

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STREAM RESTORATION
& SPECIES RECOVERY

February 05, 2001
1:00 P.M.

Hearing Room E
Tapes 23 - 25

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Rep. Bob Jenson, Chair**
 Rep. Jan Lee, Vice-Chair
 Rep. Randy Leonard Vice-Chair
 Rep. Tim Knopp
 Rep. Jeff Kruse
 Rep. Patti Smith
 Rep. Al King
 Rep. Carolyn Tomei
 Rep. Kelley Wirth

STAFF PRESENT: **Sandy Thiele-Cirka, Administrator**
 Linda K. Gatto, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:
 Public Hearing
 HJM 5
 Informational Meeting
 Hatchery & Wild Fish Discussion:
 American Fisheries Society
 Independent Fisheries Scientists

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE/#	Speaker	Comments
TAPE 23, A		
004	Chair Jenson	Calls the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m. as a subcommittee and opens a public hearing on HJM 5.
<u>PUBLIC HEARING HJM 5</u>		
010	Chair Jenson	Summarizes HJM 5 and opens full committee.
027	Mike Graine	Assistant Director, Office of Energy. Submits (EXHIBIT A) and provides a brief background on the Hanford site.
051	Chair Jenson	Requests an explanation on the difference between single shell and double shell storage tanks.
056	Graine	Responds that there are in excess of 150 underground tanks storing liquid radioactive waste. Provides details on tank design.
077	Chair Jenson	Questions if any leakage has occurred.
078	Graine	Responds affirmatively and describes the types and locations.
080	Rep. Lee	Inquires if the annual clean-up expense is included in the budget.
083	Graine	Responds there are estimates of the expense. States that currently the budget for Hanford cleanup is \$1.6 billion annually.

Notes that this level of funding will be necessary for the next 30 – 50 years.

097 Rep. King Notes the plume and tests are not part of the exhibit.

100 Grainey Expresses that there has been contamination.

132 Rep. Lee Questions why Oregon was not made part of the tri-county agreement.

137 Grainey Answers the agreement pertains to the state where the facility is located. Identifies US Department of Energy, Federal Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Washington as parties of the agreement..

140 Chair Jenson Generalizes that of the \$1.6 billion what portion is being spent on economic development for the geographic area.

173 Doug Riggs Representing PAC/WEST and member of Hanford Information Network. Submits **(EXHIBIT B)**. Outlines and explains the three problems:

1. Spent nuclear fuel was not reprocessed;
2. Variety of waste sites;
3. End of design life for the underground tanks.

290 Riggs Concludes testimony stating the need for broad public support and cooperation between the state and federal delegations.

314 Rep. Jeff Merkley House District 16. States the clean up effort is a significant undertaking. Provides an overview.

348 Rep. King Questions the contractor’s status.

350 Riggs Provides the names of the current contractors.

377 Rep. King Notes the problems associated with keeping contractors engaged in the project. Notes that the companies mentioned are Fortune 500 companies with the strong credentials.

396 Riggs Comments that the transition from a production mode to a clean up mode has taken longer than necessary.

TAPE 24, A

013 Chair Jenson Comments that it has been stated that the Hanford waste site is the single largest environmental problem in the United States. Closes the public hearing on HJM 5. Announces an Oregon Plan work group **(EXHIBIT C)**. Submits a series of articles by Robert Lackey **(EXHIBIT D)**. Opens informational meeting.

INFORMATIONAL MEETING

089 Stephan Kafoury Representing American Fisheries Society. Submits white paper, Managing Wild and Hatchery Fish in Oregon **(EXHIBIT E)**. Introduces panel.

145 Jim Hall, Ph.D. Presents position of the Oregon Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. Notes that hatchery fish may pose both genetic and ecological risk to wild fish.

159 Barbara Shields Professor Oregon State University (OSU). Reads from **(EXHIBIT E)**.

162 Doug Cramer Fish Biologist, Portland General Electric. Talks about how the timing of the returns have changed. Expresses concern that the hatchery fish are not spawning and this will extend the time the fish are listed.

224 Rep. Tomei Clarifies that the large number of hatchery fish in the Sandy River compete with the wild fish.

234 Cramer Responds affirmatively.

283 Rep. Leonard Concludes that hatchery survival is being promoted. Notes that the current hatchery practices are not based on current science.

337	Cramer	Explains that production hatcheries remove all the pressure of natural selection.
365	Rep. Leonard	Expresses confusion about the status of hatchery fish that have lived in the ocean and return.
388	Shields	Responds by illustrating a comparison to childhood diseases and vaccines.
TAPE 23, B		
017	Shields	Discussion with Rep. Leonard about what constitutes a feral fish
023	Rep. Leonard	Questions if wild brood stocks raised in a hatchery, released, and returned have been studied for survival traits.
107	Shields	Responds studies have been based on neutral, indirect indicators of what is occurring genetically.
157	Rep. King	Questions if a conservation hatchery fish and a concrete hatchery fish are same degree feral fish.
166	Shields	Responds the degree of difference is dependent on the pressure placed on them.
180	Rep. King	Comments on zero reproduction testimony.
194	Cramer	Responds there are hatchery fish spawning in the wild but not reproducing at an identifiable level.
218	Chair Jenson	Comments on the costs associated with of replicating a natural environment. Requests clarification about the genetic differences.
251	Shields	Responds the change occurs when the hatchery practices alter the survivability of the fish.
381	Jim Lannan	Emeritus Professor, OSU. Submits (EXHIBIT F) and discusses the conservation role of hatcheries.
TAPE 24, B		
042	Lannan	Discusses proposed hatchery closures and the genetic differences.
101	Lannan	Continues testimony stating that the genetic differences can be found between natural and hatchery populations because of genetic history.
179	William McNeil, Ph.D.	Comments on the dominance of hatchery fish and production limitations.
295	McNeil	Discusses four areas of survivability.
335	Don Amend, Ph.D.	Provides professional background. Submits resume and reads prepared testimony (EXHIBIT G) .
TAPE 25, A		
040	Rep. Leonard	Asks for his opinion why National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) does not include hatchery fish in the listing of endangered species.
047	Lannan	Answers the intention of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is to address natural populations. Notes that this position is being challenged.
060	Rep. King	Comments that the genetic difference in the wild would be broader than the hatchery fish.
085	Lannan	Responds that the selective pressures are placed on the fish while in the ocean.
158		General hatchery management discussion.
239	Richard Noble	Member of American Fisheries Society. Discusses hatchery practices.
330	Chair Jenson	Closes informational meeting and adjourns the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Submitted By,

Reviewed By,

Linda K. Gatto,
Committee Assistant

Sandy Thiele-Cirka,
Committee Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A. HJM 5, written materials, Mike Grainey, 3 pp.**
- B. HJM 5, written materials, Doug Riggs, 3 pp.**
- C. Oregon Plan Workgroup announcement, Rep. Jenson, 1 p**
- D. Articles authored by Robert Lackey, Rep. Jenson, 18 pp.**
- E. Managing Wild & Hatchery Fish in Oregon, Stephen Kafoury, 4 pp.**
- F. Written testimony, James Lannan, 5 pp.**
- G. Written testimony, Donald F. Amend, 3 pp.**