

## Raszka Shelley

---

**From:** Reiley Beth  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 15, 2013 2:34 PM  
**To:** Raszka Shelley  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on HB 4331

Beth Reiley

---

**From:** Schreck, Carl [<mailto:carl.schreck@oregonstate.edu>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 15, 2013 2:19 PM  
**To:** Reiley Beth  
**Subject:** Comments on HB 4331

Dear Ms. Reiley. Below are comments concerning the Oregon Hatchery Research Center and HB 4331 that I would like to enter into testimony concerning this bill. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Carl B. Schreck  
Oregon Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit  
U.S.G.S.  
Department of Fisheries and Wildlife  
104 Nash Hall  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331-3803  
541, 737-1961*

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend today's hearing on HB 4331 and so thought that I would share my perspective.

I chaired the IMST workshop (I'm still Co-Chair of the IMST) that was tasked with addressing both an operational plan for and facility design of the OHRC. One of the main points that was repeatedly stressed by both scientists and managers that were in attendance is that the OHRC needs to be able to operate in an environment free of scientific censorship. There cannot be censorship of the science that is done at the Center, or even the perception of it. This is fundamental to doing good science and it is fundamental if the center is to have any credibility. I personally strongly support this premise as well.

The main fault that I see in the present draft of the bill is that there is to be a board that votes on projects, rather than an board that is advisory (as it is at present). Second, the proposed constitution of this new board is quite devoid of scientists. I believe that it is neither in the best interest to Oregonians nor to the fish themselves for a board that could, because of some political motivation, prevent research from happening. Further, this is particularly misguided in cases where a researcher would have a project that fits within the mission of the OHRC and would be funded from outside sources (not state money). Since the opening of the facility, the millions of dollars of excellent research that has been done there directed at OHRC objectives has had very little state money involved. In fact, why would a researcher even bother to go to the extreme effort it takes secure outside funding if the project could be prevented from happening for non-scientific reasons (I include all of the checks and balances that scientists must already go through such as bioethics, animal care, etc. under doing good science)?

If the new board were to have any voting authority at all, then I respectfully request that the areas where the board would have authority be clearly defined and NOT include anything that would or could be considered censorship of science.