

# **Exhibit E**

## **Public Correspondence**

**Public correspondence received as of  
December 27, 2013**

**From:** [Amanda Mckenzie](mailto:Amanda.Mckenzie@state.or.us)  
**To:** [rcardwell6@gmail.com](mailto:rcardwell6@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Citizen Comments on "Management Strategies for Columbia River Recreational and Commercial Fisheries: 2013 and Beyond"  
**Date:** Monday, December 02, 2013 10:50:15 AM

---

Good morning Mr. Cardwell,

Thank you for your input regarding the Management Strategies for the Columbia River Recreational and Commercial Fisheries for 2013 and Beyond. The Commission will be conducting an annual review of the program in January and your input will be included in the public correspondence. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

*Amanda Mckenzie*

Fish Operations Assistant  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302  
Phone: (503) 947-6226  
Fax: (503) 947-6202  
Email: [Amanda.Mckenzie@state.or.us](mailto:Amanda.Mckenzie@state.or.us)



---

**From:** Rick cardwell [<mailto:rcardwell6@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 30, 2013 11:20 AM  
**To:** [odfw.commission@state.or.us](mailto:odfw.commission@state.or.us)  
**Subject:** Citizen Comments on "Management Strategies for Columbia River Recreational and Commercial Fisheries: 2013 and Beyond"

Dear Honorable Commission Members:

First, thank you for your service to Oregon. It is much appreciated.

I am writing to offer several comments and recommendations concerning the subject document. As background, I (1) am a senior citizen of Oregon, (2) am a lay technical reader post-graduate education in the biological sciences, (3) and serve on the editorial board of a scientific journal.

-- I question whether the subject document was written for lay technical readers or the public in general. Rather, it seems to have been written by a group of experts for other experts and those intimately familiar with the subject. Recommendation: I suggest preparing a separate, extended (3-5 page) executive summary for the public at large. This summary should include links to documents that allow the reader to obtain more information.

-- It is not possible to evaluate the extent to which the many policy choices are based on best professional judgement (BPJ) or scientific data or both. Citations are not provided in the text.

-- It is not possible to evaluate the pros, cons and uncertainties associated with the policy recommendations? I understand these may represent BPJ of the experts, the best science. Yet, we all appreciate the difficulty in managing highly dynamic and complex fish stocks in this dynamic watershed: So there are probably different options and different uncertainties associated with each option.

-- It would be desirable to include the following: (1) table of contents, (2) an Adobe pdf that provides links to all the main headings and subheadings so the reader can identify and move quickly to referenced sections, and (3) a glossary.

-- Define in text or using footnotes all jargon and ambiguous phrases, such as "consistent and concurrent policies," "selective-fishing gear and techniques," "significant economic harm," "non-selective gill nets," and *summer* versus *tule fall* versus *upriver bright* Chinook. Links to documents that describe the run-timing, biology and harvest history of these stocks would be especially helpful.

I wish to thank all of you in advance for taking the time to consider this input and for service on the Commission.

Best Regards,

Rick Cardwell  
Corvallis, OR