<div align="center">

McNary Fisheries Compensation Committee Meeting
Northern Wasco County PUD
2345 River Road, The Dalles, Oregon 97058
Link to Webex:
https://mcnaryfisheriescompensationcommittee.my.webex.com/meet/rickdm

</div>

<div align="center" style="color:blue">

Your audio connection is up to you, Webex offers a few options visible once you are connected.
I will have the conference phone set up as backup. That number is 1-971-256-0996, the passcode is 148967.   My cell number is 541-980-7727 if you need to call me.   Updated 8/17/2020

</div>

<div align="center">

Monday, August 24, 2020, 10 am.
ON LINE MEETING ONLY

</div>

1. **November meeting minute's approval request – done via email.**
   Last call for edits. No further edits noted.
   To Do: Rick will add minutes to website.
2. **New Proposals, Extension Request or Final Report Presentations.**
   No new proposals or final reports.   No new proposals or reports.
3. **Other new business, agenda additions, etc.**
   a.   Grant Evaluation Table – review revised idea, comment

Once again, the grant evaluation table generated considerable discussion. Rather than recount each members comments, I will try to document the major points and the path forward. Also, I have added some thoughts not expressed at the meeting.

Rick opened with a brief explanation of the rating system, reading the note at the bottom of the table, "Overall evaluation based not on implementation success but rather degree to which grant criteria were met.

Blaine, Erick RD, Brandon and Patrick agree that research oriented projects may not produce more fish, they may not even achieve the stated objectives (e.g. predator reduction) but that doesn't mean they are unsuccessful. It is still good info if only to inform the next step or a new direction. It allows the researcher to "check the box".

Rick suggested the MMF is too small to fund research, that we should focus on projects that target tangible "on the ground" results, Those type of projects have a much better chance of "increasing the production of wild fish", our first and most important criteria, criteria that the Settlement Agreement requires us to consider when reviewing grant applications.

Quoting from Exhibit A from the Settlement Agreement,

(i)   The measure **must** mitigate impacts to anadromous fish stocks located above McNary Dam.

(ii)   Natural production measures which assist or improve the survival and production of naturally producing stocks shall have **priority** over any other measure.

Acknowledging that there are no guarantees in habitat restoration work, a reasonable person would have to agree that in stream work occurs after the question of what needs to be done has been answered, research is still asking the question. We should let the state resource managers get the answers and focus our meager resources on the work.

So, while we didn't discuss changing the evaluations, it seems that is the majority sentiment. Further, if using the sentiment of the majority as the measure of success, we would rate all of our grants a success. For clarity then, please respond to this question:

SHOULD GRANTS BE EVALUATED BASED ON WHETHER OR NOT THEY ACHIEVED THEIR STATED OBJECTIVES OR IF THEY MET SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT CRITERIA?

Erick asked "what is it to be used for?" Are we attempting to evaluate our decision making, if we made good choices, if it met our expectations? If the recipient met stated objectives then the project was a success.
Rick thought the purpose of the table was:

1. To provide a succinct summary and assessment of the overall success of a project based on the extent to which the project met our criteria.
2. It also would serve as a way to retain the institutional knowledge for the benefit of future, new committee members.
3. It would be a tool to help evaluate projects based on the type of project (research, habitat, etc)
4. It could be seen as a way of evaluating committee decision making as well.

So I see numerous uses for the information by the committee, I'm not sure it would be intended for public consumption.

Rick said that the amount of feedback after a final report is minimal and some projects could be considered much more successful if we had examples of how the product was used to benefit anadromous fish.

In response to this, RD said he had heard of how lamprey tracking research informed managers of where LPS's were needed and subsequently installed. This is the kind of feedback we need and hearing this sparked another topic, that of an annual survey form sent out to grant recipients that may elicit this type of feedback, which would enable us to rate grants more accurately.

Rick offered that he does ask grant recipients for updates and has asked for specifics regarding how the product was used to guide management or build something, modify something, etc., but perhaps an annual survey would elicit more detailed responses. Further, he suggested that perhaps committee reps could follow up with grant recipients from the agency if they don't respond.

Conclusion: I believe there was agreement on this.

There was some more discussion on how long after a project is done due we continue to include it in the annual survey? The response to this was "it depends on the project".

Conclusion: So we will decide this on a grant by grant basis.

Erick suggested the first question of the survey could be written to answer the question, "is further evaluation necessary?"

Around this time, Brandon noticed that Patrick's mic was muted. It was unmuted and Patrick was able to shed the notion that nobody was listening to him.

Patrick suggested the table is more of a learning exercise for the committee. He also said "questions should be in the application". **Patrick, could you expand on this comment please?**

Patrick: The question I was referring to is "How will your project increase anadromous fish populations above McNary Dam?" The application should emphasize Exhibit A of the settlement agreement which states:

1. The measure **must** mitigate impacts to anadromous fish stocks located above McNary Dam.
2. Natural production measures which assist or improve the survival and production of naturally producing stocks shall have **priority** over any other measure.

Patrick cont.: I looked at the "Get a Grant" section at https://www.mcnary.fish/grants-2. I think it is clearly stated that grants are "To fund and support sustainable long-term, cost effective projects that protect or restore fish and their habitat above the McNary Dam." This theme should be carried through to the grant proposal presentation to the Committee.

In reference to use of product from a grant, Patrick added he knew the lamprey pamphlet had been widely distributed but offered no specific examples of its use, which admittedly you may not get. The pamphlet is used by WDFW Habitat Staff while developing provisions for Hydraulic Project Approval. Lastly, Patrick asked that the reason for the survey be explained when it is distributed.

TO Do:
1. Rick will tally responses to the question asked above on a vote record form and modify grant evaluation table accordingly.
2. Rick will draft an ANNUAL SURVEY questionnaire and circulate for comment.

   b. Logo selection- review revised logo, comment

The logo also generated considerable discussion.

Rick was asked to check with PUD to see if they had a graphic artist, he did and they don't.

Rick presented the latest version he put together using on line software, incorporating comments from the last meeting: which included, remove all agency logos, simplify, and focus on fund, not the committee.
This version was not what members were looking for, various reasons were cited so it was rejected.
Brandon steered the discussion to the Blane B.version, suggesting a few changes. Others expressed interest in seeing a modified version of this and it was decided to send it back to Blane with suggestions.
The day after the meeting, Brandon sent me the attached version that his wife put together for consideration.
To Do: All- review current logo version, send suggested edits and comments to the group. Brandon can hopefully sweet talk his wife into implementing the suggestions the group agrees on.

Patrick: The new logo is much better. I like it. I have no additional suggestions to improve the logo. Keeping it simple is a good thing. It is aesthetically balanced. I wouldn't be apposed to adding a lamprey in the river or addition of rocks or logs. But by doing this, the logo would become busy and risk becoming less recognizable.

4. Grant Updates, work progress and financial activity.
Active-Open Grants
   a. Wallowa-McDaniel Habitat Restoration Project-Phase 3 – see update
   b. Juvenile Lamprey Tracking-Year 2 – see update
   c. Non Native Predator Recruitment Reduction – No-cost extension approved again, end date is now December 31, 2021.
   d. Yakima River Mile 25 Thermal Refuge, see update
   e. Icicle Creek Boulder Field Project – see update
   f. Upper Yakima River Restoration Project-KCT- no update received
   g. Screen Angle Testing- see final report
   h. Yakima Wood Fiesta – no current updates.
Closed but Update Worthy
   i. Swauk Creek Restoration-Yakama Nation
   j. Lamprey Habitat Restoration Guide – Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
   k. Cle Elum River Restoration- KCT
   l. Yakama Beaver Project- MCFEG
TO Do: Rick will review active grants and see if any extensions are needed.

5. **Change Forms**
   None submitted
6. **Website updates**
   I would like to work on website and follow format used to list Farmers Conservation Alliance fish screen projects. Click on this link to see how their projects are presented, https://farmerscreen.org/featured-projects/

   I forgot that I had added this item but I think you all can still consider this by following the link and see what you think. It might be too much for me to do, but I like the format.

   To Do: All- follow the link and review the project list format. Respond with comments and votes.

   Patrick V. comment: I like the short project description accompanied by a good representative photo of the project. This does look like it would be a lot of work. But it would be helpful to those working on funding proposals to see the types of project the McNary Fisheries Fund has funded. I think you already have a project description on the internet site. Adding a photo would improve it.

7. **Next Meeting Date**: Mid-November