



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



Date: September 30th, 2025

Location: Eagle Crest Conference Center -
 Redmond, OR

Fish Restoration & Enhancement Program

Board Member	Staff/Guests	
Dave Grosjacques – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Marty Olson, ODFW	Jen Luke, ODFW
Tom VanderPlaat – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Sara Hart, ODFW	Evan Leonetti, ODFW
Fred Cholick – Representing Recreational Fisheries	Michele Weaver, ODFW	Chris Traill, ODFW
Brett Montague – Representing Commercial Troll Fisheries	Dave Banks, ODFW	Zach Carothers, TWCCI
Winter Rhodes – Representing the Public	Brent Hinners, ODFW	Ryan Sollee, TWCCI
Susan Chambers – Representing Fish Processing Industry	Katie Woodside, ODFW	Matt Thorton, TWCCI
Troy Laws – Representing Gillnet Fisheries	Paul Olmsted, ODFW	Spencer Polack, City of Canby
	Christine Clapp, ODFW	Tyler Nizer, City of Canby

Call to Order & Introductions

D. Grosjacques, the R&E Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

Introductions: All Board member that were present introduced themselves. T. Laws joined the meeting virtually.

B. Montague and S. Chambers were absent. Guests in the room and online also introduced themselves.

Agenda Approval

Discussion: no discussion

Motion: F. Cholick made a motion to approve the meeting agenda. T. VanderPlaat seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

March 2025 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval

Discussion: D. Grosjacques reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. He would like to see the administration package applications in a different format because they are so different from the other application.

T. VanderPlaat: He would like something to give out to the public to show what R&E is and does – found the legislative report and it is helpful.

D. Grosjacques: Suggests using the strategies lined out in the legislative report to make sure we are continuing to do the things that R&E was intended for.

F. Cholick: Agrees that we need to take these R&E strategic plans into account when reviewing projects.

T. VanderPlaat: Be sure to review the action items and make sure they are being accomplished before the next meeting.

T. Laws: Has a small edit; on page 2 it is written down that he was “trolling”, this need to be changed to “gill netting”.

Motion: T. VanderPlaat made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting with edits listed above. F. Cholick seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Look into how to change to application to better fit admin applications.
- **ACTION ITEM:** S. Hart to make small change to page 2 of minutes before posting on the website.

Board Member Updates

W. Rhodes: Tualatin River Keepers are working to reduce invasive species in this basin, especially invasive plants. There has been a lot of good effort this summer.

F. Cholick: Eastern region is still in a drought state. East Lake is dropping water levels fast this year, there are currently no usable boat ramps. He has just been appointed as a new member of the Salmon & Trout Advisory Committee (STAC), representing the Eastern Oregon STEP District. His first meeting will be in Grants Pass in two weeks. He has a plan to visit all the STEP programs around the state in the next couple of years. Along with Jen Luke and other volunteers, they helped about 2,000 youth in the last year – it is important to engage the next generation.

T. VanderPlaat: Been busy with the Fish Eggs to Fry Classroom program starting up. Buddy Phibbs, the Upper Willamette STEP Biologist, is serving about 170 classrooms this fall. Kids love this program, from K-12, they get a lot out of it.

D. Grosjacques: From the Merlin/Grants Pass area: The Klamath basin had a historic dam removal and recently the first salmon crossed the Keno Dam in about 100 years. Tribes and other volunteers are doing a lot of planting in the old reservoir areas where there is not a lot of vegetation. The Rogue fall Chinook run is looking good this year, but the steelhead run is down – you can look those numbers up with averages online. On the Umpqua, after the Rock Creek Hatchery burn, they are still trying to find ways to keep that program running. Shaun Clements came down to the area earlier this year and gave a presentation to explain their plan on how to continue providing hatchery fish to the Umpqua.

T. Laws: Harvest/gill nets – Spring Chinook, about 20,000 caught including summer fish. Fall Chinook, about 25,000 in zones 4-5, late fall added in about 14,000 and about 6,000 coho caught. The lower zones included a tangle net where unclipped fish were released. Prices have been low, tule Chinook are only \$0.25/lb right now. The SAFE (areas set aside from gill netting) areas caught about 40,000 coho and 19,000 Chinook. Similar to last year, maybe a little better. Columbia River having good returns overall. Run estimates were all fairly accurate. Met with ____ to discuss rebuilding the boat ramp at Youngs Bay - a lot needs to happen to pull that off.

Program Update, Emergency Grants, 25/27 Budget Projection Update – M. Olson

23/25 Biennium Wrap-Up: Allocated \$4,456,732 to projects. R vs E split was good with 50/50 split. Sport/Commercial split was 89/11 split, which is very close to the 90/10 that is the goal.

Return Funds: Anticipated about \$264,576. Ending balance is about \$421,576 (return funds + end balance). Ideally, we would like the ending balance to be about \$500,000.

Return funds from projects about \$123,500; Program Admin returned \$36,089; Grant Management System \$8,813; R&E/STEP Publicity almost \$10,000; STEP Education \$30,000; R&E Emergency Account \$56,259
All these equal \$264,576

F. Cholick: Agrees with the strategy of holding back that money to make sure we have money left – but would like that money to be spent on the things it was intended for, especially publicity and education funds.

Roll over projects: Empire Lake, Yellowjacket Lake, Hatchery Bundle – only partial for hatchery raceways at Elk River, trying to get bids in and find match money through a bond to cover costs.

B. Hinners: Elk River bids have been tough, we did not get any bids this last round so we have to go back to engineering and relook at some things and put out another round of bid. The bond for \$20 million would be put toward deferred maintenance for hatcheries, up to Fish Division to decide where that money will go.

T. VanderPlaat: Talked about bond and how that might be used... (2:40 in recording/transcript)

Emergency Grants: St Louis host site well repair; Salmon River backup generator; Letz Creek STEP hatchery repair; Whittaker Creek STEP hatchery repair; Trask River Hatchery Intake (part of the approved hatchery bundle is to move this intake, so this emergency grant was a temporary fix).

D. Grosjacques: If an emergency grant is under \$5,000, then Marty can approve it on his own. If it is over that amount, it requires a board vote.

25/27 Biennium: Projection of \$3.5 million in project revenue (assumed license sales); Hold back \$250,000 in reserve. This gives us \$3.25 million for projects.

Reserve funds = 250k + ending balance from 23/25 biennium = about \$671,576 – If our projection holds strong then we could dip into this, but we want to be cautious going forward.

F. Cholick: Possibly a potentially small amount of money for Cycle 3.

W. Rhodes: If we don't spend the money then someone will look at it and want to dip into it. **M. Olson:** No, these funds are dedicated to R&E, no one else can dip into this fund.

There is an angler license fee increase coming in January 2026.

Current projections: Cycle 1: \$3.25 million available - \$2,269.949 allocated so far. R/E and S/C splits look good at this point. Total remaining for the rest of the biennium = \$980.052; R available = \$740.025; E available = \$240.027

Things to Consider: Funding for later cycles – only have \$240,000 left to allocate to E projects. We have \$723k worth of E projects submitted in Cycle 2.

License fee increase in 25/27, it is unknown how the fee increase will affect license sales.

T. VanderPlaat: With the Electronic License System (ELS) is that something the department updates monthly or quarterly to see how many licenses are being sold? **M. Olson:** We have a report put out monthly. We can track sales that way.

Last biennium we came in \$300,000 less than the start of the biennium projection.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Try to get someone from fiscal to come in and talk to the board about how the projection is calculated.

Cycle 2 Project Review

25-012 Sturgeon Viewing & Interpretive Center Renovation

R&E Request: \$75,000

Discussion: **T. VanderPlaat:** The majority of the ask from R&E would be for dredging the pond. Other sources of money are for the building, etc. **F. Cholick:** All other funds are pending. Not sure what the impact to the strategic plan for R&E would be. **T. Laws:** Was there a cubic yard estimate for the dredging? **M. Olson:** Application says 1.5-2 feet of sediment as settled in pond, no cubic yard estimate though. **T. VanderPlaat:** This is an important facility for the public, lots of people visit this place. But where does it apply to R&E? **D. Grosjacques:** If we think the dredging portion is too expensive, can we cross that out and just fund the other parts? There is no one here that represents this project to approve that change.

25-013 Metolius Pond Pavilion and Improvements

Jen Luke is online representing the project.

R&E Request: \$22,000 what was original ask??

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Would be nice to have, but building a pavilion would be a stretch to say it improves the fishing. **J. Luke:** The whole Metolius pond development was 90% funded by R&E, the original design had a covered area, but we left it out to save money. Now we are coming back around to ask for the extra piece we left out before. Would benefit the fishing classes and the youth that use facility. **F. Cholick:** Last year, in June, during a

class we had someone get heat stroke and there was little shade to help them. We do have a firm quote on permitting and building costs. We can remove the picnic tables and fence costs. Central Oregon Fly Fishers will up the amount they are donating. We would like to reduce our ask of R&E to \$22,000. Pavilion will benefit the people that use this facility greatly.

25-014 Hatchery Restoration (R) Bundle

Brent Hinner is online representing the project.

R&E Request: \$740,000

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** What are the other funding sources? **M. Olson:** Hatchery maintenance bond funds and other program funds. **D. Grosjacques:** This money will be spent on 7 different hatcheries. **B. Hinner:** Yes.

F. Cholick: How will the Trask River improvements benefit Chinook populations? **B. Hinner:** (transcript 3:43) Water intake improvements will help draw all species, but 3-400k fall chinook.

T. Laws: Are there any of these items they can go without? **B. Hinner:** All of these projects in the bundle are priorities for the hatchery systems but it is up to the board. **D. Grosjacques:** This is an important and needed project. **T. VanderPlaat:** In regard to the falconry costs, what amount of predation is happening at this hatchery?

B. Hinner: Not sure of exact numbers but it is significant. We had a company come out and show us how their services work and it made a huge difference just in the short time the falcon was on site. **T. VanderPlaat:** Reason for the restroom for \$90,000 at Bandon hatchery. **B. Hinner:** Bandon is open to public and only has a port-a-potty right now, would like to replace with a vault toilet. **T. VanderPlaat:** What would the bond funds be used for versus the R&E funds. **B. Hinner:** The Cedar Creek hatchery pond expansion would use both.

W. Rhodes: Asking for two vehicles, do you need both right now, or can you get by with one? **B. Hinner:** The two F550s are both needing to be replaced. If we had to choose where to spend the money, we would choose the trucks over the Cedar Creek hatchery ponds.

- **ACTION:** Would like more info on \$20 million hatchery bond at next meeting.

25-015 Hatchery Restoration (E) Bundle

Brent Hinner is online representing the project.

R&E Request: \$10,000

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Signage at hatcheries are not in bad shape. **F. Cholick:** \$1,250 per sign seems like a lot. **B. Hinner:** Each sign needs to have its own estimate. Oregon Corrections will do the signs. It will depend on the hatchery and the signs sizes, etc.

T. Laws: Can you find sponsorships for the signs? The pictures look run down but they are still readable. **B.**

Hinner: We have not gone that route, but we could try to look into it. We do have great partnerships in the areas of these hatcheries. **D. Grosjacques:** What size of signs are you wanting? **B. Hinner:** Some will be big signs that talk about the specific hatchery and other smaller sign that talk about fish species in the raceways. We want good quality with a good finish to make them last a long time.

25-016 East Side Electrofishing Boat

Dave Banks online.

R&E Request: \$146,000

Discussion: **D. Banks:** We would use this boat for warmwater sampling, but could also use it for illegal introduction investigations. Opportunity for more information for anglers about what it going on with the warmwater fisheries. Also will be used for understanding the management of different species. **D. Grosjacques:** Eastern Oregon does

not get as much attention for their fisheries programs. **F. Cholick:** Likes that they can detect invasive species, very important. Talked to Jerry George out of the Bend office, he said if funded he would use this boat about 20 days a year and would be shared around east side, will be very well used. **W. Rhodes:** Is the motor something that needs to be upgraded or can it be rolled into the cost of the boat? **D. Banks:** the company that we work with does

motors separately; we can find motors sometimes at state surplus for much cheaper. **T. Laws:** Have any dealings been made with this manufacturer or is this a set price? **D. Banks:** We have been in consultation with Idaho, based off conversations with them and other biologists that have used this brand of boat, this is the one that fits our needs. **T. VanderPlaat:** How many times a year would this boat be used versus the one you have been using?

D. Banks: Right now, we are borrowing the Roseburg boat, but it is in high demand. There are 5-6 districts that would be using this boat; each one would have 10-20 days a year of use, high demand for this area.

25-017 Canyonville Access Walkway

Evan Lenonetti online to represent this project.

R&E Request: \$38,970

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** damage to walkway happened this last spring. The area uses a lot of volunteers that need to access the fish ladder. **E. Leonetti:** It is very important for access to gathering broodstock. Tribe is very supportive of this project. Fish are donated to the local food bank, to the tribes, and used for stream enrichment. Only other access options would be from I-5 which is dangerous, or by the crossing creek, and depending on flow can also be very dangerous. There is a definite high priority need for the district. **F. Cholick:** Is fish passage approval not required? **E. Leonetti:** ODFW has programmatic agreement that if no structures are going in the channel, then we are cleared without fish passage approval. **F. Cholick:** Like that they are going to build the new one out of floodplain. **T. VanderPlaat:** Any other funds available? What about insurance? **E. Leonetti:** Insurance would not cover the cost. We have been working with engineering but have not received documents from them yet. **T. Laws:** What about FEMA? **E. Leonetti:** There was no FEMA declaration.

25-018 Investigating Ocean Migration of Steelhead Kelts

Ryan Sollee, **Matt, and Zach** are online to represent project.

R&E Request: \$43,450

Discussion: **R. Sollee:** This was modeled after an Alaskan study. Not tagging a ton of fish but each fish data is pretty robust. **Matt T:** We can hopefully fill in some data gaps on where they go when they are out in the ocean. We are bringing in anglers to the study to help out. This project is designed to get kids involved in the study while also getting them involved in the traditions of angling, very collaborative. **R. Sollee:** Had eggs to fry in classroom and it was very influential to him.

F. Cholick: Loves educational component. Questions about the number of fish being tagged, only 22 fish. Alaska was a three-year study and up to 35 fish. Validity of conclusions on the data with so few fish? **R. Sollee:** The plan is to carry this project for 5 years. **F. Cholick:** What other sources of funding? **R. Sollee:** 1% of the Planet invited them in and is providing funding. We have other corporate sponsors and private sponsors. **Matt T:** Raised \$26,000 in a few months when we were just getting started. Now we are building a bigger community and base for finding funding. Having this grant approval in our corner will help legitimize our project. **T. VanderPlaat:** How will this directly benefit anglers? It is a big investment on something that may not help anglers. **Matt T:** Predation rates are also something that we can calculate. We are starting to get data back from last-years tagged fish and are starting to process that now. With this info we can find out if the fish and going to make it back into the rivers or not. **T. Laws:** There is a mention of curtailing ocean fisheries, what stocks are they mingling with, how will that affect the fisheries. **Matt T:** PIT tagged fish must be intercepted and scanned, these fish we can monitor without having to catch them. **D. Grosjacques:** Need to decide if this project fits with what R&E stands for.

25-019 Siuslaw High School STEP Hatchery

Christine Clapp online to represent this project.

R&E Request: \$54,484

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** The high school hatcheries that we have funded in the past have been great.

M. Olson: STEP propagation permit is working its way through the process and is about half way through.

C. Clapp: She is fine with funding being contingent on getting that permit. Fish will come from Oak Springs. There is an existing aquaculture program at this school, they go out with the STEP program and help with the trap.

Middle school has a stream team that does water quality monitoring. Fish are released at a local lake right before free fishing weekend. **D. Grosjacques:** What is the teacher and principal's commitment to the program? **C. Clapp:**

The high school teacher is long term, there is a letter of support from school district superintendents. They have been doing the other programs like stream team for a long time – they are very committed. **T. VanderPlaat:** Is this program replacing the Munsel Creek STEP Hatchery? **C. Clapp:** Yes.

25-020 SWWD Fisheries Boat Repower

Paul Olmsted online to represent project.

R&E Request: \$13,123

Discussion: **P. Olmsted:** A fish biologist in Corvallis area. **T. VanderPlaat:** Does the department not have a budget for replacements of things like this? **M. Olson:** No, each district manages its own budget. **W. Rhodes:** This is also a matter of safety to have a good working boat motor – very important.

25-021 South Fork Schooner Creek Foot Bridge

Christine Clapp online to represent this project.

R&E Request: \$13,425

Discussion: **C. Clapp:** The channel has changed a lot with recent flooding; the US Forest Service owns the land. We use this trap for monitoring winter steelhead mostly, but also coho and Chinook. It is their most popular volunteer program in the area. We have been crossing the creek, but it is a big safety issue, especially with volunteers. All archeology surveys are done. Fish passage permitting is not needed, we are not putting structure in water. **T. VanderPlaat:** What about insurance costs and costs of permitting. **C. Clapp:** We have covered all of those costs.

25-022 Tillamook Basin Chs Salmon Abundance Estimates

Katie Woodside and Brian Riggers online to represent project.

R&E Request: \$130,926

Discussion: **F. Cholick:** One river in the cost seems very high. **K. Woodside:** Most expenses are employee costs, tried to use volunteers and existing staff in past years, but it was not effective. We would agree to reduce the staff to three and reduce ask to \$85,000. In the future we will pursue other funding types and will not plan to continue to ask for R&E funds.

25-023 Canby Pond

Tyler and Online to represent project.

R&E Request: \$122,000

Discussion: **Tyler:** The fishing at this location hasn't been very successful because of the need to dredge and the weed growth. **F. Cholick:** Alluded to lots of fishing at pond, do you have a number on how many anglers you get? **Tyler:** No definitive numbers. ODFW partnerships with free fishing weekends, those are very popular. But the fish right now don't last long because of the lack of depth. **W. Rhodes:** Agrees that this pond really needs the work. He has fished here. **T. Laws:** If the city is going to have a significant part of the dredging, why is the cost listed at \$100,000. **Tyler:** It is an estimated 5,000 cubic yards. Also, the fountain and aeration is to keep weeds down. There are multiple departments in the city that are going to contribute to hauling off the material. Labor and electrical costs are also included. **T. VanderPlaat:** Would like to recognize the city for your efforts and your partnership in working toward a goal of increasing fishing. Could you get by with just the fountain, and no dredging? **Tyler:** We really need to do both together to be most effective, but we would prioritize the dredging over the fountain.

LUNCH BREAK

Board Discussion, Scoring, and Voting

(Note: Projects were discussed one by one in number order, then the Board scored each project anonymously. Once all scores were submitted the projects were voted on from highest average score to lowest average score. Discussion, scores and votes were condensed in the minutes for clarity.)

25-012 Sturgeon Viewing & Interpretive Center Renovation

Discussion: **F. Cholick:** Has been to this site many times, great location and great PR, however, little to no impact on fishing and anglers. **D. Grosjacques:** Agreed, may not score it very high. **T. VanderPlaat:** could possibly use some of the STEP education fund.

Score: 1.6

Decision: T. VanderPlaat made a motion to deny project 25.012. W. Rhodes seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

25-013 Metolius Pond Pavilion and Improvements

Discussion: **F. Cholick:** Formally want to reduce the asking amount to \$22,000. The number one priority is the pavilion. The other members of the Central Oregon Flyfishers were briefed on what the situation is and why this project may not be funded. **T. VanderPlaat:** From procedural standpoint, we need to be careful about making last minute changes like this, it is a fairness issue. **W. Rhodes:** Hears that, but very rare that we will have this happen a lot in the future. With this project, we were given us a very clear reason for reducing the price by taking out parts of the project, not just asking for smaller amounts. **M. Olson:** If a project is changed significantly at this point, it changes the basis of the project. This could affect the IRT scoring because they have not seen these changes.

F. Cholick: The major negative comment from the IRT was the fence, which has been removed. I was directed to make these changes by the COFF who are also putting \$20,000 into the project.

Score: 3.4

Decision: T. VanderPlaat motions to approve project 25.013 for the amount of \$22,000. W. Rhodes seconded the motion. YES – Rhodes, VanderPlaat, Grosjacques, Laws (4); NO – none; ABSTAIN – Cholick (1). Motion passes.

25-014 Hatchery Restoration (R) Bundle

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** This fits with what we need to spend on R- projects. **T. Laws:** Wish there were a couple things that they would drop out of their ask. There is a commercial aspect which he is supportive of, but there is a lot of other stuff there.

Score: 4.2

Decision: F. Cholick made a motion to approve project 25-014 for the full amount requested. T. VanderPlaat seconded the motion. YES – Rhodes, Cholick, VanderPlaat, Grosjacques (4); NO – Laws (1). Motion passes.

>> ACTION: Tom - need to understand how the 20mil bond is going to play with RE funds. How are those going to work together. Dave – need more details on where is that money going.

25-015 Hatchery Restoration (E) Bundle

Discussion: **T. VanderPlaat:** Thinks signage is important but struggling with the timing of it coming in, we have limited funds. **T. Laws:** When he worked for ODFW he put signage up and there is a wide range of bids coming in. **D. Grosjacques:** The cost correlates with how long they last. Maybe sponsors would be a better choice. When faced with all these other projects, it may not be a priority.

Score: 3.0

Decision: W. Rhodes made a motion to approve 25-015 for the full amount. No second. Motion fails.

W. Rhodes made a motion to deny project 25-015. T. VanderPlaat seconded the motion. YES – Cholick, VanderPlaat, Laws, Grosjacques (4); NO – Rhodes (1). Motion passes.

25-016 East Side Electrofishing Boat

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Eastern Oregon fish biologist would agree that a lot of money is going to the west side. They are going to use it a lot. Very supportive. **T. VanderPlaat:** Directly for ODFW to conduct their work. Struggle with that compared to these other projects that involved volunteers and have an outside influence.

T. Laws: Can appreciate the need for this but it seems like the price could be lower if they go out to bid or work with the company. **F. Cholick:** Highest rated by IRT, but if you fund it we only have \$100,000 left to spend.

Score: 3.8

Decision: D. Grosjacques makes a motion to approve project 25-016 for the full amount requested. No second. Motion fails.

T. VanderPlaat makes a motion to deny project 25-016. T. Laws seconded the motion. YES – VanderPlaat, Laws (2); NO – Grosjacques, Rhodes, Cholick. Motion fails.

W. Rhodes motions to table this project to later in the meeting. F. Cholick seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

Reason: because of fiscal situation, this takes too much of the available funds. Does not reflect the benefits of the project.

*end of project discussion and voting: W. Rhodes motions to take it from the table. F. Cholick seconded. W. Rhodes made a motion to deny project 25-016. D. Grosjacques seconded the motion. YES – Rhodes, VanderPlaat, Grosjacques, Laws (4); NO – Cholick (1). Motion passes.

25-017 Canyonville Access Walkway

Discussion: **T. VanderPlaat:** There is an obvious direct benefit to anglers. **D. Grosjacques:** There is a big safety issue here, especially for volunteers.

Score: 4.6

Decision: T. VanderPlaat made a motion to approve project 25-017 for the full amount requested. W. Rhodes seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

25-018 Investigating Ocean Migration of Steelhead Kelts

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Does not think it fits with the goals of R&E. **F. Cholick:** It is the lowest rated project by the IRT. **T. VanderPlaat:** Proving this type of monitoring is important, but it is just in the beginning stages. **W. Rhodes:** How are scientific data projects viewed by the IRT? **M. Olson:** We have a wide variety of background folks on the IRT. They score those projects individually and the non-science people on the IRT might not score as high, but the scientist will, so they should even out.

Score: 1.4

Decision: F. Cholick motions to deny project 25-018. T. VanderPlaat seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

25-019 Siuslaw High School STEP Hatchery

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** As an educator I am in full support. **W. Rhodes:** The future of the program after the person running it leaves the school is unsure. **D. Grosjacques:** The larger school district is in full support and so they will look for a person to take over that will take on that program. **T. VanderPlaat:** Munsel Creek STEP hatchery is going away, all those resources need to go somewhere and the community will keep this program going as well. **T. Laws:** I support this, I was a benefactor of the Astoria program when we went to high school there. These programs are very beneficial.

Score: 3.8

Decision: T. VanderPlaat made a motion to approve project 25-019 for the full amount. W. Rhodes seconded the motion.

YES – Rhodes, VanderPlaat, Grosjacques, Laws (4). NO – Cholick (1). Motion passes.

Reason: F. Cholick no vote due to the worry of the long-term stability of the program.

25-020 SWWD Fisheries Boat Repower

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Their old motor was very old. **F. Cholick:** Yes, 31 years old. **W. Rhodes:** It is all about job safety, he is supportive. **T. VanderPlaat:** It is an ODFW project, why don't they have this in their budget. **M. Weaver:** Everyone struggles with budgets and need funding. Why only ask that of ODFW and not the outside applicants? **W. Rhodes:** You are putting the safety of your employees on the line with these old motors. **F. Cholick:** In proposal, they state they are only investigating three areas, not being used in a lot of areas.

Score: 3.8

Decision: Winter motions to approve, Dave 2nd. YES - Rhodes, Cholick, Grosjacques, Laws (4); NO – VanderPlaat(1). Motion passes.

25-021 South Fork Schooner Creek Foot Bridge

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Two different bridges in our application pool, how can we fund one without the other? What one would be easier to get donations or volunteer labor? This one seems like it would be easier to fund other ways. **F. Cholick:** Where is this creek and where are these fish going? **M. Olson:** The creek is outside of Newport. **W. Rhodes:** Should be prioritizing safety, and there is a need for a bridge. There is a human factor here where you are trying to do things for the angler without harming yourself. **D. Grosjacques:** This one looks like most of the time it wouldn't be as big of a deal to walk across the creek. **T. Laws:** Is there public access at this creek. It is on Forest Service land. **T. VanderPlaat:** There is public has access to the creek for recreational purposes but not for fishing. **T. Laws:** The Forest Service should be putting money toward this then.

Score: 3.2

Decision: T. VanderPlaat made a motion to approve project 25-021 for the full amount requested. W. Rhodes seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

25-022 Tillamook Basin Chs Salmon Abundance Estimates

Discussion: **D. Grosjacques:** Similar thoughts to kelt project. It doesn't fit into the R&E strategic plan. **F. Cholick:** They have asked for Pacific Salmon Council funds and they did not fund it, why?

Score: 1.4

Decision: W. Rhodes made a motion to deny project 25-022. F. Cholick seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

25-023 Canby Pond

Discussion: **W. Rhodes:** Very good project, but the money is a lot for just dredging. **T. Laws:** Application seems vague in the budget numbers on what they can accomplish themselves versus what is being contracted. Seems like they have the ability to do more of this equipment work they have listed. The details are unclear. They are contributing a lot, but not sure where our money will be going. It is a lot of truckloads of materials, may depend on where they are dumping the material they dredge.

Score: 2.0

Decision: W. Rhodes made a motion to deny project 25-023. F. Cholick seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 5 yes, 0 no.

All remaining money is for E project in the amount of \$98,025. M. Olson will follow up with applicants about the boards decisions.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Score cards should have Project Numbers on them to make them easier to read, Sara and Marty will make sure this happens before the next meeting.

Administration Discussion

Elections:

D. Grosjacques: The Chairs responsibility includes being in contact with Marty for agenda and emergency grants. Vice Chair fills in for Chair if absent or they need help.

W. Rhodes made a motion for Tom VanderPlaat to be next Board Chair. F. Cholick seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

T. VanderPlaat made a motion for Troy Laws to be Vice Chair. F. Cholick seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Calendar and Next Meeting:

M. Olson: We do not know when the commission meetings are scheduled yet, we would not want to overlap with those. Could consider beginning of the week again.

March 5-6, 2026 - Meeting Thursday and tour Friday. Second choice: March 2-3, 2026 - Tour Monday and meeting Tuesday.

Location: Salem, ODFW HQ

T. VanderPlaat: Would encourage a joint meeting with STAC. **M. Olson:** Maybe a combined Fall meeting for 2026.

T. VanderPlaat: Would like to get around to some of these hatcheries and see where our investment is going. Also combined with STEP biologists if possible.

Legislative Summary:

D. Grosjacques: Likes to reference the last page for RE strategic plans.

Self-Attestation Form: There are State OARs that override our R&E OARs that allow Board members to get paid for these positions.

D. Grosjacques: We do not want to take away from projects. **T. VanderPlaat:** Yes, but you have to think about these people who may be taking time off work to be on this board. **M. Weaver:** This was passed so that more people could have the opportunity to be on these types of Boards.

Recruitment:

Need one Commercial Rep and one Sport Fish Rep. The listing is active right now, been out for about a week. Had interest from Sport Fish Reps. Have not for Commercial Rep reach out yet, but we will be reaching out to folks. Leaning on current Commercial board members to try to recruit for those positions.

F. Cholick: To review action items from this meeting: 1. Hatchery bond money information, 2. Provide board with better idea of how they determine funding and projection, 3. Sub-committee to take a new a look cycle split, would like to revisit.

W. Rhodes: With how the funding is, could we limit our per project allocation (top it at \$25-50k) for all application with exceptions to admin and hatchery bundles. **T. VanderPlaat:** That could be a goal but putting hard side boards on it is tough because costs of projects are so high. **W. Rhodes:** This will make the applicants have to look elsewhere for additional funding sources. **D. Grosjacques:** Against setting a limit on project funds. **F. Cholick:** A better answer may be to limit what we spend in Cycles 1 and 2 and leave more money for Cycles 3 and 4. If a grant comes in for a large amount but it is a high priority then we should be able to fund it.

M. Weaver: We saw in a lot of applications people are already piecing together for these projects. There is a lot of administrative cost associated with trying to get money from a lot of different sources instead of just one, it is much harder to track and time consuming.

Sub-committee for budgeting by Cycle: F. Cholick volunteers. W. Rhodes also volunteers but has different goals on how to budget. T. Laws volunteers. **T. VanderPlaat:** Wants to make sure that we are not giving all of our money to ODFW projects. Wants to have more diversity in who we are funding and new partnerships.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Marty and Sara will schedule with the sub-committee to meet sometime this winter.

Parting Thoughts:

Marty wanted to say thank you to Susan, even though she is absent.

Mike Gauvin was online and thanked Dave for all his effort throughout the years.

Mike Harrington was online and wanted to thank Dave for his amazing volunteer efforts.

Dave gave some wise parting thoughts (transcript 8:45). Thank you ODFW, the people I have worked with have been fantastic.

Tom gave some parting thoughts about the joy of working with Dave. He has tough shoes to fill.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourned meeting at 4:02pm.