



QUARTERLY MEETING

W E L C O M E T O S E A T T L E I N M A R C H

ADVANCE COMMITTEE REPORT - 112th QUARTERLY MEETING

MARCH ¹⁰~~17~~ - ¹¹~~18~~, 1962, IN SEATTLE

The March meeting will be in Seattle; headquarters to be the New Washington Hotel, Second & Stewart. The hotel will provide free parking for registered guests at the Second Avenue Garage, directly across the street, with in-and-out privileges. The hotel also has a courtesy car to meet incoming planes. If you plan to fly in, make known your arrival time with your reservation.

A word to the wise: It might be well to make your reservations well in advance. The Seattle Worlds Fair, Century 21, will open in April; hotel space may well be at a premium. The New Washington Hotel is holding a block of rooms for this convention, but will not guarantee space later than ten days before convention time. The rates for rooms will be at pre-fair 1961 level.

May we, the committee, ask you to come to this convention and perhaps get a preview of the Fair Grounds. It might be that you can make arrangements for a place to stay in Seattle during Fair Time, on this visit. At the least, you can make yourself familiar with the layout.

The committee is considering guided tours of the Fair Grounds and other entertainment for our guests. Let's make it BIG.

Lee Hughes, Co-Chairman for Hi-Line Sportsmen's Club

Tom Morrissey, Co-Chairman for Ballard Fish & Game Club

From Your Quarterly Chairman:

In spite of many requests on my part, and downright demands by our good President Pete, the submission of material by committee chairmen evidently has reached an all-time low low water for this issue of the convention Quarterly. As of now, I have a one-page Welcome to Seattle for the March 17 - 18, 1962, meeting. I expect a preliminary appeal for action regarding Boy's Camp from Len Carlson in the mail this noon.

I hope that some additional chairmen will have mailed in their letters. This does not give me much time for stencelling, reproduction, piling and binding, does it? However, I cannot process material which I do not have!

Some of you may ask - who is this guy Martin, to read (and write) me off? Well, it does no good to get sore at Martin for other's shortcomings. I have met disappointments before, my body is weak, but my spirit is strong and personal interest in this Council is very vivid. Most of you know this and I challenge anyone to prove that they can surpass that interest.

Feeling let down but still happy, let's go to sweeter thoughts of love and brotherhood - I still have one of three blood brothers alive, but many fraters.

We have previously met in Yakima 14 times - this is the 15th. Indeed, Yakima is the birthplace of this Council where the organizational conference was held on May 19, 1934. Few of those who attended are still active as of today but I would be remiss if I did not mention the fact that our Honorary Secretary Ken McLeod is the only person of whom I know who has been present at each and every convention of the Washington State Sportsmen's Council. This makes 111 in a row; I will not even try to predict Ken's future but he sure may well be very proud of this unbeatable record.

I am not in a position to discuss resolutions nor issues before this Council today, but I do appeal in all sincerity that we arrive at true and just decisions to promote the good and welfare of this Council.

"A house divided will surely fall." I pray for harmony to triumph over jazz.

S. E. Martin, Chairman
Quarterly Committee

(1961)
NAVY - 13 Yaass!
Army - 7

BOYS CAMP 1962

The Boys Junior Conservation Camp for the summer of 1962 will be held the week of July 29 to August 4, 1962, at Moran State Park on Orcas Island.

Your directors will soon start selecting the camp staff and plan the various camp instructions.

Why not appoint a committee in your club now to make arrangements to send a boy to camp next summer? Schools will almost always go half on the expense. Your other community organizations may be interested.

If you can't talk to the clubs, show the Boys Camp film, "Your Boy and Mine." This is always good for an evening's program.

Remember, the future of your club depends on the Junior Sportsmen of today. Let's get behind them and show that we are interested in what they are doing!

Len Carlson

QUARTERLY REPORT (December 1961) National Affairs Committee

The president of the National Wildlife Federation, Dr. Paul Herbert, has announced that a President's Trophy will be awarded to "...the best local sportsmen's club in the United States" at the annual meeting in Denver next March. He has asked that each state affiliate send information on at least one outstanding club in each state. He requests that all material be in his hands by February 1, 1962. Therefore, all such material should be in the hands of our secretary, Roy Holland, before that time so it can be sent in time.

As you know, the Washington State Sportsmen's Council has won the Conservation Award for the state organizations in four of six years. That achievement is simply the result of club and individual activity; so it is a fair statement to say that, in this newly announced club award, much of your club competition will be from within our own state. However, there are some fine, hardworking local organizations in many other states. Dr. Herbert states that the material need not be elaborate, "...just a letter with such supporting material as is available."

Any sportsmen's or sportswomen's organization could certainly be proud to be judged, "the best club in the United States," which means - the world

W. S. Vickerman, Chairman

December 7, 1961
Washington State
Sportsmen's Council

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF GAME
THE FISHERY PROGRAM

If we include all classes of anglers who fish for game fish we find that some 600,000 people in Washington depend on the Game Department to supply sufficient numbers of fish for their pleasure. The "all classes" mentioned above, includes those who purchase licenses, those who are eligible for free licenses (certain veterans, etc.), and juvenile fishermen under 16 years of age. Close to 200,000 of our fishermen fall into the category of those who are privileged to fish without buying a license. One out of every three fishermen is getting a free ride. The trout program is a costly one. The division is operating at a cost of one and a quarter million dollars a year.

Silver trout reproduce themselves in our lakes and our planting program merely supplements the natural reproduction.

Excepting silver trout, more than 90% of the trout caught by fishermen originate in our hatcheries. There would be very little trout fishing in Washington without the annual hatchery output. If we do not do a good job and fishing becomes poor, we will lose our best customers - those who purchase licenses. Since our expenditures cannot exceed our income, it is imperative we continue to provide good fishing. It can be said that every Department employee has a definite personal interest in the success of the game fish program. It can also be said that all employees have contributed in some degree to the efforts of the fish management division and all are entitled to share a feeling of pride in any accomplishments made by the division.

The program of fish management is a large one. Twenty-four trout hatcheries are in current operation. The combined output of these stations is about 1,000,000 pounds of fish per year. Not counting silver trout,

annual production amounts to 26-28 million fish. The silver trout program fluctuates yearly depending on success of obtaining eggs. It may vary from a low of 8 million eggs to 15 million or more. Most silver trout eggs used in the program are obtained at Lake Whatcom.

Personnel in the Fishery Management Division numbers between 95-100 men. Of this group, 77 employees work at hatcheries in production of fish. There are 12 field biologists and six men that work out of the Olympia office.

The Division Chief, Robert Meigs, and his Assistant, Cliff Millenbach, are generally responsible for programing and operations.

The position of Fisheries Management Coordinator is held by Ralph Larson. The duties of this position are varied, though much time is devoted to planning and meeting with agencies sponsoring river development projects. Additional duties include work on committees supervising experiments and research for safe passage of fish at dams, processing water right applications and requests for permits to do hydraulic work in streams.

The position of Federal Fisheries Aid Coordinator is held by Roy Banner. The principle responsibility of this position is setting up and seeing that Dingell-Johnson projects are properly completed. Since many of the projects involve the construction of fish screens, fish barriers, and miscellaneous small construction jobs, Banner supervises the activities of two stream improvement men, Vanderbilt and Hanson, and he acts as liaison man between the division and the Yakima screening shop.

The position of General Superintendent of Hatcheries is held by John Johansen. John handles certain phases of ordering equipment, supplies and feed, for the hatcheries. His job includes programing egg allotments. Another important duty is overseeing eyeing stations.

The District fish biologists have many duties that range from planning district programs to securing catch data. They participate in fish planting, run lake and stream surveys and lend a hand in the hatcheries. Lake rehabilitation projects are planned and completed. The field biologists work on hydraulic projects, investigating proposed construction effecting either fish passage or lake or stream environment.

Jack Donaldson has the title of "Aquatic Chemist", and is working principally on the Fern Lake project. This study is being cooperatively carried out with the University of Washington. It is hoped the research will result in learning a good deal about trace materials which may be responsible for basic fertility of waters.

The Yakima Screening Shop is primarily a function of the State Fisheries Department. However, much of the screening work benefits both salmon and game fish. The Department of Game contributes financially to the operation of the shop to compensate for both direct and indirect benefits we obtain.

The division has attempted to keep up with current material relating to spiny-rayed management. Most interest has centered on bass. Merrill Spence has worked on waters throughout eastern and western Washington, checking growth of bass, obtaining catch records, exploring food requirements and experimenting with controlled reproduction and rearing of both large and smallmouth bass. Spiny-rayed fishes are one of the most important recreational assets we have.

WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

WASHINGTON'S 1961 SALMON SPORT FISHERY

Inner Puget Sound

The fishing on the inner Sound is still in progress -- final catch estimates are therefore incomplete. However, the general trend of this fishery is evident. Never has a season been so dependent on a single year class of a single species -- the 1958 brood chinook. The 1957 and 1959 broods were conspicuously absent from the fishery. Resident silver salmon fishing has remained poor since 1957. Apparently in recent years young Puget Sound silvers have not found inside waters to their liking and have largely utilized the outside feeding areas. Pink salmon fishing was poor in 1961.

The 1958 brood furnished some good winter and spring angling. Summer in-Sound fishing was generally poor. There were some notable exceptions however. Elliott Bay had perhaps its most productive "king" season since this department has had sport data.

Strait of Juan de Fuca

The picture was brighter here. Fishing was good for chinook and also good near outside waters for silver salmon. Pink salmon catches were poor. The Sekiu--Pillar Point area had its best chinook season but, strangely, a rather poor silver year. Neah Bay catches were good for chinook and silver salmon. Catches for 1961 as compared to the 1956-60 average are as follows:

<u>Neah Bay - 1961</u>	<u>1956-60 Average</u>
42,000 Angler trips	36,000 Angler trips
8,000 Chinook	8,000 Chinooks
34,000 Silvers	28,000 Silvers
6,000 Pinks	12,000 Pinks
1.13 Salmon/angler	1.36 Salmon/angler

1961		1956-60 Average
	<u>Sekiu--Pillar Point</u>	
59,000 Angler trips		54,000 Angler trips
29,000 Chinook		18,000 Chinook
13,000 Silvers		22,000 Silvers
7,000 Pinks		13,000 Pinks
0.83 Salmon/angler		0.83 Salmon/angler

Westport

Fishing was good here. Catches of both chinook and silver salmon were encouraging. An estimated 95,000 anglers caught 45,000 chinook and 57,000 silvers, for an average catch of 1.08 salmon per angler.

Mouth of the Columbia River

This is a rapidly growing sport fishery. Angling intensity was way up this year due to improved sport fishing facilities and good weather. Fishing was good, with an estimated 90,000 angler trips accounting for 20,500 chinook and 85,500 silvers, for a very good average catch of 1.20 salmon per angler.

The majority of the participants in the hearing were opposed to the measure and the statements were by way of criticism of the bill. While some of the state representatives were well-meaning, generally the protestants disagreed with the following:

**A Report on the Public Hearing on the Wilderness Bill
Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands
at McCall, Idaho
October 30-31, 1961**

The Subcommittee consisted of Gracie Pfost, Chairman; Arnold Olson, representative from Montana; and Milton Pearl, Land Consultant. The hearing began sharp at 10:00 a.m., October 30. Mrs. Pfost allowed only five minutes for each statement, giving priority to the people who had previously filed their statements in Washington, D. C. In all there were 106 statements given orally plus approximately 300 submitted for the record.

Of the opposition, mining interests were the most heavily represented, followed by timber and cattle interests and Chambers of Commerce. The proponents for the bill were primarily wildlife and wilderness organizations.

The arguments by those favoring the bill were:

1. The Idaho Fish and Game Department said that the wilderness areas were necessary for the maintenance of certain stocks and that the national preservation of such areas undoubtedly supply a distinct and unique type of hunting and fishing.
2. Wildlife and wilderness organizations emphasized the need for guaranteeing the use of these areas for generations to come and that the aesthetic values should be recognized as resource.
3. The wilderness supporters argued that only 1/50th of the total land of the United States would be involved and that this amount was little enough to set aside.
4. They further argued that claims by the opposition that use would be limited to only a few who have means to use these areas were not valid.
5. Wildlife Management Institute pointed out that nationalizing these areas was a desirable thing and that future alterations of these areas by law would have the protection by public hearings.
6. Individuals favoring the bill explained that disease, insects, and fire control could be maintained satisfactorily.
7. The wilderness-designated areas would have educational values as many plants and animals will not survive in close proximity to man's activities.

The majority of the participants in the hearing were opposed to the measure and the statements were by way of criticism of the bill. While some of the statements were ridiculously exaggerated and sarcastic in nature, most were well-meaning and sincere in their points of opposition. Generally the protestants disagreed with the bill on the following:

1. The authority of Congress in the establishment of Federal land holdings would be changed to the Executive Branch.
2. The bill would restrict use of the area to a few.
3. The bill would not allow practice of the multiple-use concept.
4. Roadless areas would be difficult to control for fire, insects and disease.
5. There would be no adequate provisions for prospecting.
6. The areas should be evaluated for best use before being designated categorically as wilderness.

The protestants of the bill either believe that the provisions the bill contains for the future of other uses such as mining, water storage, cattle grazing, etc. are not adequate or the provisions are not fully understood. In either event the individual and organizational interests representing industries were almost 100% opposed to the bill for one or more of the above-listed reasons.

Several of the participants indicated favor for the wilderness concept but opposed the bill in its bill form. The Idaho Fish and Game Commission, while it had resolved strongly in favor of the wilderness concept, failed to state that they favored passage of the bill.

In summary, it appeared that individuals and organizations representing the wildlife and wilderness interests favored the bill and argued that it had been amended many times and now contained provisions which would sufficiently protect all uses of the area including industrial uses for posterity. The individuals and organizations representing industry, particularly mining, timber and cattle, opposed passage of the bill arguing generally that the areas now designated as primitive are sufficiently well protected for future use both as wilderness and for industry under the present system of administration by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Of the 106 oral statements given, 78 were opposed to the bill and 28 were in favor. In addition about 300 statements were not read, but submitted for the record. A partial count showed 113 in favor and 34 against the bill.

The Washington State Sports Council was represented by E. C. Yarwood. His statement expressed favor in behalf of the Council for the wilderness concept.

E. C. Yarwood, President
Washington State Sports Council