

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING  
WESTERN DIVISION AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY

June 1 - 3, 1953

NO RESOLUTIONS WERE ATTACHED TO MINUTES. THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH, COPIED FROM MINUTES, REFERS TO ACTIVITIES OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:

"At the request of the Chairman as to whether or not there were any resolutions to be acted on, Mr. Dill, acting for Mr. Calhoun, explained that no resolutions had been turned in up to a late hour."

Resolution No. 1

WHEREAS, Technical articles on sport fishery problems and investigations are presently being published in a large number of journals and bulletins, and

WHEREAS, the information contained in these articles is of great importance and use to fisheries workers everywhere, and

WHEREAS, Abstracts of such articles are not now published in any complete and readily available form, and

WHEREAS, No state department is able to undertake the task of preparing such abstracts, and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is logically best equipped for this task; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be requested to initiate under the Branch of Federal Aid or Dingell-Johnson administration the preparation of abstracts of published articles pertinent to sport fisheries research and management in the various states and in foreign countries according to the strip sheet method used in "Commercial Fisheries Abstracts", not published by the Service.

Mr. Calhoun stated that California had even considered taking on a job like this, but it didn't seem profitable for a state to do such a thing. There has been a feeling in the coasted states that the Fish and Wildlife Service should take over this job, and it was felt that this resolution would bring it to a head. It is one way to indicate our desires to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Walter Allen asked if the money is available.

Mr. Simpson stated that if the Service accepts the job, there is Dingell-Johnson money available through the funds taken out for administrative purposes.

Mr. Greene asked if this would replace the annual fisheries activity report that is now circulated.

Mr. Simpson answered in the negative, and stated that it would reach out and survey all articles on fisheries. If there is information listed in the abstract that you are interested in, you will know where to go for it.

Mr. Greene then explained the commercial fisheries abstract.

Mr. Wagner asked about the combined cost of the commercial fisheries abstract and the Review. Current problems and reports are usually in the Review. It would certainly help a lot of men to be able to get them both under a Dingell-Johnson set-up.

Mr. Peck stated that the commercial fisheries abstracts are a normal function of the Service, and that there is a regular appropriation set aside for it. As far as the Resolution that has been presented, that would be a function of the Branch of Federal Aid, and according to law the Service is permitted to take up to eight percent each year for administrative purposes. If this Resolution is passed, it will necessarily require additional personnel which would come from the administrative funds that are available to handle the costs of Dingell-Johnson activities. By raising the percentage, it would merely cut down states' allocation by a small amount.

Mr. Garlick stated that there is a point of order to consider as to whether the Society has the authority to actually pass such a resolution, or whether it should be passed on to the parent body for a resolution.

Mr. Greene stated that the constitution requires that the Division submit a Resolution to the parent society for their consideration and final passage. It must be decided whether the Division will present the proposed resolution to the parent body for their consideration and final passage. It is not proper for us to indicate that our secretary write our Congressmen, Department of the Interior or the Service. This is a prerogative of the parent society.

Mr. Simpson indicated that this was stated in the resolution.

There being no further discussion, the resolution was put up for a vote and passed.

*May 3, 1954*  
Resolution No. 2

WHEREAS, fish populations of the western states are dependent upon continuous supplies of water, and

WHEREAS, the western states all have to some degree appropriation law as opposed to common law to govern distribution of water, and

WHEREAS, this type of law permits all water in a stream to be appropriated, and

WHEREAS, fish production is not always recognized as a beneficial use of water, and

WHEREAS, the fishery resource is of great economic and social value to the States:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that legislation should be sought and sponsored in all Western States that will definitely recognize fish production as a beneficial use of water and will make it possible to maintain minimum flows in the streams for that purpose, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that legislation should be sought to enable the states to utilize a specified amount of any new storage developed for the maintenance of fish life downstream.

Mr. Simpson stated that this resolution applies to many of us. To date, water governing agencies have not seen fit to allow state departments of fish and game to appropriate or reserve water for fish use. In some states they may.

Mr. Garlick was of the opinion that everyone is in agreement with the nature of the contents of the resolution, but in order for the resolution to be effective it should be addressed to some agency.

Mr. Simpson assumed that it would have to be directed to the Directors of the various departments.

Mr. Allen felt that it should be directed to the Columbia Basin Compact Committee.

Mr. Garlick felt that the resolution should be elaborated upon, and Mr. Greene asked for any modifications.

Mr. Allen stated that if it was sent to the parent body, it would probably be redrafted in the fall.

Mr. Garlick suggested adding "BE IT RESOLVED further that this resolution be submitted to all appropriate agencies and authorities." A committee would be appointed to get it out to the various organizations.

Mr. Pautake stated that the state agencies concerned almost have to take their own problems and push them through. He then asked if this was simply to give the states a little confidence and some backing.

Mr. Dill felt that it was proper to have a general type of resolution amended as per Mr. Garlick's suggestion.

Mr. Greene asked for a vote on the resolution as read and amended.

Mr. Dill moved to accept Resolution No. 2 as read and amended by Mr. Lou Garlick. Seconded by Walter Allen. Motion carried.

May 9 1954  
Resolution No. 3  
(Development of Upper Colorado River  
Storage Project)

WHEREAS, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, published in the Federal Register of July 20, 1939, specifically stipulated that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the Reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904\*\*\* in connection with the Green River Project," and

WHEREAS, the construction and development of the Upper Colorado Storage Project is imperative to the progress and economic prosperity of the Upper Basin State, and

WHEREAS, the post project fisheries and recreational values of the Upper Colorado River Project will be far greater than the undeveloped river now possesses;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Western Division of the American Fisheries Society go on record as approving the report of the Secretary of the Interior, recommending the development of the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, including the construction of the Echo Park Dam, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Budget Director, and to appropriate Congressional Committee.

Mr. Simpson stated that this resolution, which was presented by Utah, arrived too late to be discussed by the committee, but was presented for the consideration of the Society.

Dr. Needham stated that this dam has been most bitterly opposed by conservation people in California, not because of fisheries reasons principally, but because it will blank out a primeval virgin area. The people in California feel that it would be better not to build the dam.

Mr. Madsen stated that the Commission of the State of Utah has gone on record as favoring the dam on this basis: The records show that the area known as Dinosaur National Park is used very little, and furthermore when the dam is built, not all of Dinosaur National Monument will be inundated. There are other primeval areas encompassing dinosaur deposits in other parts of the country that are even superior to this that may take its place. The second point is that the area

affords nothing in the way of fisheries at the present time. Should a dam be built, there is a good likelihood that what is occurring at Lake Mead would occur in this area. There was no fisheries of any consequence prior to Lake Mead. Echo Park would be the same thing. Anything whatsoever, whether large or small, would be 100% over what is now existing. The Utah Commission is looking at the economic value. That area is in very serious need of hydro-electric power of which this has a potential of creating great amounts. From an agricultural standpoint, there is the possibility of new areas being developed. By placing vast gains of construction of this dam against the loss of an area that may be re-established in another area, they have felt that they should go on record as highly favoring the construction of this dam and not oppose its development. They do hold in reserve one thought. While this particular dam may serve a very definitely good purpose, there may be other dams within the system that may not have these particular features. There is a possibility of a door being opened here of which things of more consequence would come. They have notified Congress that they are in favor of the construction.

Dr. Needham was of the opinion that the thing that should be thought about in a resolution of this kind is that we don't give the impression that we are favoring some of these projects. I would hate to see a resolution go through that would show that we, as a fisheries organization, were aiding and abetting some plans that might later back-fire and hurt things we are interested in saving.

Mr. Madsen was of the opinion that it might open the door a little way and set a precedent. In this case, it doesn't make any difference but it might make a vast difference in some other place.

Dr. Needham stated that he had heard that it might flood out unexplored dinosaur beds.

Mr. Madsen informed the members that if they would visit the area, they would find that there is a lot of the area that is never used.

Mr. Wagner asked if Echo Park wasn't one of a package of three.

Mr. Madsen replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Garlick stated that this issue and its objectives are both controversial and political. No doubt there will be some people in the conservation field who will take a certain side and others might take another side. Whatever action is finally taken, it will not be resolved by any action taken by us. We might be setting a dangerous precedent by taking such action. Mr. Garlick then moved to table Resolution No. 3. Seconded by Alex Calhoun. Motion carried.

Mr. Simpson stated that some complaints have been received relative to papers submitted at the meetings for the transactions. The president touched on this subject. The complaints are these: That the editing committee has been arbitrary. They may or may not publish the papers. In many cases, they have rewritten parts of the papers and changed the wording so that in the end the findings may be altered. In view of the complaints and the rather strong feeling of several members of the Western Division, I would like to propose to the group that the Committee be permitted to draft a resolution and submit it through the Executive Board to the parent body for their consideration, making known our feelings here in the Western Division.

Dr. Needham stated that we have had trouble right along to the very point of this resolution. We have to keep in mind that the papers we prepare have to meet the editorial standards of the parent body. This is absolutely necessary. In one case, one of my papers was so changed. Another thing we should remember is that our national editorial committee of the parent body has to spend at least one month throughout the year on editing papers. There is an element of criticism from either standpoint. We have to submit papers that are up to the standards of the editorial committee. I think it is important that we keep that in mind. Such a resolution would help us in better understanding our problems, but I don't think we should be too tough on the editorial committee since it takes at least a month a year for editing. As President Thompson told you, we can expect our transactions by June or July.

Mr. Garlick was of the opinion that a resolution should not go out from the Western Division to the parent body without being passed on as to its contents.

Mr. Needham suggested memorializing the parent body through the Executive Board urging their consideration of these problems. The time is coming when we are going to have a paid editor. It takes too much time for one man.

Dr. Needham moved that we memorialize the parent body.

Mr. Garlick stated that this is a rather delicate matter. There could be many ramifications. Perhaps the executive committee or a committee appointed for this purpose might take up this matter with the parent body to bring out our common problems. We may not be aware of certain problems. We don't want to make for dissention within the Society which might happen if we memorialize rather than take it up in an arbitrary fashion. Let's try to iron it out.

Dr. Needham suggested that instead of taking a vote at

the meeting, the Executive Board investigate the possibility of hiring a paid editor and report back to the parent body.

Dr. Needham moved that the executive committee meet with the parent Society at their next meeting to discuss the matter of the presentation of papers and their consideration by the editorial board, and further that a paid editor be considered as a future officer of the parent Society. Seconded by Mr. Garlick. Motion carried.

Mr. Garlick stated that the Executive Committee consists of all officers plus the past chairman.

*May 20, 1951*  
Resolution No. 4

WHEREAS, the Western Division of the American Fisheries Society has been assembled in Las Vegas, Nevada, at its 6th annual meeting, and

WHEREAS, the Nevada Fish and Game Commission has been the host agency, and

WHEREAS, they have put forth a great deal of effort to make the conference a success, and in view of the many courtesies and the hospitality extended to all assembled,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Division does hereby express its appreciation and gratitude to the Nevada Fish and Game Commission for a most successful convention, and be it further resolved that the secretary submit a copy of this resolution to the Nevada Fish and Game Commission.

Mr. Simpson moved to adopt Resolution No. 4. Seconded by Mr. Pautzke.

Mr. Thompson brought up the fact that other organizations helped with the convention.

Mr. Garlick suggested incorporation in the resolutions the other organizations to include the Nevada Federated Sportsmen and the Nevada Fish and Game Commission.

**Nominating Committee:**

Proposed slate of new officers for coming year.

Chairman - Alex J. Calhoun of California.

Vice-Chairman - Walter Allen of Montana.

Secretary-Treasurer - Lou Garlick, Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

Nominations were requested from the floor.