



FISH PASSAGE CENTER

1827 NE 44th Ave., Suite 240, Portland, OR 97213

Phone: (503) 230-4099 Fax: (503) 230-7559

<http://www.fpc.org/>
e-mail us at fpcstaff@fpc.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tom Rien, ODFW

FROM: Michele DeHart, FPC

DATE: July 9, 2010

RE: Review Comments-Draft Methods for Analysis Outline-Draft Consensus Hypotheses

We reviewed the two subject documents and offer the following comments for your consideration. Overall the two draft documents closely align with the objectives and expectations outlined in the Consensus Proposal. The documents establish a foundation for the anticipated technical workshop evaluating existing data and analysis. A timeline for developing planning and implementing the workshop as the first step, and a timeline for the development of the Methods for Analysis Report as a second step, would be useful.

Draft Consensus Hypotheses

The consensus hypotheses presented in the draft, address the management questions outlined in the consensus proposal. The draft presents a good starting point for the workshop described in the consensus proposal. During preparations for the workshop the hypothesis presented in the draft could be organized in a hierarchical structure in which the overall hypothesis could be broken out into more detailed hypotheses. This might allow for examination of the available specific data and analyses that address detailed hypotheses. Organization of the hypotheses in a hierarchical frame work could also help illustrate the life cycle affect of some parameters, such as life cycle impacts of juvenile route of passage, such as arrival timing in the estuary, and delayed mortality. Hierarchical organization of detailed hypotheses would allow the consideration of causal affects of associated with observations such as the overwintering strategy.

Draft Methods for Analysis

The Methods for Analysis draft reflects the specifics of the consensus proposal. The draft does not discuss or include a section on the logistical methods utilized in the studies generating the data. A logistical methods section might be helpful in setting the ground work for considering the analyses that will be conducted, particularly since some of the logistical methods might be associated with specific biases. Some of the logistical methods might affect the selection of appropriate analyses. Specifics such as sources of fish, experiences of those groups, such as rearing, location, acclimation location and release location could introduce differences in results. Also inclusion of a Logistical Methods section would allow documentation of changes in study or mark groups that may have occurred year-to-year and may affect the analytical results.