



Panel Discussion: Regional Implications for Hatchery Reform Implementation

Barbara Cairns,
Executive Director, Long Live The Kings

Moderator

Dan Diggs,
Assistant Regional Director for Fisheries, USFWS

Panel

Jeff Koenings,
Director, WDFW

Jim Waldo,
Gordon Thomas Honeywell

Billy Frank, Jr.,
Chair, NWIFC

Moderator Remarks

Barbara Cairns

Executive Director, Long Live the Kings

For this session, we have Jeff Koenings, the Director of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Billy Frank, Jr., the Chair of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, our conference co-chairs back up front. Joining us are Dan Diggs, Assistant Regional Director Fisheries, USFWS and Jim Waldo. Jim Waldo is a partner with Gordon Thomas Honeywell. For the last five years, he has been the lead facilitator for the hatchery reform project, and we're delighted he's here to lend his perspectives after thirty years of working on these issues in various capacities.

I want to start with Dan, in part because we haven't heard from the USFWS, and in addition to being the funding source for this project for the last five years, they've been active participants in it. I think that Dan comes today with maybe the most tangible example of real implementation on a regional scale.

Panel Discussion

Moderator Question

Dan, you have led the drive and started to take the recommendations, the framework, the tools of reform into the Columbia River system for an internal review of Fish and Wildlife Service hatcheries. Would you like to talk about that a little bit?

Response from Dan Diggs

Thank you, I would. The Fish and Wildlife Service believes the Hatchery Reform Project has created an outstanding model. It is the best effort we've been involved in here in the Northwest and nationally as it relates to hatchery reform. We are hopeful that one of the implications of the project is that we can expand on this here in Puget Sound and the Coast and take it into other areas.

Many of you, I know, are familiar with the Columbia River Basin. There's been no shortage of processes in the Columbia River Basin -- many, many different processes. There have been many hatchery reform related processes. But I think what we've heard here today is that we've all seen a lot of process, but the important thing is execution, implementation, and getting it done. That is one of the very exciting things we have seen here in the Washington State hatchery reform process.

First, I will talk about what we're trying to do in the Columbia and maybe answer the question of why, and Barbara asked me to talk about that a little bit and then sort of hand things off to my other panel members. We have been involved in the Washington State effort from the beginning. We've watched it evolve into what it was, and it really has developed into something more than I ever imagined it would be.

The Columbia River Basin is obviously a very big and important part of this region, and it has

been an important part of what the Fish and Wildlife Service does. I put together a team of folks internally to really look at this Washington State model and ask, "is this something that we could in large part imitate down here"? The answer that came back from my internal working group was the right answer: yes. It has some differences but it is based all on the very same principles. It's not congressionally mandated as this was up here in Washington State, but the Fish and Wildlife Service has been involved in fish production since the beginning -- over 130 years. We felt that after our experience here in Washington State and our desire to see how this would work in the Columbia River Basin, we would step forward down there and utilize the same kind of model in terms of an independent, science-based review of our programs. I just want to make it clear right now this is limited to Fish and Wildlife facilities and facilities that we will fund.

"I think we also realized that even though it's called hatchery reform -- that's a bit of a misnomer, because it's more than hatchery reform as we've seen today. It's really salmon management reform."

– Dan Diggs

We're starting out with a pilot review at Warm Springs National Hatchery. We will then be starting our next group of facilities, in terms of this process, in the mid-Columbia region at Leavenworth, Entiat, Methow National Fish Hatcheries; expand that into Service-operated Mitchell Act hatcheries, which are funded by NOAA Fisheries; and eventually into a large program, which is the Lower Snake Facilities, around 25 different production facilities. We've started, and we're tremendously excited about it.



Now in terms of why, there's a lot of reasons. I think of the Fish and Wildlife Service as an agency that bases its reputation on making science-based, informed decisions. Any process that starts out with science has always excited us. That was key in this process – to have the benefit of independent scientific review and the types of products you've seen here today. The AHA tool, the risk assessment models, the concepts of integrated and segregated hatcheries – when we see that type of scientific foundation, it gets us kind of excited.

I think we also realized that even though it's called hatchery reform, that's a bit of a misnomer, because it's more than hatchery reform as we've seen today. It's really salmon management reform. You can't get very far into looking at how to operate your hatcheries, from a scientific basis, before you butt up against the other questions of habitat capacity, wild stock status, and harvest management. You know you have to integrate these things to make sense. We've had 130 years of hatchery management where that approach was not always taken. In fact, it was the rare case where it was taken. So, it was truly exciting to us to see this integrated approach and that hatchery reform meant salmon management reform in a lot of aspects.

Our agency is also an agency that deals a lot with habitat conservation. One of the initial paradigm shifts in this effort was that we can't replace habitat; hatcheries can't be used to fully replace lost habitat. But we have to integrate what we do hatchery production into habitat conservation and harvest management programs. That was another exciting element that got us involved.

In terms of future implications, I certainly hope that the science, the development of the science, continues and that the models continue to be produced and continue to be refined. I think this work deserves a lot of support by all of the management agencies, because this group of independent scientists and the agencies that have been involved in this effort have given us some very, very powerful tools to work with, and it's really enhancing our ability to make informed decisions.

To be able to lay things out in black and white, a clear process of information gathering, decision making is such a powerful tool for policy makers to have.

This is a big step for us in helping to fulfill other different kinds of obligations. One of them would be ESA, for example. This process takes all those kinds of things to a different level. It is going to help us develop with NOAA Fisheries our final biological opinions and operating plans for facilities in the future.

Finally the biggest implication, and perhaps I've already mentioned it, is that this wasn't just hatchery reform. It is salmon management reform. So one of the biggest implications, as this is handed off to the agencies and management entities, the co-managers, the tribes, the states, the federal agencies, this positions us to have to make decisions, and those decisions are not easy. They are tough ones, and that's been part of the magic of this process.

We had this wonderful independent scientific review process that was handing information and recommendations off to managers. Managers were talking back to the scientists about things relative to the world they live and work in. Now we have to implement these in the context of our legal responsibilities, of our mitigation responsibilities, of our ESA responsibilities, of our trust responsibilities, and those are tough decisions. They end up being negotiations. I think we saw today how, with the tool that we've been handed, we can get through those kinds of talks; we can get through those kinds of negotiations.

If everyone takes a long-term perspective, there may be some short-term pain. There may be some changes we have to make, and certain hatcheries are not going to function the way they used to. They're not going to raise the same stocks. They're going to be raising different stocks. They may have different goals entirely. There will be implications to harvest management that we'll have to work our way through, but those are big ones, and that's where we're at right now. We're right in the middle of

that as we implement what we're doing up here in Washington State, and certainly we'll be in the same situation in the Columbia River Basin.

Moderator Question

Dan Diggs was talking about having to make decisions inside different management schemes, inside different responsibilities, within different frameworks. As the Director of WDFW you have salmon recovery plans for listed species, and you have the HSRG's recommendations for reform. The Governor has certain expectations of all the agencies in her cabinet. I know you've made some significant changes internally, and you've made new overtures to the tribes about moving forward as co-managers to begin to create the mechanisms where you can integrate all of these things.

It's a real challenge for a policy maker to be on the receiving end of a lot of scientific recommendations and a lot of new legal requirements. How do you balance what's coming at you? How do you find your way through that maze?

Response from Jeff Koenings

I think that examples were presented in this room this afternoon when people got up from both the tribes and agencies and went through how we're already implementing hatchery reform. Kit Rawson's presentation and other people's presentations, I think, gave you a clear pathway on how the co-managers are working together to actually implement the recommendations of the hatchery reform process.

I just wanted to say that I'm really proud of the staff, not only for their presentations, but for all the hard work they've put into this for the last 4 or 5 years. When you talk about workloads, they've not only worked on the HSRG process and moving forward with that, but they've also had to work on the salmon recovery plans and watersheds together as co-managers.

There's another example of how we work together to solve problems. We've had to put together planning targets for recovered populations. We did that together. We recognize that there's a co-management relationship that we have to deliver on and both sides have been delivering on that, with the harvest and hatchery portions of the fishery resources here in the state. So, I'm really proud of how they've come together. It wasn't always that way, as I'm told, in terms of institutional memory. I don't have that institutional memory, because where I was working in forests everything was together.

So I really am proud of how we're pulling together and actually not only dealing with the operational part of co-management, but with the spirit as well. I think that has really come through on both our staffs, and we're going to keep that up. So the tribes and state together both, biologists, scientists, and policy makers have really taken on this and other tasks for the benefit of the resource. That was very well demonstrated, I think, today. I think to also demonstrate it is – we have made some excellent process toward reforming our hatcheries. You have the science framework, which has been put forward by the HSRG. We have some funding to start the work. Is it enough? No, but it's a good start, and with that start we can also jump start future funding as well.

"I think the science has spoken and I think it's time for the hand-off, a clear hand-off for implementation to the co-managers and that does require some policy decisions. We're going to have to step up and make those policy decisions."

– Jeff Koenings

I think the co-managers have the political will to continue. I don't think there is any shortage of that. So, I believe we're on the right path. I believe what's essential for here today though, is that the HSRG has delivered the message that hatcheries in this state can be operated consistent with



salmon recovery and the natural spawning stocks and sustainable fisheries. I think the science has spoken, and I think it's time for the hand-off, a clear handoff for implementation to the co-managers, and that does require some policy decisions. We're going to have to step up and make those policy decisions. For example, we're looking at implementation timeframes. How long is it going to take to implement some of the changes that are necessary? I think Larry Rutter was asking some of those questions earlier. I think we're looking at a timeframe that fits with the other H's. How long is it going to take to restore the habitat? We need habitat, and habitat is going to be a necessary part of how we operate our hatchery system into the future. So, in some respects, habitat restoration will frame some of the future sizes of our hatchery programs.

In some cases the amount of monoproduction may decrease. This doesn't mean, because of quality changes, that we aren't going to have the same number or more fish coming back to those facilities. There's going to have to be a balance going on, which may mean increased quality of fish versus the way we've done business in the past. I am confident that hatchery reform will be implemented. I don't have any question about that. As Sara mentioned we have established some transparent methods to track the implementation of the HSRG recommendations. We will be tracking those implementation programs as they go forward. There are assurances that I'm trying to put on the table here that hatchery reform has to fit into salmon recovery, and it has to fit into sustainable fisheries. That's going to be part of the program as we go forward.

We now have the tools to more closely operate your facilities to be consistent with the recovery of our wild stocks. If you've got those tools now; and you've got the way forward; it sort of begs the question of, "do we need to change the goals of the facilities, and if we need to change the goals, what are they going to be directed towards"? Are those goals going to be directed towards wild stock recovery, or are they going to be directed towards

sustainable fisheries, or both? If they are going to be directed towards sustainable fisheries, how are we going to change, perhaps, management relative to production of fish from our facilities? How can we better manage our facilities, perhaps to take advantage of the fish that we produce?

You've heard Andy say that in some cases when we have a hatchery program, we have to begin to harvest surplus fish; otherwise there'll be just so many coming back to the facilities that it doesn't make any sense to continue the programs, because of the effect on the naturally spawning fish. So, there are some future implications of moving forward with hatchery reform, but the big thing that I want to let you know is that we are moving forward; we are going to implement; and we are going to change the way we do business.

Moderator Question

Jim Waldo, you've been working on these issues from different angles and in different capacities for 30 years. It's been a real pleasure to work with you on this project over the last five years, and one of the things that I appreciate most about you is not just the enthusiasm for this project, but the way you began to connect the dots early on.

Dan Diggs said just a moment ago that when you start thinking about hatcheries in the context of the status of the habitat, suddenly everything starts to change. The question becomes, what suite of changes in each of the H's will deliver back to harvest or to conservation the greatest number of healthy adult fish capable of persisting over time?

When we started this project people were asking: Are hatcheries good or bad? I know you've been thinking about this and I wondered if you could share your thoughts.

Response from Jim Waldo

I have a couple of observations and then a couple of thoughts. One, I was struck when Billy was talking earlier today. About this time 30 years ago, I was an assistant U.S. attorney, and it was about this time of

the fall that we were regularly going to court – state court or federal court. I had actually just started as a U.S. attorney. I arrived in the spring, and by that fall I had been in court 22 times. Nobody was talking about fish management. Nobody was talking about habitat. Nobody was talking about the long-term. It was all a fight over who's going to catch the next fish – literally the next fish.

A couple of years after that, we started an effort to put together a long-term plan. There was a recent graduate from the University of Washington by the name of Lars Mobrand who was working for the Small Tribes of Western Washington. He was part of a team that was put together, because no one had ever had the money, to analyze the fish tags. They had been collected for years, but the Department did not have the funding to analyze anything, so we had no idea what various hatcheries produced. And we had no idea in terms of U.S. and Canada, for example, how many fish were being taken before they returned to these waters. There was a period of time after the Boldt Decision, which I think was a very difficult time for departments – there was a Fisheries Department and a Game Department at that time – because they'd literally been in charge of everything, and the Boldt Decision not only had harvest implications, but it basically said that the tribes will also be managers.

There was a lot of conflict and turmoil about that, but one of the great things that I think happened at that time by virtue of breaking up a monopoly of information, is that there was a lot of ferment. It wasn't just a debate between the state and the tribes. It became a debate within the state agencies; and a debate within and among the tribes; and much of what we now think of as accepted wisdom in fisheries management came out of that late 70s, early 80s period of time. One of the tragedies, actually, was that by the time we figured all that out, we had over-harvested, significantly over-harvested, in every fisheries run in the Northwest. You go back and look at any of those charts; and you look at the harvest rates in the 70s, and you compare it to what the stocks could support at that time, what we now know is that if we'd had all this information

and knowledge in front of us we wouldn't have done that, and it would have made a significant difference.

Then there was a period of time where I felt that the state and the tribes really gained ground in fisheries management. That was followed, though, by what I would call the "valley of despair" in which a number of bad things happened. We had some bad climate cycles. One of Jeff's predecessors pretty much demolished the Department of Fish and Wildlife in terms of what it did to the people that worked there, the morale, the funding, the relationship with the legislature, and the relationship between them and the tribes. You had the ESA listings occur. You had NOAA Fisheries, which had largely been a commerce-oriented agency, all of a sudden in charge of all these other areas and decisions – how do they interact with the state and the tribes? This was a period where it was just institutional survival. Not that good people weren't thinking about good things or doing good things, but it was a hard time to be in this business. Recent recovery planning has taken a quantum jump forward in terms of thinking about long-term fish habitat. Not just by the fish managers, but also by the people who used to know nothing about fish – local government people, businesses, land owners, utilities. Our knowledge, and our sense of what needs doing, has taken a quantum jump in the last five to eight years.

Hatcheries were always kind of – "We'll get to them next." The conflicts were over allocation. Then the conflicts became ESA: habitat vs. fish, with how it affected other people. I think one of the reasons we all owe Congressman Dicks and Senator Gorton a real debt of gratitude was not only the money, but providing the money for a sustained period of time in which to ask "how should we think about these institutions?"; and "how should we think about how they fit?"; and "what is the current science?" I think we have to thank a number of the state and tribal managers and scientists who, when we were trying to figure out this effort, basically said "do it with us." Don't go off in an ivory tower, write a report, put on a robe, and sit up there and announce revealed truth. Some independent science efforts did this, and I think it's the reason they failed. I've



seen a number of them elsewhere that have failed, and I can remember hearing Gary Moreshima in particular saying “if you start out; go into the regions; and you sit down with the people who run the programs; with the people who do habitat; and with the scientists; and you find out what is really going on, what their thinking is, and then use that to interact with, you will come out with a much better product.” He was absolutely right.

So when people talk about the success of the HSRG, there is a lot of credit that is due to those scientists, but there’s a lot of credit due to an awful lot of the people in this room because they didn’t do it in isolation, and they didn’t do it in a vacuum. Many of the HSRG recommendations resonated with the people in the regions they worked in, because people in those regions often came up and said: “with latitude, political support or funding, this is what I would do.” It wasn’t that they hadn’t thought about it, or didn’t know about it. What they needed was a way to get the concept out and get it organized and get it validated, or have somebody debate it and say no: you know, really that may seem like a good idea, but it has been used in three other places; and it never worked. We don’t see any reason why this place should be any different. Those discussions and debates went on during the five years that this process worked its way through each of the regions.

So what we have is not only a scientific focus on hatcheries by the independent science group, we’ve had a focus where the habitat and hatchery and management people from the Department and the tribes in the region all got together and talked about stock goals and how these programs relate to what we want to do. If you think about Kip Killebrew’s presentation, we have goals for these naturally spawning elements of the stocks; what are we going to do about hatcheries so they fit? Not one in isolation from the other. Where are you going to put parameters, one way or the other, on what you’re going to do as managers? How are you going to divide up risks and benefits in harvest? How are you going to divide up risks and benefits in terms of hatchery programs? How are you going to divide

up risks and benefits between a naturally spawning stock and getting an integrated hatchery stock? Even once you understand the principles, this is hard work. You have to get down to very specific decisions as managers that often are not what’s good or bad science. You’re allocating risks and benefits. That’s what managers do. If you’re a good manager, a lot of the time you’re allocating risks and benefits.

“I think there has been a tendency in the state, tribes and federal agencies to be afraid that some of these tools will hurt you. I want to tell you that . . . these are the things that are going to get you the support and the funding and the money, because you are going to be able to demonstrate value.”

– Jim Waldo

The other thing this effort hopefully will help us overcome – going back to what I said about when Lars was still wandering around loose after he just got out of the university, and Pete Bergman and Frank Haw hadn’t even retired the first time, and others like that - is that it was so exciting to get new information. You could see a quantum jump in the ability to make informed decisions. What’s happened over the last 30 years? We’ve gotten so much information it can paralyze. The reality is we know so much more than we used to know, and there’s so much more information on all aspects of fisheries management. It’s very easy to say, “I don’t know if I can make a decision here.” It can become an excuse for failing to make those hard decisions. One of the opportunities these tools present is the ability to get a handle on the complexity and use the information so we can make decisions in a timely manner. The tools can be improved. The input can be improved. There’s no magic in any of this, but what we’re beginning to get is, and we saw it in David Troutt’s example, which I thought was perfect, where he said we thought we had it nailed, and then we started analyzing where our goals fit together. There was nothing wrong with either of their goals, except they didn’t fit together. They did

their own analysis, and looked at them and said, “we want both of these goals – harvest and conservation. It’s not real obvious how we’re going to get them with the current facts - with this habitat, in this situation, at this time.”

Then David ran through what looked like about eight different ways of thinking about it – in the face of all that, how are you going to move ahead to make some decisions, and what are some decisions that could allow you to at least approximate some success on both those goals: recovery and sustainable fisheries for the Nisqually members. They’ve come up with at least one plausible way of proceeding, which is based on science, that uses that complexity, which they can put forward and say, “here’s our rationale for why we believe this is necessary, and a way of evaluating down the road if it worked out the way you want it.” The Managing for Success type of calculation - and I liked Andy’s description of this as a calculator - it’s not magic. It’s not a black box. It’s not voodoo. It’s just a way of trying to manage a lot of complex information. But it allows you to look at some of these interactions over time and say this is what we thought would happen, this is what has happened, and determine how those match up.

There are a couple of recommendations that I wanted to make. This is my kind of swan song on this project, so I’m going to toss them in for what it’s worth. I think there has been a tendency in the state and the tribes and the federal agencies, to some degree, to be afraid that some of these tools will hurt you. I want to tell you that with every ounce of intuition and experience I have, I can say these are the things that are going to get you the support and the funding, because you are going to be able to demonstrate value. Now whether it’s exactly these tools or something different, that isn’t the point. The point is that when you can go out and demonstrate this is what we’re doing, this is the anticipated benefit, here’s how we’re going to know if it’s accomplished, and if we get the support - if we get this decision or we get this political backing - here’s what we can achieve. I think you will get it. Without it, I worry, and Billy and Jeff know because

I’ve been beating this drum for the last 3 or 4 years, society can decide we’ve been there on an issue, and we’ve done that. I think the risk with salmon is that people can say we’ve been there and we’ve done that, instead of we’ve just begun, we got a good start, and we got a long way to go. The ability to pull these together shows how they fit. If something is going to take a long time, not because people are ducking an issue, but simply because it takes a long time, you can demonstrate that fact. It’s not that we don’t want to do this, it’s just going to take us a while to accomplish it, or there’s no point in starting until we get these other things in place.

You have the ability here to literally – to have the same kind of period as what happened after the Boldt Decision 30 years ago – where you could see the intellectual ferment. You can see the energy, and that was communicated to the political leaders at the time. I think that same opportunity exists now. I think that this program is tailor-made to get the current Governor excited about this. Sara talked about how this fits with the Governor’s performance measurement system. The Governor is going to be looking for who her examples are going to be throughout the whole state government for showing how a performance system can be put into place. It’s not easy. I think you all are further along than a lot of other agencies are going to be. I think that’s a significant opportunity.

Tom’s here from Congressman Dick’s office, and I certainly heard from the Congressman and Senator Murray that what they need to show their colleagues in Congress is that if we invest money in the following ways, then we will get the following benefits. They can’t go back anymore and just say “salmon’s important, give us millions and millions of dollars.” These tools give you the ability to do that. So I think the opportunities here are so exciting that I guess the last thing that I want to say - having worked on salmon issues and caring about them, and having worked on this effort for the last five years - it was great to be here today. It was very affirming for me to be here today and to see what people have already accomplished. I know how hard it is. Nobody gave you a bunch of extra staff. People



are doing this on extra time, extra hours with whatever little money they could squeeze out, and I just wanted to tell you how impressed I am. Thank you.

Moderator Remarks from Barbara Cairns

Jim, thank you for those remarks. You have a lot of friends in this room, and people who learned a lot from you over the years, and I think it means something to them to hear that from you.

It has been an impressive day. Billy, you've got to be really proud of the presentations that you've seen. I was struck by what Jim was saying about what the science and tools can do. So many of the people in this room are also working in salmon recovery in the ESA context, and a big part of your work has been going into the watersheds and engaging watershed councils and local citizens and other non-state or tribal decision makers about habitat recovery. Very few of those people understand anything about hatcheries. I think you can demonstrate to people, as Jim said, that these are complex decisions, but there is a way to get a handle on them. As Lars has told us, there's always going to be some uncertainty when you're managing natural resources, but if you can demonstrate to otherwise well-meaning people that you can document your hypotheses, and you can document your goals, and you can document your strategies and illustrate what the different levels of benefit and risk are, most people will be really happy with that. They won't expect a perfection that cannot be achieved.

I agree with Jim. I like the tools because they help us have a conversation that's grounded in reality and not with the abstract.

Moderator Question

Billy, we're coming to the end of the day here, and I want to ask you to close it out. I want to ask you about the consequences of not doing this work. I think we need to hear from you about the next steps for those of us in this room.

Response from Billy Frank, Jr.

Thank you. I want to thank Barbara, first of all, for telling our story. I can remember when we all got together about five, six years ago and talked about how we're going to do this. And Jim Waldo, you know how over the last thirty years we've been all connected together trying to find a way to find the middle of the road. And here today is all of our A Team. There ain't no goddamn B Team. It's an A Team.

I want to thank all of them for the commitment and the time and the debate. Our tribal staff, the commission and our tribal technical people, as well as the policy people – you have to go away and maybe get hell when you get home because you're away too long. It ain't easy to do what we do. It ain't easy to challenge the system, to challenge our great Northwest, to tell 'em what's wrong with it.

“Every one of these presentations is medicine for the salmon. It's medicine when we get to talk together and we're able to agree with each other and then move forward. That's what we need.”

– Billy Frank, Jr.

You know when you talk about salmon you're the bad guy. When you talk about habitat you're the bad guy. You talk about 4 H's; you are the bad guy in this state. I think we need to challenge ourselves. I think we need to challenge our people in the great Northwest, the State of Washington, and the great Columbia River, Idaho, Snake River – all of our Pacific salmon regions and along the Pacific Coast. Everybody has got to be challenged. We're going to have the salmon here, and we've found a way through the hatcheries to make that happen.

The challenges should go out to our Governor. We've got a new Governor. Say we got a hold of this and move forward. You know, let's challenge the President of the United States, the administration, the Interior, the BIA, all the agencies. You know, let's challenge all the agencies of the state. Let's

challenge the tribes. Now, right now, the tribes ain't challenged because they ain't got no money. We have to fix that. We have to challenge the United States Congress. You know how important salmon is to us. You know, we gotta give Norm help. We gotta give Senator Murray help. We got to give all of our delegation help.

We talk about the hydro. We talk about the big business. We talk about the salmon. We talk about the harvesting. We talk about everything. How do you integrate all that together? We're managing the resource; U.S., Canada, clear to Alaska, clear to Mexico. That's a big job. That's a big job for all of us right here in this room and all of our agencies and all of our United States Congress and all of our states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Alaska. When we talk about needing \$44 million for a watershed, does that scare the hell out of you? Hell no. That's no money. That's no money to put our watersheds back together.

When David talks about a couple of million dollars for a weir on the Nisqually River to make it healthier and to be able to count them fish, that's no money. Let's do what we have to do to bring these salmon home and to make sure we have a home when they get there. Today I hear two H's: harvest and hatchery. We've addressed both of those. The fishery on the tribal side is closed about 85% right now. We're sitting on the beach. No more harvest.

Right now, today, we're ready to move on with hatcheries. We have our team to move forward. We have the policy and the technical people and the infrastructure to do that. We need the funding. How do we get that across? How do we get it across to people that we're damn serious about managing our resource? We're in our own backyard doing it. We're in Seattle, Washington today – the greatest place in the world – to talk about managing. We're not going to take the I-5 corridor out. We're not going to take our dams out up here. Some of them need to be taken out. And the hydro people know that, but we're not ready to move on all these things.

We're trying to find a balance of how we all live in the Northwest and when you point at these lights, and you see salmon coming out of these lights, well the hydro people, they have to come in this room too. They have to come in this room and make a presentation in front of the United States Congress, in front of the Governor, in front of us – the people.

What are you doing to protect the salmon? What are you doing? Is your money coming into that pot? Where is the timber industry? They have billions of dollars. Billions of dollars they're making off that timber for us to all work together. Where in the hell do you guys think you're going? You gotta put money back in this resource in order to have them billions of dollars. The developers, the people that's making the roads – bring them in the room. You've left them all out. You got us in the room right now because we're talking about trying to find a way to bring the salmon back – the wild and the hatchery and make them coincide with one another – and bring our watersheds back to life.

We need to send medicine down the Columbia River. We have to send medicine down to the Snake River. This is medicine right here today. Every one of these presentations is medicine for the salmon. It's medicine when we get to talk together and we're able to agree with each other and then move forward. That's what we need. It's important when we get together and hear ourselves, and we have hope every day, when we hear ourselves.

It's getting harder to get up in the morning and start moving. By the time I get to the front door, I'm going pretty good. But you know fifty years now, goddamn, there better be some more fish around here.

Moderator Remarks from Barbara Cairns

Okay, Billy, I think we're ready. We're not going to let you down.



Audience Remarks

Kip Killebrew: I'd like to make a statement. I have students come in, Billy, every year to my hatchery. A thousand students, and we talk about this, and we talk about habitat, and a lot of those kids get depressed like we could get depressed, and I reminded them the majority of the people in this room have seen what you and I have seen. You and I have seen six feet of phosphate soap suds on Lake Erie. Lake Erie was dead. We fixed it. We've seen DDT almost take out the American emblem, the national symbol, of the eagle; those who have been delisted. You could not swim in Lake Washington in the 60s because of human feces. It is now one of the cleanest urban lakes in the world. So we have done it in the past. People still have jobs. We still have houses built and businesses built, and I'm convinced that we can do it for salmon because we've done it in the past.

Moderator Remarks from Barbara Cairns

Thank you all very much for being here. I would like a round of applause for all the presenters today.

