

MADISON-O'DELL CREEK STUDY

Fish and Game Commission
Ennis, Montana
October 5, 1973

Art Whitney: The report on this study including the data through last fall's collection has been in rough draft for two months. It has been reviewed by Mr. Holton and by a statistician from the Bureau of Data Processing. The reviewers' questions were taken to the project leaders in Bozeman and were satisfactorily answered. Therefore the Division Administrator is convinced the statistical methods are sound and that the report's conclusions are valid.

Our recommendation today is that for the 1974 season we do not plant catchables in streams with thriving wild trout populations. We make this recommendation before final publication of the study for two reasons. (1) Our review was more detailed than others will be able to give it because our reviewers had access to the original data; and (2) The cost of fish food is increasing almost unbelievably -- from 9-10¢ in '69-71 to 11¢ in 1972 to 15¢ last year and we are now paying 20¢ per lb. This increase will put us over our budget for fish food so any reduction we can make this year will help us stay closer to our budget figure.

The change we recommend is not irreversible. If we go on this for two or three years and you want to go back to planting sometime in the future, you would be in the same position during the first year of planting as you would if you had planted each year.

We are an environmental agency which should be more careful about its actions than a private company. The Bureau of Land Management, also an environmental agency, has a policy that applies to our situation. That policy is, "If there is any reasonable doubt that an action of this agency is causing harm, that action will be stopped."

The Madison-O'Dell study data certainly give us cause for reasonable doubt about the benefits of planting catchables in streams with good numbers of wild trout. Therefore I recommend our most prudent course of action is to cease such planting in 1974.

Mr. Rieder: We are short two Commissioners today. You are all aware this is a controversial issue. We won't make any decisions until the full Commission is present. At the conclusion of the department's presentation, we will listen to anyone who has something to say.

Mr. John J. (Bud) Gaffney presented a slide series describing sampling methods and summarizing the results of the Madison-O'Dell Creek study.

In 1967, Montana started a trout population study on two sections of the Madison River. We were trying to find out if

unusually low spring flows affected the numbers of trout. The flows were regulated by Hebgen Dam.

In 1968 releases from the dam changed and spring flows were improved. However, trout increased in only one of our two study sections. The section which didn't show improvement was being stocked annually with catchables, while the section that improved hadn't been stocked for over ten years.

In 1970 the study was changed to check on the effect of planting. We continued sampling the two Madison River sections and stopped planting the one that had been stocked annually. We also began sampling two sections of O'Dell Creek, which is a tributary of the Madison. One of the O'Dell Creek sections had been sampled before, the other hadn't. The creek had not been planted for seven years. We began planting one O'Dell Creek section, the other remained unstocked.

By 1971, in the Madison section where we stopped planting, wild trout had increased over 180 percent, both by numbers and by weight. At the same time, in the O'Dell Creek section that we started stocking, wild trout decreased over 45 percent in both numbers and weight. In the O'Dell Creek section that remained unplanted, both number and weight of wild trout stayed about the same. In the Madison River section that has remained unplanted for over ten years, wild trout have continued to increase. This is probably still in response to the better spring flows the river has had since 1968.

The 1972 fall estimates showed a substantial reduction in numbers of wild trout in the Varney section. We first felt this might indicate a weakness in the study but later found a plant of fish was made in the study section in 1972 about the time the fishing season started even though we had asked for no fish to be planted. This resulted in an almost immediate reduction of wild fish. In 1973 fish numbers in the Varney section are back up to where they were in 1971. Although this plant wasn't designed in the experiment, it did give one more measure of the effect of planting fish in the stream. Although tremendously large numbers were planted previously this showed that what we presume to be a smaller number of fish also had a definite detrimental effect.

Fish were sampled by electrofishing which was conducted by floating through the study sections. A basic mark-and-recapture method was used to estimate total numbers and pounds. These estimates were made only for two-year-old and older, wild, brown and rainbow trout. Trout were marked with tags in the spring. Return of these tags by fishermen was used to estimate angler harvest. This harvest appeared to drop slightly both in the Madison section where stocking ceased and in the O'Dell section where stocking was started.

Questions

Bill Baker: What is the O'Dell Creek flow?

Dick Vincent: Between 80 and 120 cfs.

Question: Did you measure?

Vincent: Yes.

Question: What time of year?

Vincent: All through the summer.

Lew Chamberlin: Regarding the cost of fish food, does the state reimburse the Federal hatchery for their food cost?

Whitney: No.

Chamberlin: How can you count that as a cost when the federal government pays it?

Whitney: Their costs have gone up the same as ours have.

Chamberlin: How can you say it is a cost to the state, that doesn't seem fair to me.

Whitney: We are talking about costs of this type of planting statewide, not just in the Madison River and O'Dell Creek.

Mr. Rieder: Is that water below the Beartrap comparable to the Varney section?

Gaffney: No. The only comparison we are making between Varney and the Norris section is that when we improve flow conditions in the winter, we get a response in Norris but not at Varney. I suspect the Norris section will always support more fish than Varney. We don't make comparisons between these two sections because they are so different.

Baker: You mentioned fish planted in '72. I will state categorically there was no fish planted since 1969 in the Varney section and since 1959 no fish have been planted below Varney Bridge in the test area because there was no access. I recognize some might have drifted in from above but none was planted.

Gaffney: Fishermen reported taking catchables soon after the fishing season opened and we found some of them in the fall sampling. Where the fish came from isn't important, but their effect on the wild fish is.

Chamberlin: He (Gaffney) said there were more fish in the Norris area than here. He didn't remind you that that portion of the river is also fed by the Missouri. We are getting fish from the Missouri River there. In the last 25 years the Meadow Lake has been drained several times. They pulled thousands of fish out of that lake. The second time was in a terrific cold winter and there were ice gorges. The water loss was about 75%. Black Eagle and Rainbow didn't have sufficient water to get the power. They pulled Meadow Lake as much as they could. There was a tremendous loss of fish out of the lake. That has never been reported to you. The third time Montana Power lowered the lake was to do some repair work on the dam. Workmen told me about the enormous amount of fish that were dead. Those have never been returned either to our Madison River waters. We lost thousands of them.

This gentleman talks about the mortality. If we lose so many of these catchables why don't we see these dead fish somewhere along the river? And about another thing I have noticed in nature. Wild creatures will protect their offspring a great deal better from interference. He talks about plants hurting wild trout. I have planted and those wild trout were right up there trying to eat them up. You can't tell me you can go against nature. The wild trout were eating the planted trout that were almost as big as the ones trying to eat them.

Mr. Whitney explained that the study did not include estimates of total numbers of hatchery fish in the section because the short period that the catchables were available did not fit the sampling periods well enough for such estimates to be made. He stated the catchables' effect could be estimated, however, from what is known about the hatcheries planting schedules and the survival of the catchables. Mr. Whitney presented the following chart.

EFFECT OF CATCHABLES ON TOTAL NUMBERS AND POUNDS OF TROUT AVAILABLE

10,000 7-9" fish in 5 mile section - 2,000/mile
In 2 months most are gone, so average effect is 1,000/mile

Planted Fish	1,000/mi	@ 5/lb	200 lbs/mi
Wild Fish	<u>300/mi</u>		<u>400 lbs/mi</u>
Total (2 months)	1,300/mi		600 lbs/mi
12 month average	450/mi		350 lbs/mi

1st yr without stocking	550/mi	700 lbs/mi
2nd yr without stocking	800/mi	1,000 lbs/mi

Mr. Whitney pointed out that while the 2-month average of 1,300 trout per mile was not reached by the wild trout alone without stocking, the year-around average number with planting was exceeded the very first year by the wild trout when stocking ceased. He further emphasized that when pounds are considered the wild fish alone provided more throughout the entire year than were available for only

two months of the year with stocking.

Baker: Your figures are misleading because the fish were not distributed throughout the entire section but were planted only at the head end of it by the Varney Bridge and up to Hutchins Bridge.

Whitney: This chart was prepared to show the maximum effect the hatchery fish could have had. As you point out their effect was probably somewhat less than this, thereby making their benefits even lower than the chart shows. Thank you for pointing this out. Your comment strengthens the argument for getting the catchables out of the Madison.

Mr. Whitney presented the following charts which summarize our Madison-O'Dell Creek Study and a Colorado Study which concludes that planting catchables has no effect on wild trout.

<u>Montana</u> Madison-O'Dell Study 6 years	<u>Fish Numbers</u>					
	Stocked	Not Stocked	Good	Poor	Incr.	Decr. Same
Varney Section) 1967) Flows	x			*		
Norris Section) Poor		x	*			
Varney) 1968-69) Good Flows	x			*		*
Norris)		x	*		+	
Varney) 1970-71-72) Good Flows		x	*		+	
Norris)		x	*		+	
O'Dell Upper Before 1970		x	*			
O'Dell Lower		x	*			
O'Dell Upper 1971-72		x	*			*
O'Dell Lower	x			*	-	

<u>Colorado</u> Cache La Poudre Study 2 years	<u>Fish Numbers</u>	
	Stocked	Not Stocked
Upper Section		x
Lower Section	x	

Mr. Whitney said, "Ours is a 6-year study showing what happened on four sections of two streams coincident with changed management

programs. The Colorado Study was for two years on two sections of one stream. He pointed out that our study showed different sections of the same stream may naturally have different numbers of wild fish and added that if Montana had stopped the Madison-O'Dell Study in 1968 it would have shown a very dramatic effect of catchables on wild fish which wouldn't have been true. This is because the Norris Section provides the best habitat and even with management similar to the Varney section, will provide many more wild trout. He concluded: "We didn't draw any management conclusions from our 2-year study of two sections on the same stream and I don't think Colorado is justified in doing so either."

Mr. Rieder: Do you consider the brown trout as native?

Gaffney: Browns and rainbows were originally introduced.

Whitney: About six months ago I asked the regional manager to assume this study held up and assume the Commission went along with our recommendation, and then tell me how they would reduce their requests for catchable fish. About 200,000 were deleted which will constitute about a two-fifth reduction for next year. These fish are now in our system and if you go along with our recommendation, they will go to lakes and reservoirs in the spring. This would result in a food cost saving.

For future years the department's recommendation is to switch the effort from these rainbow to cutthroat. This would cost less in dollars.

Mr. Rieder: Do you have a creel count in this area before and after?

Vincent: We had a spot creel census for the last three summers. We find we are seeing more of the larger browns -- heavier and longer.

Mr. Rieder: What is the difference between the creel counts with and without stocking? This should be one of the guidelines.

Vincent: Using tag returns, people take between 15 to 20% of the total spring population of wild trout. This would represent a larger number of fish being caught. The large fish have increased quite significantly. The total numbers of wild fish has increased about threefold over this period.

Baker: Dick, we have had excellent water years during your study up until this year. The last bad year was 1962.

Vincent: If you talk about 9 - 10-month flow, there isn't a great deal of difference.

Baker: The flows have been higher.

Vincent: Your high peak flows have been higher.

There was a coffee break. Then Mr. Rieder invited everyone to

see the fish shocking demonstration on O'Dell Creek shortly after 1 o'clock. Everyone welcome.

Dr. Pengelly: In talking about planting hatchery trout, what is the department's position on our responsibility to the skillful fisherman? They claim their sport is being mongrelized in planting fish for people who don't know how to fish.

Whitney: In the past it was our idea that planting fish at campgrounds and access areas was putting a little cream on the top without hurting anything. We figured the skillful fishermen wouldn't have a serious gripe because they could go someplace else on the stream and fish. Now we feel if the Commission determines we have a responsibility to plant easily catchable fish for the novice fisherman, we must do it in someplace other than in our good trout streams.

Mr. Rieder: What is the proportion of the skillful fisherman against the dub fisherman?

Whitney: We have a 10-year total census on Rock Creek out of Missoula. There we could put a checking station at each end and get almost all of the fishermen. If we were going to make a total estimate on the Madison it would be extremely expensive. He asked Mr. Holton to respond to Mr. Rieder's question with Rock Creek figures.

Mr. Holton explained that while the words "good" and "poor" are not exactly definable we can group anglers with percentage groups by the portion of the fish they take. Using this method on Rock Creek the most successful 10% of the fishermen caught 40% of the fish. The most successful 25% took 75% of the fish and the most successful 50% of the anglers took 97% of the fish. One of our questions was, "How much good are we doing the poor fisherman?" Without stocking 47% of the people caught no fish and with stocking, 41% were unsuccessful so we aren't doing much good for the poor fisherman and the better fishermen are still taking the majority of the fish.

Homer Terwilliger: I'm with Trout Unlimited -- I would like to ask the gentleman who does the tagging, you get the number of fish by the tags that are returned, but how do you come to the figure of wild fish and planted fish through the return of these tags?

Vincent: We determine the number of trout and then compute the percentage of the fish that are harvested. If we tag fish throughout the spring and during the year 150 are returned, we know what percentage of the fish were caught, we assume the same percentage of tagged and untagged fish were caught. We would tag 10% of the hatchery fish planted and know what percentage are returned. About 70% of the fishermen return the tags.

Dr. Richard Timken, Western Montana College, Dillon: We think it is unsound biologically to stock trout in these reproductive streams. You say 66% of the anglers prefer to fish in streams. There are two groups -- families with small children who want streams where they can catch fish and the second group are people who want quality

fishing. I represent these people. We do not want to catch stocked trout. You are dinged to death with these little stocked fish. I know of no one who keeps these trout. Most of us avoid those places. They are a nuisance. Nobody fishes for them. People usually go to a lake, pond or reservoir if they want to catch those fish. I don't want to see our money spent on fish food when it won't do us any good. I would rather see them dropped in the lakes and reservoirs. If we fish for brown trout in the Big Hole, we don't want to catch rainbow trout. If your data is correct, you are hurting the brown trout population. Most people who fish the quality streams want quality fishing. They don't want stocked trout.

Lewis Myers, Dillon, representing the Beaverhead Sportsmen's Association, presented a resolution from that group in favor of the Fisheries Division recommendation to the Commission.

Frank Valgenti, Ennis: I have fished the Madison for 21 years. The department study has been conducted scientifically. I have a beautiful hole right in front of my place and there are wild trout there. I happen to believe the department biologists are experts in their field. This is a 6-year study - I believe in the study and in the people who did it. They show us they are destroying the wild trout fishery, I believe something has to be done. I ask the Commission to rule in favor of the study.

Dan Bailey, Livingston: I came to Montana on account of this wild trout fishing 35 years ago. I am speaking for Trout Unlimited. I am a national director of Trout Unlimited. We have a North American trout policy which is too long to read. We talk only about wild trout. It has been out a number of years and it reaches the same conclusion as we are about to reach here. That stocking hatchery trout is detrimental to wild trout. He read a statement from the Montana State Council of Trout Unlimited. At the meeting on September 15 we passed a resolution asking the Fish and Game Commission to include in the catchable program only those waters which do not have the capability of sustaining a quality natural reproductive standard.

Jack McGowan, Ennis: I think we need trout planting. People come in, bring their kids in to fish, and they don't catch fish. They aren't expert fishermen. We need fish for Montana fishermen from the Hi-line or other places in the state who come to Ennis. They cannot afford to go long distances. If the expert fisherman can't catch the fish he wants here, he can afford to go someplace else to fish.

Jerry O'Hara, Ennis: I've fished Montana since 1920 and fished the Madison since '45. I can't add much to what McGowan said -- for the guy that gets out in the stream, the walking fisherman, they aren't there like they used to be. For many the fishing is getting poorer each year. I would like to see the river for fish for the average fellow to go to the river and catch fish. I think there should be a compromise. I think there should be a wild river for people who want to float but plant some fish in other places for those who wade. If you can't catch fish in low water like this year, you can never catch them. I am very much in favor of planting the river. The people who used to come here to fish don't come any more. They fish only two or three days and don't catch many fish. They only come back because of friends.

Mary Ann Baker, Riverside Motel, Ennis: My business now seems to be just the tourist. I don't have the fishermen like I used to have. My husband fished all the time and quit fishing the Madison because it just wasn't like it used to be. Many customers just don't come to fish because they say the fishing is just gone here. I believe the fishing has deteriorated since you quit planting.

Timken: I don't send out just professional people. Most people that fish with me couldn't afford to go very far. They are expert only in that they know how to catch fish. Another inference on a low water year -- I fish often and find it harder to catch fish when the water is real low. Sneeds runs a fishing contest and when the water drops down you will find very few big fish brought in.

Arvin Anderson, Economy Food Market, Ennis: The average run of fisherman wants to catch catchable size fish and they just want to be able to catch a few fish. Many people just aren't coming back any more.

Dean Storey, Rainbow Valley Motel, Ennis: I'm all for a planting program because I have had the Rainbow Motel for 13 years and was born and raised here in the valley. In 13 years the number of good fish and good catches have decreased practically every year. Like Mary Ann Baker said, if they weren't good friends over the years, they don't come back for the fish. The last few years fishing just isn't there any more. Some people that take float trips make good catches but the majority of the fishermen can't afford these. People used to come and stay a week but with a day or two of poor fishing, they leave.

Baker: I have worked with the Madison from 1936 to this year. I've had 37 years experience on the Madison River. I know that fishing in low water periods has been much better than in normal flows or high water years. This is true in the Madison River but I don't know about other streams.

Mrs. Yancey, Elkhorn Trailer Court and Groceries, Ennis: Customers used to come and spend a month or two, now the fishing is getting much worse and they take hardly any trips on the river because the river fishing is so disappointing. I feel the area is big enough to accommodate both kinds of fishing. In the areas that are acceptable for people with families and children, it is getting to where I can hardly take a child on the Madison and catch a fish. We definitely feel some areas should be planted. The little person who comes in and spends a month helps everybody in the community. They should be accommodated. We have a lot of friends who float the river and some of them even went out of state with their customers so it shows it is to a certain extent going down hill.

If the brown trout reproduce and all, why can't a few of them be planted? Instead of planting many rainbows, why not plant some browns so that you would have something to restock the river. People who have worked with the browns for years say they will reproduce in a river. Why can't the program be set up to develop a few of the browns. If they cost twice as much to produce, you would be better off with half

and maybe you would satisfy everybody. Our business has dropped off. People stay only a short time who used to stay a month or so. This small community depends almost entirely on tourist trade for our livelihood.

Mr. Rieder: Are these people you are talking about satisfied about catching the planted fish?

Mrs. Yancey: They just want to catch fish. I have never heard any complaints about hatchery trout.

Ed Clark, Ennis: I am postmaster and have lived here 52 years. We had good fishing in the Madison River this year. We caught bigger fish and mounted more fish for people out of state than any year the last ten or fifteen years. I have pictures of these fish. I have floated the river for twenty years and never had a customer dissatisfied with a planted fish. You go to the campgrounds and all people tell you is that they bring their kids and they can't catch fish any more. They have fished two days and haven't caught any fish.

Another gripe I have is that nobody has ever proven that these planted fish don't survive. Do we have seagulls and pelicans that only pick up the rainbow? We find whitefish and suckers floating on the river but not rainbow. We caught fish this year up to 5½ pounds that were planted several years ago. I know a hatchery fish. I worked at the hatchery for several years. We ought to have a machine to turn out fish on the Madison River. I think people have a right to go out here and catch fish that were raised by the government. We have been losing fishermen here in great numbers. I live at the Varney Bridge. There used to be 20-25 cars parked there on a weekend. Now only about 5 because they can't catch fish. Not one single thing wrong with a fish that comes out of this federal hatchery up here. I am sure everybody thinks a little bit when you go against nature. This is a natural brown trout stream. They are doing very well for not being planted for 30 years. But if rainbow is all we can get, we should plant them. I think we should have a supplement of 25 or 50,000 brown trout planted in the river. Then we would boost the population of brown. We are putting rainbow in for people to take, a put-and-take proposition. We were getting people to stay on the Madison but now we are losing all these people.

I can take you with guests from outside the state to where they have planted catchable trout and these people are satisfied. These purists have no right to say they shouldn't be planted, especially in access areas. There is nothing the matter with fishing the Madison River unless I get all the good fishermen.

McGowan: Others said fishing was good this year but it is poor in these access areas. You put fish in for 20 years. Now you take them away. I go along with planting 100%. I would like to put rainbow back and some browns for natural propagation purposes. I definitely think rainbow should be planted in these access areas.

Mr. Rieder: Have you any idea of the amount of fish this year compared to when stocking was in full progress.

Clark: I would have no way of giving a figure but it has dropped off considerably the last two or three years just from observing the number of people. People aren't staying because they aren't catching fish.

Pat Barnes, Tackle Shop, West Yellowstone: I was born in 1909. My father had a cabin on Meadow Creek when the limit was 40 fish and 20 lbs. I have five guides working for me in the summer. Most customers are dry fly fishermen but we occasionally take someone who fishes lures. We didn't catch any 5-pounders this year but took 3 fish over 4 pounds. In the last three weeks we have killed only 8 fish. We catch and release most of them. I sympathize with the people in Ennis. If the Madison River is poor, we take customers where fishing is better. I think people who are concerned about fishing, if they were to watch this and go ahead with the department recommendation, I think that people would be coming back. They would get a different group of people and they would be spending more money. Many of my people spend \$75 to \$200 for a fly rod. They leave money in Ennis and the state. Montana is surrounded by states that have done things other than what our department is proposing. I think fishing has gone down considerably in the 50 years I have fished and I don't know if planting improves it or not.

I like this system of boating one stretch and not the other. We have long seasons, large creels, no size limits. We can use any hook, any method, we can float -- some states around us are doing other things. Other states are changing regulations and Montana is staying status quo. This is the way I see it. I hope our Fish and Game Commission does something about it in the next ten years.

Tom Williams, Ennis: Check your license agents and you will find that we are selling more licenses than ever. Ask any agent. My store to June (when I sold out) was way ahead of last year. Ed sold more licenses from then on. Check the nine agents that sell licenses for the Madison and you will see. We are not losing these fishermen. We have got to take care of them, that's all.

Dick McGuire, Ennis: What has been the response to the present game fish limits in the State of Montana?

Whitney: About the only major request for a change in the last few years has been from the people in the eastern part of the state who want a 2-day limit. We get only a few requests for smaller limits.

McGuire: He told how many fish people could take if they fulfilled the different limits. -- There has been no opposition or little, to these massive limits, but many people say that fishing is poor. They say, "Yes, we have great numbers of fish in our rivers." On the other hand they say, "We are short of fish -- how about stocking more?" If we have so many fish we can live with the present limits, we certainly do not need any subsidies.

Fishing in Yellowstone National Park is for recreation, rather than fishing for fish to eat. Other eastern states have "Fishing for fun."

The Fish and Game study is but one of many studies that demonstrate the effects of planting. It has been clearly demonstrated that stocking catchables is biologically unsound. It is probably also illegal in the light of environmental impact.

Ed Curnow, Ed's Tackle Shop, Ennis: I've fished since 1959. I want to reiterate what Ed Clark said. This has been the best year for fishing for large fish since 1965. We had large fish every single day and not all are taken by boat fishermen. I want to maintain the stocking but not in the Madison River. I think a compromise is available to the people in Ennis. I feel the argument basically has boiled down to do we supply fish for everyone to catch and supply the same kind of fish for the better fishermen. We have Ennis Lake that will provide an excellent fishery for those people who cannot catch fish so easily. I think there are enough fish to provide a good fishery and this would offer the type of compromise that would satisfy most people. We have a quality fishery and we should maintain it. I think the economy of Ennis will go up. People caught bigger fish this fall. They averaged 5 to 10 fish per day. Almost everyone had a 1-to 2-pound fish and most everyone lost a big fish. We have to preserve this resource. I feel the Commission should give this a trial either permanent or a 3-year trial. To give the native fish time to come back, I think this is a step in the right direction. Catchable fish could be put in the lake to maintain the economy of Ennis and also have a quality stream.

Bill Baker: On Ed's remarks -- this is the lowest water year since '62 and in a large part that accounts for the fishing success. It isn't because of an increased population.

Dick Vincent, have you figured out on the planting of the experimental area on O'Dell in relation to flows. If we planted a comparable number in the Madison River for 50-60 miles in relation to flows, the number of fish planted would have been many times increased.

Vincent: They were planted in O'Dell in relation to the adult wild population at the beginning of the study. We picked the same ratio of hatchery fish to adult wild fish in each section.

Baker: Dick Vincent didn't plant the same ratio. There weren't enough fish to plant the Madison in the same ratio to flows.

Vincent: We tried to stock at the same basis in relation to wild fish but last year's fish were bigger than I requested.

Baker: There should have been fish going into the Madison.

Vincent: The fish didn't move into the lower section or vice versa.

Chamberlin: Mr. Chamberlin gave some planting information from the U. S. Bureau of Fisheries and thanked the Commission for coming to their community. He mentioned the transplanting of 27 elk - the herd has increased to 550 in the Gravellys.

He expressed concern for the economy of the state and wants trout

planted two to three miles above Ennis to Ennis Lake and have the boat fishermen kept out of there. "It behooves us to plant more fish because you have heard people who run motels tell how their business is slipping."

Mr. Rieder: Our decision will be somewhat difficult. Whether we plant or don't or come to a compromise the Commission will do what we think is right. I want to thank each and everyone for your input in guiding the Commission in its decision. It will probably be made at the next meeting when we have a full Commission. Thank you for coming.

Everyone is invited to attend the fish shocking demonstration on O'Dell Creek this afternoon.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. and the next meeting will be December 6 and 7, 1973, in Helena.

