of the work.

Y. Lind said that IRT recommended no on this project because there is no long-term commitment from the school district and second comment was that there should be more outside money. Ron Rehn explained that this school program has been in place since the 70's and that it would continue for a long time. Explained that the value is creating environmental stewards out of students.

Discussion

Board discussed what the board's role is on this project and what options are to partially fund. Y. Lind said he liked the education part of this project, but there isn't a lot of direct angler benefit. D. Grosjacques agreed. R. Monroe said that the benefit of bringing kids into fishing is huge. T. VanderPlaat said the school can't put anything on the property without an engineering stamp.

Motion: R. Monroe motioned to approve, K. Brown seconded. Only if engineering is done and stamped by a professional engineer. Yes: K. Brown, S. Chambers, R. Monroe, T. VanderPlaat. No: Y. Lind, D. Grosjacques. Motion passed 4-2.

23-005 Coaledo Tide Gate Monitoring

Y. Lind pointed out that IRT said not to do this project. He summarized, this project does not directly support implementation of ODFW priorities or directly benefit commercial or recreational anglers. Gary Vonderohe said the design of the tide gate came after OWEB funding. Design came with "pet door" for salmon and that we need to study and see if fish will use the door in the tide gate to inform future decisions. The more fish we can grow healthier and bigger, the more anglers will benefit. This is for wild coho, but eventually coho may be harvestable. K. Brown asked how the pet door would work. Gary said the door is approx. 1'x1' but it's not an actual door with a flap, it will be an opening. T. VanderPlaat said he looked at the design and couldn't find the pet door. Gary said it's a hole that we could close if needed. S. Chambers asked what future projects this monitoring project would inform. Gary said in the Coos basin, and if this is successful this will all go to Greg Apke in fish passage program and may lead to some changes in requirements in the future.

Discussion

T. VanderPlaat asked for feedback as to why a motion to deny. K. Brown said there doesn't seem to be any benefit to anglers. It has a lot of other funding too so not sure why they need R&E money. D. Grosjacques said it seems like a stretch to call this the best use of angler dollars. T. VanderPlaat asked if there was additional info that would get the group to yes votes. K. Brown said if the money is needed as match she would consider voting yes. Y. Lind said the IRT comments were interesting because they asked why there was no angler benefit listed and there was no response. T. VanderPlaat said there is some science here that we don't understand. Y. Lind said we have funded tide gates in the past.

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to deny, K. Brown seconded. Motion passed with S. Chambers and Y. Lind voting no.

23-006 Internships Invasive Removal in High Lakes 23-24

K. Brown asked about continued removal of fish in high lakes, there doesn't seem to be any end in sight. She asked how this effort will come to an end. Jen Luke said the chub will likely be there until we find another way to remove them. Jen said it would be nearly impossible to get rid of chub in the three lakes. T. VanderPlaat asked if the past activities and removal have enhanced the fisheries; if there was a direct benefit to anglers. Jen said yes. When this effort first started, focus was on East Lake, and they monitored the health and other biological attributes of trout bycatch. After a few years of chub removal, they saw a rebound in the health and quality of the trout and other fish people target for recreational fishing. ODFW started helping the resort at Lava Lake trap chub in Lava Lake in ~2012. D. Grosjacques asked if there is much of a volunteer effort associated with this. Jen said initially when it started there was a lot of volunteers, it was almost completely a volunteer effort. But then the resort realized how labor intensive it was and said they could no longer commit to doing it. Jen said volunteers will be included, but the only way to make this effective is to have two interns dedicated to the effort because it is more work than you can ask of volunteers. 40 hours a week. Some fishing groups are helping fund this effort almost every year. Y. Lind asked if R&E gave more money, could it help get more of the limiting factor of the project such as interns, boats, nets, etc to target bullheads in Crane Prairie. K. Brown asked if R&E didn't fund this, would there be another funding source for the project? Jen said that in Crane Prairie there is another source to target bullhead because of the spotted frogs. K. Brown said her concern is this ongoing expense for R&E and she doesn't see an end to it unless there is another source of funding.

T. VanderPlaat said we are putting out spot fires here and there, but what is the big picture on invasive species? There is currently no funding for a non-native fish program to focus on efforts like this.

Discussion

100% recreation. Y. Lind said he is sympathetic with K. Brown but there would be much anger if the project was denied.

Motion: K. Brown motioned to deny the project. No second, the motion failed.

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to approve, T. VanderPlaat seconded. Motion carries 5-1 with K. Brown voting no.

23-007 Cape Meares Lake Invasive Weed Treatment

T. VanderPlaat asked if we spend the \$80K and we don't know the source of the weeds, are we going to be dealing with this again in the near future? Mike Sinnot said that the risk of reintroduction is real, but now that we know what we're dealing with, and the lake is so close to the district office (15 minutes), it can be monitored and spot treated so that a total takeover won't happen again. K. Brown said that that plan helps alleviate some of her concerns that this project may turn into another perennial project. Mike Sinnot said there are other funding sources for the smaller spot treatments but that this total lake treatment was going to cost more than the dollar caps in place for the other funding sources. K. Brown asked why the dollar amount went up, Mike Sinnot said it is because he wrote the ask before a contractor survey was completed to figure out the volume of the lake. T. VanderPlaat asked for clarification on why whole lake treatment is necessary, Mike Sinnot said it is because of how Eurasian milfoil spreads in fragmentation and that leaving a small portion could result in quick reinfestation.

T. VanderPlaat asked what the benefit to the angler would be? Before the weed infestation, what was the public's utilization of the resource? Mike Sinnot said that it is utilized by both boat and bank anglers however the R&E funded dock is not currently usable for launching boats because of the weeds. Also, can't angle from bank because of weeds.

Discussion

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to approve the project, K. Brown seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

23-009 Coquille River Predatory Fish Reduction Project

K. Brown asked about how the fencing would help. Gary Vonderohe talked about the warm water in the Coquille and how bass are thriving. Fencing and improving riparian areas helps keep the water cooler and limit the good bass habitat. K. Brown asked if we have experience with fencing, and Gary said no. He said that in the NE there is fencing experience. D. Grosjacques asked about the timeline. The Chinook population crashed in 2018, and asked how far back there was evidence of bass in the river. Gary said SMB were present in 2011. He said there were reports before 2011 but those reports were never substantiated. The bass were concentrated in a few pools but by 2020 they were throughout. The warmer forks of the river have a bigger issue than the cooler forks. D. Grosjacques asked if the crash was due to the bass and Gary said yes, because the crash was so much bigger than the decline observed in all the surrounding rivers. Mike Gray added that we know that in 2015-16 we had the warm ocean blob that persisted for 2 summers in a row. Looking at the graphs from the coastal rivers Chinook populations, the REDD group was tasked with looking at potential limiting factors of the Chinook. They determined that the warm ocean was a major factor and while many rivers' populations have rebounded, the Coquille hasn't. So, the thought is that the bass population is the reason. K. Brown asked about the REDD group. Mike Gray said its Resource Evaluation Data and Decision (REDD) work group. They look at the science and data and help programs/projects make decisions. They looked at disease and other possible factors. An assessment of the bass population was done and that data is being used to inform the actions being proposed.

Gary said that working with landowners is difficult, they may initially agree to fencing but then if there is a long wait time, they might say no to the fencing. This project would allow there to be a stockpile of fencing supplies and would allow the district to act much quicker. Other funding sources like OWEB have timelines and hoops that result in up to years of waiting for fencing and landowners will often change their minds. Y. Lind asked why the benefit was listed as 100% recreational and Gary said that's in line with previous projects.

Discussion

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to approve project for \$67,604 (without the fencing materials), seconded by S. Chambers. Motion passed unanimously.

23-010 Coastal Fall Chinook Fecundity Estimation

Y. Lind said this was the lowest ranked project in the cycle because R&E is being asked to fund staff time. Scott Patterson said that we have lost the ability to estimate the fecundity of broodstock. Micki Varney is primarily funded with federal dollars. Scott needs state funds to do this study because federal dollars can't be used solely for the benefit of the state.

Discussion

K. Brown voiced her support for the project. D. Grosjacques said he thinks it's a good study but not sure if it is the best use of angler dollars. T. VanderPlaat said he agrees and asked if there was any additional information that would sway him to support the project. R. Monroe said the main reason is that the money is funding an odfw staff person.

Motion: K. Brown motioned to approve. No second, motion failed. D. Grosjacques motioned to deny. T. VanderPlaat seconded. Motion carried with Y. Lind and K. Brown voting no.

23-011 Cycle 23-1 Hatchery Maintenance Bundle

Y. Lind said this was the most confusing of all the applications. Brent Hinners said \$1M for pipeline repair at Big Creek Hatchery, and \$85K for two rearing ponds at Elk River Hatchery. No longer asking for trucks, hatch house, or bathroom at Bandon Hatchery. Scott Patterson said that he has applied for other funding for the pipeline and if that money comes through the savings would be moved on down the line. T. VanderPlaat said that when he saw a million dollar ask, he wanted to know what the million dollars was going towards. Doesn't feel like there was enough information to explain why it was so expensive. Is it a tough area to do the work? How do we justify spending a million dollars at one hatchery for a pipeline? Scott said \$1M was the estimate from ODFW head of engineering (Ryan Couture). Final design can be done and then would go out to bid. This is the priority project for the hatcheries in this cycle. Brent elaborated that based on the work done at Clackamas and another hatchery, those costs helped inform this estimate. Scott explained that we are down a few hatcheries right now and to do repairs at hatcheries that require the water to be turned off for repairs to be made, we need other places to raise those fish. This repair will help us maintain production needs and then we can look at repairing other hatcheries. Big Creek doesn't have enough water to move Nehalem fish to it while we repair the Nehalem raceways. The Big Creek pipeline has been repaired multiple times and is compromised.

Y. Lind asked about prioritization of the projects. Why would the bathroom be above the Klamath Hatchery repairs? Scott said it's the dollar amount. Cost aside, the Klamath Hatchery would be prioritized above the bathroom repair. Ryan said FEMA wildfire and insurance dollars are being negotiated. T. VanderPlaat asked what happens if there is money left over, does board get say in how it is spent, answer was yes.

Discussion

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to approve, T. VanderPlaat seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

23-012 Fishing Facilities Bundle 23/25

K. Brown asked if there has been some work done at EE Wilson in the past. M. Olson said there has been and there are a couple more things that need to be done. Without repairing the water control structure, it could fail, and the lake would drain. T. VanderPlaat said Water Resources Department needs to get involved when dams are involved, dam safety is required for certain sized dams and water volumes. Y. Lind asked why there is \$0 for project management. The in-house personnel are listed but there is no R&E staff listed. What is the involvement of R&E staff? M. Olson said he would be working with Bryce on both of the projects in the bundle. Bryce would do the survey, design, engineering, bidding, and construction management on site. M. Gauvin explained that the projects in the bundle have gone through the prioritization process and Bryce would be working on all of them.

Discussion

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to approve, R. Monroe seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

23-013 Poison Creek Reservoir Aeration System

T. VanderPlaat asked if the aeration systems are effective. M. Olson said he's unsure but that this would be a test case. Y. Lind said the board has discussed interest in trying aeration. K. Brown asked what kind of angler use Poison Creek gets. M. Olson said it sounds like a popular spot based on discussions with the district. D. Grosjacques asked about security. M. Olson said Dave Banks said that they haven't had issues with vandalism out there. D. Grosjacques said the solar panels would be a target. K. Brown said there was some mention of a vault toilet and if there are plans to put one in in the future. M. Olson said he is unsure but that this ask is just for the aeration system. M. Gauvin noted that the application says the toilet maintenance would fall on the Burns BLM.

Discussion

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to approve, D. Grosjacques seconded. Motion passed 5-1 with K. Brown voting no.

23-014 ROV Replacement for Nearshore Video Surveys

K. Brown said it's a big ask with no other funding sources, asked if there are any other potential sources. Scott Marion said yes. Scott said there is \$50K available, possibly up to \$100K from the Marine Program. This info is in the IRT question answers. Requests have been put in for other funding sources as well. K. Brown asked if that would reduce request from R&E. Scott said that there would likely be a partnership requirement. Foresee a minimum \$150K from R&E to build out the other support to get to \$350K. Someone must be first to the table to start the ball rolling to get other sources to buy in. Scott said a partial funding of \$150K would allow this to start happening. Scott said he could return later if R&E doesn't want to be the first on the dance floor. Said it is difficult to say what that minimum amount would be to drum up other funding.

Y. Lind said in the past that funding sources have been identified with stipulations on other funding being available. Made the point that R&E could say here's some amount of money and come back to us when you get other funding and we can approve the initial amount. Scott said this is plan D to fund this because they have looked for funding elsewhere. Scott hasn't heard from other organizations that they would give money if there was other funding, but having some commitment from a source helps with acquiring that other funding. Scott said part of the challenge here is how long it takes to get the equipment after it is ordered. This is why they have come in with a cycle 1 request. Scott says he is seeing a convergence of possible funding sources which is why he came to R&E now. T. VanderPlaat asked about how this technology is progressing. Scott said ROV needs to have high payload capacity but not be so big it can't be launched off a commercial fishing vessel. There are newer, smaller ROVs with sensors and what not, but they don't have the payload capacity to deploy the scientific instruments needed for the studies the Marine Resources Program is trying to do.

S. Chambers asked about inflation mention in questions from IRT. Would a contract lock in price or...? Scott said that the price quote would be good for 60-90 days but they don't want to get a quote until they have funding secured because it could then change.

Discussion

30% commercial benefit. R. Monroe voiced his support for the project. Y. Lind said it's premature to fund something like this and didn't appreciate that they just asked for the full amount without pursuing additional funding sources. T. VanderPlaat asked if R&E funds are used to buy equipment that is treated as an asset for the department, does the department have a fund for replacing equipment like that? T. VanderPlaat said he recognizes the value of equipment like this but is unsure R&E should be the funding source. K. Brown said she never has seen an agency have a fund for replacing equipment, it always gets cut by the legislature. M. Gauvin said that R&E buys a lot of equipment like boat motors, boats, liberation trucks, etc. S. Chambers voiced her support and said that this equipment is supposed to last 20 years according to the application. Pointed out that

these ROVs allow us to count fish where other sampling methods just don't work (hook and line, etc.). S. Chambers pointed out that unknowns around rockfish can close fisheries.

Motion: K. Brown motioned to amend amount to \$150K with instruction to get other funding. D. Grosjacques seconded. S. Chambers suggested friendly amendment to \$200K. K. Brown accepted. D. Grosjacques seconded amended motion. Motion passed 5-1 with Y. Lind voting no.

23-016 St. Paul Ponds Security & Sustainability Project

K. Brown said IRT comment wanted budget split out for cost of roof and gate. Kevin said roof ask was dropped from the request.

Discussion

T. VanderPlaat pointed out that this is a freshwater project.

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to approve, K. Brown seconded. Motion carried 5-1 with D. Grosjacques voting no.

Discussion in general about administration budget

D. Grosjacques said that he doesn't recall voting on administration projects A0-9 in the past. Y. Lind pointed out that the administrative budget is as large as all of the enhancement spending. The group discussed how admin budget is paid for by R&E funds. M. Gauvin pointed out that the strictly admin staffing money pays for Coordinator, Assistant, and Construction Manager. Y. Lind said when he started with R&E, there were 8 meetings a biennium and now that there are only 4 meetings and all the money is being spent at the front end, does R&E still need 2 full time staff persons? D. Grosjacques said yes based on his discussion with the previous coordinator about how hard it is to track things, get paperwork in and keep track of projects. R. Monroe talked about how complicated tracking grants is because he has some experience with it. M. Gauvin talked about how much work the staff do with tracking projects, working with the legislature, traveling around the state, keeping up with permit requirements, etc. M. Gauvin pointed out that the staff also run the STEP Program and STAC Board. M. Gauvin talked about how difficult it was for the last coordinator when the STEP Coordinator and R&E Coordinator positions were combined.

T. VanderPlaat asked if it is efficient for the board to meet twice a year when we've spent the money in cycle 1. Said he is excited to see Cape Meares project when it is done. R. Monroe pointed out that in government that employees are doing the work that has to get done because it's not going to be done by anybody else. M. Gauvin talked about the value in having the board meet in person and get to see the projects out in the field. T. VanderPlaat said that ODFW staff are looking for direction from the board and expressed that the board can help set priorities for the R&E staff.

Y. Lind talked about how when the Construction Manager position was added, there was talk about it leveraging dollars. He didn't see that in the angler access bundle this cycle. M. Olson said he put that bundle grant package together with Bryce. M. Gauvin talked about how Bryce has got Travel Oregon grants, and OSMB grants, got volunteers to help out. Y. Lind said he would like to see examples of how Bryce's position is paying for itself. T. VanderPlaat said he sees Bryce's position in part as a QA/QC role because he understands construction and engineering.

23-A0+ R&E Program Administration (all but mini grants)

Motion: R. Monroe motioned to approve all but the mini grants item, K. Brown seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

23-A5 STAC Mini-Grant Program

Group discussed increasing the amount of money that is set aside for STAC mini grants. D. Grosjacques expressed his reservation about increasing the amount from \$50K. Group talked about raising it to \$75K instead of the full ask of \$100K. K. Brown said that she is concerned about R&E ability to increase amounts without an R&E revenue increase. T. VanderPlaat talked about \$2,000 hardly doing anything anymore. He said he thinks it inhibits the ability of STAC do to anything really meaningful, even like planting trees etc. T. VanderPlaat said the STAC perspective on R&E is that R&E has \$4M and so STAC wants more. T. VanderPlaat says we need to be careful of that perspective because we don't want to be penny wise and pound foolish. These mini grants are important for our volunteer base. T. VanderPlaat pointed out that they are asking for less than 10% of R&E remaining funds. R. Monroe said that \$2,000 isn't much because when planting trees, for example, you pay \$6 per tree. He thinks a little more money could be helpful. Group discussed that STAC can increase the \$2,000 per mini grant limit without R&E increasing total funding.

Motion: T. VanderPlaat motioned to approve at amount of \$75K. No second. Motion failed.

Motion: D. Grosjacques motioned to leave mini-grant amount at \$50K, K. Brown seconded. Motion failed 2-4 with K. Brown and D. Grosjacques voting yes.

Motion: Y. Lind motioned to approve at amount of \$75K with caveat that the additional \$25K can only be used for education related grants and that the limit for mini grants be raised to \$3000 on the whole fund. T. VanderPlaat seconded. Group discussed the ability of R&E board to tell STAC how they can spend the money and what the definition of education or classroom would be. Motion was withdrawn.

Motion: Y. Lind asked D. Grosjacques and T. VanderPlaat to talk to Steve J and ODFW staff to get more info on STAC Mini grants based on Steve's presentation and the annual reports. Y. Lind motioned to approve the \$50K, R. Monroe seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Emergency Requests and Modifications

M. Olson gave an update on the Morgan Lake and Hatchery Bundle projects. A \$5,000 addition was made to the Morgan Lake grant to help pay for the increased toilet cost. The hatchery bundle changes were presented by Brent Hinners. Brent asked the board to reaffirm that they are okay with purchasing the tractor (truck) for Oak Springs if the Nehalem Hatchery pond repair isn't possible this biennium.

M. Olson presented about the Tillamook ADA fishing dock emergency repair. R&E funding was \$4,950.

M. Olson presented about the Alsea Hatchery liberation truck fill pump for \$4,474.

Clatsop County Fisheries floating fish delivery pipe, total project cost was \$11,386.25. We approved \$5,000 towards the floating fish delivery project. K. Brown asked if there was a plan to replace the pier that was destroyed, and Scott Patterson said yes.

T. VanderPlaat asked if we would be reporting on the spending of the emergency fund at the end of the biennium. M. Olson answered that yes there would be a report at the next meeting after the biennium was closed.

Open Discussion

R&E Strategies from the last page of the R&E legislative report. T. VanderPlaat said that he thinks the department is missing community gathering opportunities and community facilities. Would like to see ODFW and R&E focus on turning fishing facilities into destination facilities. Y. Lind said he would like to organize a tour of Wizard Falls for his fishing club. T. VanderPlaat wants to see hatcheries be a destination to visit with your family. D. Grosjacques said that Rock Creek was somewhat that. Scott Patterson said in 2011-13 they asked for informational kiosks at the hatcheries and didn't get Board support for it.

M. Olson talked about the current recruitment process to fill the gillnet representative position and that we hope to have the person onboard for the next meeting. Next meeting will be Y. Lind's and R. Monroe's last meeting and we need to find people to take their places. Program staff are now starting on that.

Meeting location and date for September meeting. September 20-21st Wednesday and Thursday. Meeting will be in Tillamook. Scott Patterson said we could probably have our meeting at the Trask Hatchery.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45PM.