

View of Amendment Recommendations

In Closing- Let's look at recommendation 3.

“Board of laypersons, will not only not have the expertise to propose research. A lay Board that approves research projects will result in loss of credibility for the Oregon Hatchery Research Center.”

Recommendation 10 with scientist on the Board the (typical) lay person will not have the background and (capability) to propose research.

Recommendation 11 a lay person Board without scientist that approve science proposals will not have credibility in the scientific community and there the center will lose credibility.

The 50 co-sponsors are lay persons, the 14 constituent groups that support HB 3441 are lay persons, the unanimous vote on the House Floor, and these Legislators are lay persons.

According to the proponents of the amendments,

1. We don't have expertise
2. We will cause loss of credibility
3. We don't have the proper background and capabilities
4. We lay persons will not bring credibility in scientific community.

How arrogant are these proponents?

They worry about how their science will appear. They worry about credibility. They worry about their name being on a published scientific paper and getting credit.

The unqualified ignorant Board, the unqualified ignorant 50 Co-Sponsors, The unqualified ignorant Legislators have a different concern and vision. We want sound research, to guide fish management. We want what is in the best interest of fish.

Groups that endorse HB 3441

Association of NW Steelheaders

Oregon Salmon Commission

Salmon for All

McKenzie River Guides Association

Oregon Chapter Trout Unlimited

Native Fish Society

Coastal Conservation Association

Oregon Concrete/Aggregate Producers
Association

Special Districts/ Oregon Coastal Ports

--Over---

Oregonians for Food and Shelter

Small Woodland Owners Association

Alsea Sportsman's Association

Oregon Farm Bureau

Carpenters Industrial Council

Suggested Changes

Word Advisory-

Recommendation 1. That may have been the case in the past. HB 3441 proposes a stronger advisory Board. We do not want to give the impression that OSW and the ODFW can completely disregard the Board's concerns or advice.

Voting

Recommendation 2. When dealing with difficult issues, all Boards end up voting, even the ODFW Commission votes and OPAC votes and that process helped us establish marine reserves.

Need for Scientist on the Board

Recommendation 3. Existing Board has scientist. What did that accomplish? Nothing!

Recommendation 4-5-6. Director Elicker can appoint 3 positions. All can be scientist. Also, other appointed positions could have science backgrounds.

Recommendation 4-5-6. You should note the word layperson not having the expertise to propose research. I guess OSU and ODFW think the public constituent base is too ignorant and only scientists have a brain. (Madam Chair if I put you and Sen. Olsen.)

Credibility among scientific community.

Recommendation 4-5-6-7. Research should focus on science for Oregon to better manage hatcheries and lessen impact on wild fish.

Recruitment for the Board

Recommendation 4. No change needed. There will be more than enough people to fill the Board slots.

Anyone can propose a project.

Recommendation 10-11. It is up to OSU and ODFW to inform the Board of the value of a proposal and its feasibility.

Approve proposed projects.

Recommendation 10-11. Dr. Edge, in my office stated that they already approve the graduate student's research projects and didn't think it was a problem. Only the ODFW seems concerned. In reality they don't want any oversight or to be answerable to anyone. When public entities receive public dollars, there should have been oversight and accountability. There hasn't been any.

Recommendation 12. Most Boards select their Chair. Director Elicker selects the Board. It would be inappropriate to have him select the Chair. A conflict of interest would be a problem.

Recommendation 14. There is not restricting of research. Someone is misreading or misinterpreting what the bills says.

Maintaining consumptive harvest of hatchery fish is a must and protects wild fish. The bill does not determine any outcome of science. Again it appears OSU and ODFW are misreading or don't understand legislative wording. ORS 496.275- gives direction to the ODFW to review and revise existing state administrative rules so that the different forms of hatchery production are recognized as a necessary and critical element in the state's salmon production system in order to provide harvest opportunities for Oregon's citizens.

This is a key example of someone not liking the direction given in a statute. It is the legislative prerogative to give direction to an agency to do or not to do something.

Recommendation 14. Under Sec; 5 the key question should be answered and give purpose of Research Center.

Recommendation 15. The Board will be working with the Director. It is appropriate for the Board to have input. If there is a working relationship between the Board and Director, OSU and ODFW should be made aware. If not they need to know.

Suggested Amendments/Edits to April 16 version of HB 3441

Section	Suggested Change	Rational
Throughout	Insert Advisory before each mention of Board	The function of this Board is mostly advisory and should therefore be called that. The current Advisory Committee for the OHRC functions in much this way.
Throughout	Remove mention of "voting" or "voting members".	Advisory Boards reach consensus through discussion and "decisions" are advisory in nature which would eliminate need to vote.
1 (1) line 8 1(2) line 13	See next suggestion to add 3 or 4 scientists to the Board "The board shall consist of xx members, including xx voting " ...current version is "13" and "10"	Scientists on the committee play an extremely important role in helping to evaluate the science conducted at the OHRC and providing credibility. An Advisory Board composed of laypersons only will not have the expertise to propose research as directed in the bill. Furthermore, a lay board that <i>approves</i> research projects will result in a loss of credibility for the OHRC among the scientific community.
1 (2) (f) line 22	Add "or local government" at end of sentence	Will improve ODFW ability to recruit members.
1 (2) (i)	Insert—"(i) three or four scientists at large."	See rational for changes in 1 (1)
1 (3) (a)	Appoint the following two <u>three</u> non-voting members.	Suggest that ODFW appoint two program managers (Conservation and Recovery and Propagation programs) be represented on the board.
1 (3) (a) (A)	One <u>Two</u> members to represent the state Department of Fish and Wildlife.	
2 (3)	Insert—"(3) Three (or four ?) shall serve for a term ending June 30, 2017"	To accommodate the scientists added to the board and distribute term renewals over a 3 years.
3 line 13	Insert—"advise the Senior Scientist to":	The purpose of the board should be advisory to the Senior Scientist.
3 (3) line 19	Delete if scientists are not appointed to the board	Without scientists on the board, the typical layperson will not have the background and capability to propose research—that is typically the role of scientists.
3 (4)	Review, approve and prioritize.....	A layperson board without scientists that approves scientific proposals will not have credibility in the scientific community and therefore the center will lose credibility. Furthermore, approval implies a funding decision that currently is usually handled by funding agencies other than ODFW or the Board.
4 (1)	The Oregon Hatchery Research	This is a common practice among advisory

	<p>Center Board <u>Director of the State Department of Fish and Wildlife</u> shall select one of its members as as chairperson and another as vice chairperson,.....</p>	boards currently managed by ODFW.
5 (2)(a)	<p>Conduct research on methods to minimize the genetic and ecological risk to naturally produced fish when hatchery produced fish are released in the waters of this state, while also maintaining the consumptive harvest of hatchery produced fish.</p>	<p>This clause will unduly restrict research opportunities at the OHRC. It may preclude research that needs to be done in the absence of hatchery fish or may be unfeasible in some systems for some species. Determining the outcome of the science in advance is not appropriate for a scientific enterprise and this clause seems to imply that.</p>
5 (2)(b)	<p>Conduct researchfish when wild broodstock hatchery produced fish.....</p>	<p>Although now common practice, this phrase is problematic because it may restrict potential solutions in selection of hatchery fish.</p>
6 lines 15-18	<p>“.....Director, after shall consultation with the chairperson of a department related to fish and wildlife at Oregon State University and the Oregon Hatchery Research Center Board established under section 1 of this 2013 Act, shall to appoint a Director of the....”</p>	<p>Current Director of the OHRC is an academic appointment at OSU jointly hired by OSU and ODFW. This decision needs to be independent of any advisory board that might provide input into activities conducted at the center.</p>