

MINUTES
Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
January 2, 2001
ODFW Commissioners Conference Room
ODFW Headquarters
Portland Oregon

Attendees

IMST: Logan Norris, Jim Lichatowich

ODFW: Kathryn Kostow, Genetics Program Leader; Kay Brown, Policy Coordinator; Ed Bowles, Fish Division Director; Trent Stickell, Hatchery Production Program Manager; Mark Lewis, George Nandor, Hatchery Production Coordinator; Bob Hooton, Natural Production Section

Others: Cathleen Rose, IMST Support Staff; Barry Espenson, Columbia Basin Bulletin

The meeting was organized to discuss the conclusions, recommendations, and policy recommendations from the IMST's draft report on the scientific basis for artificial propagation in the recovery of wild anadromous salmonids in Oregon. The report is scheduled for release in late January.

The report conclusions and recommendations have three primary themes:

1. The need for an overarching policy framework for hatchery management
2. The need for a landscape perspective to hatchery management
3. The need for effective monitoring and evaluation of hatchery programs

IMST members and ODFW staff discussed these broad themes as well as the more detailed conclusions and recommendations from the report.

ODFW made specific comments on the following conclusions and recommendations at the meeting. The IMST responses, where applicable, follow the comments below:

1. ODFW had no conceptual disagreement with the three main points listed above; however, they noted that many of the recommendations would be difficult to implement because of the politics involved. For example, they are aware of the need for increased monitoring and evaluation of hatchery programs, but the funding is often not available.
2. ODFW asked the IMST for guidance on determining the extent of monitoring necessary when resources are limited.

The IMST will attempt to incorporate additional guidance into the report, but they emphasized the competence of ODFW staff and expressed confidence in their ability to make such operational decisions using the scientific and technical guidance from the report.

3. ODFW noted that the formation of a cohesive hatchery management policy would be difficult, and they asked for more direction.

The IMST responded that such a policy should provide linkages between the hatchery program and the Oregon Plan and linkages between hatcheries and management. A single policy document is necessary to avoid inconsistencies.

4. ODFW noted that there is a strategic policy in the IHOT Policies and Procedures from Columbia Basin Anadromous Salmonid Hatcheries, and that the Dept. had adopted these statewide.

The IMST will consider these policies, along with the other ODFW policies, in the report.

5. ODFW provided the IMST with additional policies (OARs 635-500-0001 to 635-500-3880) for the section of the report that summarizes ODFW hatchery policy.

The IMST will incorporate these additional policies into the report.

6. ODFW noted that many of the Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) currently in preparation may fulfill some of the need for a comprehensive policy and management from a landscape perspective. However, the HGMPs, prepared for each hatchery stock, do not specify how each hatchery program fits into the larger picture.

The IMST will acknowledge the role of these documents in the shift of management from a hatchery-specific to a landscape perspective, but emphasized the importance of articulating policy at the landscape level as well as for individual hatcheries.

7. ODFW provided a coastal coho document that provides an example of how individual hatchery plans could be pulled together into a larger overview document.

The IMST will decide whether this document should be included or referenced in the report as an example of the landscape perspective.

8. ODFW noted that interactions between hatchery and wild fish cannot be monitored everywhere because certain conditions are necessary for adequate genetic assessment.

The IMST acknowledged both the technical and financial (and other resource) difficulties of accomplishing this objective everywhere, but noted that it needs to be done at some level. Perhaps it is done on a rotation basis across space and time, i.e. not annually at every hatchery, but determinations made somewhere every year. If done in an orderly manner across the landscape and over time the aggregate effort will accomplish the objective. IMST suggested development of a strategy and an implementation plan for making such determinations.

9. ODFW noted that some current monitoring data may not be easily accessible in a centralized database, agreeing with desirability of the IMST recommendation to create a centralized, easily accessible database.

10. ODFW asked that the conclusion stating that hatcheries have failed to mitigate for lost natural fish production be changed to reflect the more accurate mitigation goal of replacing fish lost to fisheries.

The IMST will make the change to the report.

11. ODFW noted some of the legal requirements of using hatcheries for mitigation, stating that they are tied to decades-old federal mitigation agreements. There was some discussion about what constituted mitigation “success”.

The IMST agreed to make clearer that the existing mitigation agreements (some of which are older) provide limitations within which the Dept. must act.

12. The conclusion regarding success or failure of supplementation and augmentation hatcheries was discussed. Most agreed with the IMST conclusions that a lack of good monitoring data made it difficult to assess the success of most of these programs.

13. ODFW noted disagreement with the conclusion (from the findings of three independent science panels’ reviews of hatcheries) that many artificial propagation programs have not met their objectives. The Dept. offered examples to the contrary.

The IMST reiterated that the findings of the independent panels are generalizations and that in general the IMST agrees with these panels. The IMST agreed, however, to reevaluate the issue and to consider the examples offered by the Dept.

14. ODFW requested that the recommendations in the report be made consistent with the changes made to the conclusions in response to their comments.

The IMST will incorporate these changes into the report.