



## Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

June 3, 2022  
Board Meeting  
Conference Call/Webinar

Final Minutes  
Approved August 5, 2022

**Present:** Dan Cothren, Lee Grose, Marylyne Kostick, Hal Mahnke, Troy McCoy, Rudy Salakory, Don Swanson, Olaf Thomason, Jade Unger, Dennis Weber, and Del Wilson.

**Absent:** Richard Mahar, Gary Medvigy, Todd Olson, Ann Rivers. Vice Chair Grose excused the absent members.

**Staff:** Steve Manlow, Denise Smee, Amelia Johnson, Steve West, and Lorie Clark

---

---

### ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Vice Chair Grose stated he is presiding over the meeting in Chairman Olson's absence.

Director Manlow introduced the new SW Cities Representative, Troy McCoy from City of Battle Ground. Mr. McCoy filled the open seat for the SW Cities Representative when Paul Greenlee stepped down the end of 2021. Director Manlow asked Mr. McCoy to introduce himself to the Board.

Mr. McCoy stated he is a Battle Ground City Councilor. Prior to his city position, he was a member of the Battle Ground School Board elected in 2017. He grew up on the North Santiam River and is an avid fisherman.

### PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment was given.

### PARTNER REPORTS

- No partner reports.

### DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Manlow highlighted the following items from the Directors report:

- The SRFB met this week on June 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>. June 1<sup>st</sup> was the SRFB Retreat so no public comment was taken. Mr. Manlow summarized the following topics and key points.
  - Sponsor Capacity: Lack of sponsor capacity has become an increasing challenge.
  - Lead Entity Capacity: The SRFB acknowledged and discussed gaps in Lead Entity capacity funding, and noted budgets have been flat-lined since 2009. The SRFB called on RCO staff to evaluate gaps and needs.
  - Match Requirements: Securing match is an increasing challenge for sponsors.
  - Assessment Capacity: Currently there is a \$200K cap on assessment projects. There was discussion on raising the cap for assessments.
  - Cost Increases: Sponsors are having a hard time addressing increasing project costs.
  - Landowner Engagement: The Washington Salmon Coalition (WSC) provided comments to the SRFB regarding landowner engagement ahead of the Retreat. There was some level of discussion on the topic.
  - Mr. Manlow noted that it is unknown how many of the SRFB Retreat items will be carried forward to their work plan for action, and that on day 2 of the meeting he offered help from

the regions on any of the topics, including landowner incentives, and suggested panel type discussions may be helpful.

- The SRFB meeting on June 2<sup>nd</sup> focused on funding. The Board wrote a letter regarding the additional \$75M that was appropriated by the WA State Legislature. The RCO framed up some options for the SRFB to consider at their meeting. The Regions met multiple times and came to consensus on a funding recommendation. Mr. Manlow presented on behalf of the regions. The SRFB adopted Option 3, a regional approach, which is what both the Region's and LCFRB recommended.
- Director Manlow thanked Rudy Salakory (Cowlitz Indian Tribe), Brice Crayne and Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride (LCFEG) for providing comments to the SRFB. He noted the SRFB waived match requirements, per their recommendations. Director Manlow stated this is a very rare opportunity and we don't know if we will see this kind of funding again in the future, so we need to be effective in how it is allocated.
- Monitoring Funding: Mr. Manlow noted that we have been working with the Snake Recovery Region to shape monitoring allocations, and that the SRFB is not looking to remove funds from IMW monitoring. He noted that related to this, Ms. Johnson has been working with John Foltz of the Snake River Recovery Board, Amy Puls of Pacific NW Aquatics Monitoring Partnership, and Dr. Robert Bilby a longstanding Weyerhaeuser scientist, to publish a synthesis of what we are learning from our IMW projects - the document is titled, "Management Implications from Pacific Northwest Intensively Monitored Watersheds" and the link can be found on the PNAMP website: <https://www.pnamp.org/document/15207>.

#### Questions and comments from the Board:

- Board member Grose asked whether we are going to rely on our existing 2022 project submittals or add additional projects. Director Manlow stated there was a question on that at the SRFB meeting yesterday. He noted that for us, we are operating on the assumption that we will work with projects that are already "in the hopper" and not planning on another grant round.
- Board member Grose stated he was glad to see the SRFB waived match requirements. He asked if they were going to make it retroactive and waive match requirements for projects that are already on the ground. Director Manlow stated there was no discussion of that at the SRFB meeting, and that any change would be going forward. He explained that waiving match would be viewed as a pilot, for projects in the \$50M category.
- Board member Weber stated he wanted to thank LCFRB for the work they have done on this grant round as it represents a significant change in resources.

## BUSINESS MEETING

### Item #1 Consent Agenda

Board member Weber moved and Board member Salakory seconded to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. No discussion. Motion carried.

### Item #2 Approval of Targeted Investment Priority and Submittal

Director Manlow presented the item to the Board. Staff is recommending the Board adopt the Targeted Investment (TI) Review Committee's recommendation for which project goes forward to the SRFB and Review Panel for consideration.

Director Manlow stated the SRFB has set aside \$8.7M for Targeted Investments statewide. Each region can only submit one project for consideration and not all Regions submitted proposals. The recommendations would be submitted to the SRFB with a letter to validate the Regions recommendation for funding from this statewide fund.

He noted we received two proposals for the Targeted Investment funding. The highest ranking project was the Ridgefield Pits Floodplain Reconnection project proposed by the Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership (LCEP). The other project was the SF Toutle Steelhead Restoration project by the Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group, which ranked #2 with the scores being relatively close. Director Manlow stated we will work hard to fund both projects.

The Review Committee for the TI projects was made up of a subset of the LCFRB TAC and WDFW fish biologists that have experience with Chinook biology. The Committee had consensus on submitting the #1 project (Ridgefield Pits) to the SRFB.

Questions and comments from the Board:

- Board member McCoy stated he is familiar with the area and is excited to see what this project will do for the area. He asked if there is anything in the proposal that will address stream flow, as that is an impact. Director Manlow deferred to Paul Kolp of the LCEP to address the question. Mr. Kolp stated the project will reconnect the 200+ acres of floodplain, provide habitat diversity, and different flow path and depth regimes.

Board member McCoy moved and Board member Weber seconded to adopt the LCFRB Targeted Investment (TI) Review Committee's scores, supporting assumptions, deliberations and recommended ranked list for the 2022 TI project reviews, and submit the highest ranked project (22-1211 Ridgefield Pits Floodplain Reconnection – Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership) to the SRFB . No discussion. Motion carried.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER:**

- Ms. Smee stated there have been a few changes to the Open Public Meeting Act (OPMA) recently and one that will impact the Board. Going forward, we must provide a physical location for meetings where the public can attend. Our next meeting is scheduled for August 5, 2022, so we have some time to put things in place for our future meetings. Ms. Smee laid out a few options for the Board to consider:
  - In person meetings only with no call in option.
  - In person meeting with conference call option and no video. We have used this in the past before COVID. The potential issue with this option is that the public, if they decide to call in, will not be able to see who is speaking or any of the documents.
  - In person meeting with Go to Meeting (GTM) as a hybrid meeting. Several Boards and Councils are using this format but it does take some special equipment.

Ms. Smee stated we don't have to use the same format for every meeting. She asked the Board if members have a preference.

Questions and comments from the Board:

- Vice Chairman Grose stated the GTM format works well. However, he is confused on what the new law does or does not allow with GTM. Ms. Smee stated if we continue to use the GTM we would still need a physical location and that means we would have to have equipment to where the person in the physical location can be on camera for members in the virtual and vice-versa, so members could be heard and seen in both formats. This takes special equipment such as "OWL". She explained this is a video camera system that sits on the middle of a table and can turn to people in the room when they are talking allowing people in the room and online to see who is speaking.
- Board member Mahnke stated he likes the GTM format because he doesn't have to travel and feels that is a benefit.
- Board member Kostick stated she likes the hybrid meeting format in general for the travel aspect also and then for folks that don't have the capabilities to use a computer then they could come in.
- Board member Weber stated he is comfortable with hybrid format. He added we have to allow public comment when decisions are being made by the Board. This is the extra process requirement that the OPMA added.
- Board member Unger asked about public opinion for decision making. Ms. Smee stated this is something that we already do but the OPMA said now we have to allow for public comments in a meeting where there is a final decision being made. We have always allowed for public comment on agenda items.

Ms. Smee stated after Board discussion, we will plan for a hybrid meeting for August. Staff will schedule the WSDOT conference room (CR124) as the physical location. Board members and public may attend in person if they choose to do so.

Chairman Olson adjourned the meeting at 1:44 p.m.

/lc

Approved in open session on \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Todd Olson, Chairman