

Advisory Committee Member Answers to Dr. Noakes' Questions
Collated by Chair Barry McPherson
June 8, 2011

Not all members answered and not all who answered provided answers to all three questions. Names of AC members are not listed with their answers, and note that a given "Member #n" does not necessarily represent the same person throughout the document.

Question 1: How does the Committee wish staff to deal with questions and comments that members state at OHRC AC meetings?

Answers to Question 1:

Member #1 –

I think staff should clear up any confusion on information presented or incorrect statements made immediately, even if there is not time allotted for that purpose on the agenda. If that gets to be a problem because of meeting length, then I think we need to allow more time for discussion on those agenda items that might need such clarification.

If incorrect statements are not corrected or clarified immediately, then confusion may be created that would not occur had they been corrected or clarified. Plus, given the time between meetings, the context of the statements will not be as clear to any of us. Re-establishing that context means more time (in total) is used than if the correction or clarification had been given immediately.

Member #2 –

How they are dealt with depends on the comment or question. Some comments and questions can (and have been) dealt with immediately because they were simple and straightforward. If they can not be dealt with immediately, or later in the same meeting, staff just needs to state whether the comment or question could be dealt with at all and propose a timeframe, such as the next meeting or an email reply by a proposed date. The Committee can then accept that or propose something different that staff and committee can agree to.

Member #3 –

I agree with Dr. Noakes' statements of how questions can be dealt with, and I think he and the staff have done a good job to date.

Member #4 –

I didn't understand what is being asked of us. Questions and comments to staff have been addressed at the time or at a later meeting in a reasonable manner to date as far as I'm concerned.

Question 2: Which of the presentations at OHRC AC meetings in 2010 were not relevant?

Answers to Question 2:

Member #1 –

This member answered which talks they found relevant rather than which talks did not seem relevant. Below are the talks they found relevant to their working on the committee:

- Rich Carmichael: Supplementation: A Viable Management Tool or Only Wishful Thinking?
- Michelle Schuitman: Avian Predation and Management in Oregon
- Dennis Bromka: Swim-Thru Fishway
- Camille Leblanc: Update Report on 2010 Steelhead Smolt Study
- Barry McPherson: Examine Various Biological and Ecological Aspects of Hatchery vs Wild Trout
- Camille Leblanc: Consequences of egg size on growth of Hatchery and Wild steelhead trout
- Eric Buhle, et al: Unintended consequences of supplementation: Impacts of hatcheries on salmon population dynamics
- Shaun Clements: Achieve the mission of the OHRC
- Kathleen Cole, et al: Steelhead Temperature Ongoing Research Progress Report
- Neil Thompson: Sex reversal in hatchery steelhead
- David Noakes, et al: Potential Chinook Juvenile Study, Smolt Survival, Columbia River
- Michael Blouin: Steelhead Genetics - Hood River Stock
- Renee Bellinger: Genetics Study of Chinook in the Pacific Ocean
- Renee Bellinger: Genetics of Magnetic Reception in Salmon
- Barry Berejikian, et al: mating success of alternative male phenotypes and evidence for frequency-dependent selection in Chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*
- Michael Banks, et al: Population Structuring Among Steel head of the Alsea Basin
- Michael Blouin: Progress Report: Growth Rate, Gene Expression Study, and Reproduction by residualized hatchery fish in Hood River

Member #2 –

I have enjoyed most, if not all, presentations. They fill in my overall understanding of the task that we are trying to undertake. But specifically, presenters could keep in mind that most of us do not have a deep fisheries background. When some presenters get into deep genetic or other material we get lost. The more complicated info could be dealt with on an individual basis outside the general meeting.

Member #3 –

This member was another one who answered which talks they found relevant rather than which talks did not seem relevant. Below are the talks

they found relevant by month, with comments they added after each and some general comments at the end.

March:

- Rich Carmichael: Supplementation: A Viable Management Tool or Only Wishful Thinking? Very relevant.
- Eric Andersen: A Bayesian Network To Prioritize Aquatic Connectivity: Not so relevant
- Michelle Schuitman: Avian Predation and Management in Oregon: Relevant to salmon restoration locally, but not so much to hatchery-wild differences.
- Dennis Bromka: Swim-Thru Fishway: Appropriate because he was asking to use the OHRC facility, but does not address hatchery-wild differences.

June:

- Arthur Bass and Guillermo Giannico: Tide Gate Impacts on Juvenile Coho Salmon Movement and Migration: Relevant to salmon restoration regionally, but not so much to hatchery-wild differences.
- Grant Law: The Virtual Estuary: What can we learn from long-term datasets and modeling efforts? Antonio Baptista, OHSU-CMOP: Neat, but not so relevant
- Ben Ramirez: Interactions between coastal cutthroat trout and sculpins and differential impacts on under-yearling hatchery and wild steelhead: Very relevant, but some design issues.
- Camille Leblanc: Update Report on 2010 Steelhead Smolt Study: Very relevant.
- Barry McPherson: Examine Various Biological and Ecological Aspects of Hatchery vs Wild Trout: Very relevant.

September:

- Camille Leblanc: Consequences of egg size on growth of Hatchery and Wild steelhead trout: Very relevant.
- Eric Buhle, et al: Unintended consequences of supplementation: Impacts of hatcheries on salmon population dynamics: Very relevant.
- Shaun Clements: Achieve the mission of the OHRC: Very relevant.
- David Noakes, et al: Early marine survival of coho salmon in the Strait of Georgia declines to very low levels: Relevant to salmon restoration regionally, but not so much to hatchery-wild differences in Oregon context.
- Kathleen Cole, et al: Steelhead Temperature Ongoing Research Progress Report: Very relevant.
- Michael Blouin: Steelhead Genetics - Hood River Stock: Very relevant.
- Neil Thompson: Sex reversal in hatchery steelhead: Very relevant.
- Neil Thompson: Relaxed Sexual Selection: Worthy of a P.h.D dissertation? : Very relevant.
- David Noakes, et al: Potential Chinook Juvenile Study, Smolt Survival, Columbia River: do not remember specifics.

- Michael Banks, et al: Population Structuring Among Steel head of the Alsea Basin: Very relevant.
- Renee Bellinger: Genetics Study of Chinook in the Pacific Ocean: Very relevant.
- Renee Bellinger: Genetics of Magnetic Reception in Salmon: Very relevant.

December:

- Barry Berejikian, et al: mating success of alternative male phenotypes and evidence for frequency-dependent selection in Chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* : Very relevant.
- Michael Blouin: Progress Report: Growth Rate, Gene Expression Study, and Reproduction by residualized hatchery fish in Hood River: Very relevant.

General comments on relevance of presentations:

1. I find almost all salmon genetics presentations relevant, because hatchery fish can evolve genetic differences very rapidly, and the OHRC mission depends on understanding enough genetics to manage this. For other categories of presentations, some are very relevant, while others are more in the mode of appropriate if we were graduate students developing a broad understanding of fisheries biology – which I do not see as our role.
2. The list above is for the past year. The criticisms of relevance have been for the whole history of the committee. Seeing this list, it seems that relevance has been improving relative to earlier years. I found the March 2011 agenda to be quite relevant.
3. Another way to look at relevance for the advisory committee is to ask the following questions:
 - A. Will this presentation help the committee members do a better job of advising ODFW and the Senior Scientist on OHRC operations?
 - B. Does this presentation address an issue for which ODFW and/or the Senior Scientist want advice from the committee?

Member #4 –

I think that most of the presentations from meetings that I have attended were relevant to the OHRC mission, although some were obviously more relevant than others.

I would like to see more of the research at OHRC directed towards the part of the mission that addresses: "Developing approaches to manage the differences" (between hatchery and wild fish) since we already have large hatchery programs in Oregon that are needed to meet fishery goals. And, there is a large variation in hatchery practices within the state.

Member #5 –

In my opinion, the question is not what topics are of interest to me or to other members, but which topics are relevant to the mission of the OHRC. I don't recall a topic that wasn't relevant in at least some way to the mission of the OHRC. That said, I would like to see more research focused on improving hatchery practices, understanding the mechanism for the difference in survival and reproductive success of hatchery vs wild fish. I remain amazed at the difference in reproductive success and think research into "why" might lead to better hatchery practices, practices that may not be easy to implement, but that might allow hatcheries to raise a smaller number of salmon if the fish had a higher survival and return rate.

For example, the ODFW seems stuck on the rectangular concrete pools because of the cleaning issue. I understand the need for clean water and pools, but would like to see research on alternative pools, such as was done in WA with the circular pools. In general, I like and support the scientific research, but I would also like to see more research that will lead to "practical" changes in the hatcheries. I want both types of research.

Member #6 –

I have liked ALL of the presentations we have had. I've done enough research to know that it is not always clear what is important and every now and then there is an "Aha" moment when connections can be made with things that at first glance may seem unrelated. I have liked visiting researchers and students and postdocs. I would not change this. These are, for me, highlights of the meetings.

Member #7 –

I have not had any problem with the relevancy of the invited speakers.

Member #8 –

The relevancy of presentations at the meetings has improved since the earliest meetings. Since one of the missions of the OHRC is to help Oregonians understand the relationships among wild fish, hatchery fish and the surrounding environment, and "all things are connected" to some degree in the natural world, there are a broad range of presentation topics that can be relevant. But I think the expectation of majority of Oregonians, and especially those in the Alsea Basin, is that the OHRC would conduct research that would change the way hatchery fish (primarily salmon and steelhead) are managed "to meet fishery and conservation goals". For many, the expectation is that the OHRC will help figure out how to provide more salmon and steelhead for the public to catch (or even see), and provide those fish with increased efficiency and economy and without threat to wild fish populations.

Member #9 –

I looked through the list of topics but really could not assess which topics were not relevant. It seems that in some way they are all related to the mission of the hatchery. There are a number of us on the committee who

are not researchers but the presentation are often data, graph, and detail heavy. I don't mind this, but it is often difficult to discern the connection to OHRC, and why it is important for us as advisory member to know this information.

I wonder if it would be helpful to have a clear and concise overview of the research, how it adds to the mission and research goals of the hatchery, and how it adds to what we know about hatchery and/or wild salmon. If I am to share information with the public and educators about the important research being done at OHRC, then I need that clear concise overview.

Question 3: Which opportunities do Committee members wish to become involved in from a list of activities and operations provided by Dr. Noakes?

Answers to Question 3:

Member #1 –

I would be interested in becoming involved in the research activities. I looked at the educational option but am unsure. I certainly could be a resource for teachers but I don't think that I would fit into being part of a modern classroom.

Member #2 –

If I lived nearer to the OHRC I'd probably be interested in becoming involved with some of the activities. Due to the distance between where I live and the OHRC and because I'm heavily involved in other activities, I probably won't be able to assist with many of the activities mentioned.

Member #3 –

Unfortunately, my current work responsibilities prevent me from making commitments at this time to significant contributions in these “hands-on” areas. I will need to limit my contribution for now to review and comment on scientific matters; i.e. proposals, research designs, research reports, strategic plans, and so on.

Member #4 –

I don't feel the need to insert myself at this point.

Member #5 –

Only once have I participated when they put out a call for help. Many things go into deciding if I will participate, and I'm sure that is true for all of us. But if Ryan or whoever is organizing the work will include us in any emails requesting help or informing people of the opportunities to participate, they may - at least occasionally - get help from some of us. For me, it's not so much what the activity is, as the time of year and my schedule.

Member #6 –

I am mostly interested in assisting with Educational and Outreach activities in Lincoln County and assisting with research and monitoring activities (particularly with fish in an outdoor environment such as the fish traps).

Member #7 –

Due to distance and responsibilities at my own station I do not seek to participate in other activities at the OHRC.

Member #8 –

I am interested when available to help out with the following:

1. Assist with Educational and Outreach activities (e.g. Lincoln County schools)
2. Assist with research activities (e.g., collecting data, verifying data, compiling data, editing videos, developing proposals)