

**Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
November 18, 2003**

**Agenda Items**

**1. Call to Order, Determination of Quorum, Approval of Today's Agenda & Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Chair Ed Parker called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

It was noted that a quorum was present. The agenda was accepted.

Mr. Tom Menard moved to accept the Minutes from the January 16, 2003 meeting. Mr. Mark Tisa seconded the motion and the Minutes were approved.

**2. Report of the Executive Assistant**

Ms. Janice Rowan provided a report on Commission activities:

The Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Commission will be receiving a \$250,000 Department of Interior appropriation through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. We have a great many to thank for successfully advocating the benefits of the Connecticut River Migratory Fish Restoration Program. Our appreciation goes out to the many students, individual citizens, organizations, businesses, state and government agencies, elected officials and their hard working staff, all of who have contributed to this important accomplishment. Today, we can be very proud of our united front and this united effort to restore the fisheries potential of the Connecticut River.

These new funds come at a time of great need. Both state and federal agencies are experiencing declining revenues and reduced budgets. Yet, the Program is expanding to include a 21<sup>st</sup> century approach to brood stock management and genetic marking of hatchery-produced salmon. This will help to maintain genetic variability and facilitate improved management of freshwater habitat for salmon. Efforts to protect and improve aquatic habitat are spreading from the mainstem out into the very headwaters of many of the basin tributaries, with eelpass construction, dam removal, and culvert renovations. These projects should benefit many of the less glamorous migratory fish like herring, eels and lamprey. Additionally, the Commission is seeking to facilitate management of many of the non-salmon fisheries by developing cooperative

management plans that will help to guide basin-wide efforts with shad, herring and eels. With increased focus on the diversity of fisheries, the Commission has successfully recommitted itself to its original mission.

The Administrative Report, a summary of CRASC finances and correspondence, is attached.

Discussion:

Mr. Parker thanked all those who worked on the Congressional initiative, especially Mr. Duncan McInnes, Mr. Jim Carroll, and Ms. Rowan. He said this success has opened the door and should make future initiatives easier. He noted that the work is not over since this is but a one-year appropriation.

### **3. Report of the Technical Committee Chair**

Mr. Jay McMenemy provided a summary of the activities of the Technical Committee:

#### **Fish Culture Workgroup**

##### **Stocking/Spawning/Egg Production/Egg Incubation**

A total of 7 million fry was stocked last spring into habitat in the four basin states. This is about the same level as last year, but well short of our 10 million fry goal and the 9.6 million we stocked in 2001. Agency staff was assisted by hundreds of volunteers.

A total of 88,000 smolts was stocked from the Pittsford NFH last spring into the Connecticut River mainstem and the Farmington River. Smolts were transported by several cooperators. This is the first smolt stocking since 2000. Pittsford NFH has about 100,000 smolts for stocking in the spring. Thanks to funding from the USFWS regional office for vaccine and a large cooperative effort from many sources these pre-smolts were adipose clipped and vaccinated against *Vibrio* and furunculosis in October. Fin condition is improved from last year but still not as good as desired. As a result, the smolt production target will be reduced to 80,000 in future year classes to maintain high fin quality that should maximize marine survival.

Sea-run and some kelt brood stock were again treated with hormones to synchronize spawning for the egg bank for future brood stock. Egg banking responsibilities were shifted to White River NFH because of the planned closure of Whittemore SS. Mature parr were collected from tributaries in Connecticut and Vermont to supplement sea-run males to maximize genetic diversity.

The egg take for 2003 was projected to be about 10.8 million, about a million less than last year and short of our 15 million goal. Spawning is still underway but it appears likely that egg projections will be exceeded. Egg production is low due to reduced sea-run returns this year, reduced sea-run returns in previous years, which has reduced kelt numbers, and due to lack of staff and funding at White River NFH, which has reduced production of domestic eggs. Incubation of even this reduced number of eggs at White River will require funding of seasonal positions by cooperators and assistance from cooperators due to continued vacancies at White River. Fry stocking next spring will probably be about the same as last year's reduced level.

Warren SFH (NHFG) produced 144,000 fed fry last spring. Warren SFH has not been used by our program in several years due to concerns about IPN and BKD that NHFG has largely

addressed. Fry tested negative for disease prior to stocking. About 500,000 eggs were transferred to Warren from White River for incubation this winter. Due to high incubation temperature at Warren, fry need to be fed for an extended period prior to stocking which limits production capability there.

Domestic brood stock which are surplus to program needs were allocated to the states for use in sport fisheries outside the Connecticut River.

Staffing and budgetary concerns continue to be a major problem at several program facilities. Whittemore Salmon Station (CTDEP) is scheduled to be closed and staff transferred to the trout program on December 31 if funding is not found. White River NFH continues to be short-staffed due to assistant manager and biologist vacancies. All federal facilities have inadequate operating funds. Mike Masley, manager of Roger Reed SFH (MAFW) has retired leaving that position vacant for the time being.

### **Genetics Workgroup**

Genetically based brood stock management continued in cooperation with Conte Lab. Sea-runs were genetically typed and mating is planned to avoid breeding closely related fish. Much of the egg production of domestic brood stock at White River NFH was genetically "marked" and the resulting fry stocked in ten "regions" made up of one or more tributaries. Smolts and adults produced from marked fry will be able to be identified to tributary of origin (or group of tributaries) by analyzing a small tissue sample (i.e. partial fin clip). The 2004 smolt run will be the first with "marked" domestics contributing. Sea-run fry were stocked in the Williams River watershed for possible genetic research and mature parr production.

The 2003 year class of future brood stock at White River NFH were not PIT tagged for future identification due to lack of funds to purchase the tags. They have been maintained as separate regional groups and can be maintained separately for the remainder of their time as brood stock, although individual family information has already been lost. Due to space limitations, this can only be done for one-year class; PIT tags must be applied to the 2004 brood stock or the genetic marking of domestic brood stock will not be possible for that year class.

### **Fish Passage Workgroup**

#### **Hydro Licensing**

Implementation of improvements to upstream and downstream passage are underway as a result of the recent re-licensing at the Holyoke project. Final designs for upstream passage improvements have been reviewed and the new shad trucking system designs are being finalized. Downstream passage studies and implementation schedules are still being discussed.

#### **Upstream Passage**

Continued evaluations of the Turners Falls fishways were done in 2003 to address the severe problems with shad passage. The Shad and Passage committees decided to abandon evaluation of further modifications at Cabot ladder and instead focus on the Gatehouse ladder. Plans are being developed for a new entrance at the Gatehouse ladder downstream of the current location to avoid turbulence. Discussions and designs of a new fish lift at Cabot were started but NU is reluctant to move forward on this issue without further discussions with CRASC.

Fishway monitoring at Turners Falls was done by videotape because MAFW could not hire seasonals. Tapes are being reviewed at several locations and a final count is not yet available. However, only 267 shad passed Vernon this year so passage at Turners was likely also to be very low. Fishways at Bellows Falls and Wilder were not operated this year because no salmon passed Vernon.

### **Downstream Passage**

PG&E has responded to CRASC's request of last November for implementing downstream fish passage at Moore and Comerford Dams. PGE proposed to install a smolt sampler at Moore to collect data on seasonal and diurnal timing of migration to facilitate passage facility development. The Technical Committee approved their plan with modifications with the intention of having effective passage in place as soon as feasible.

The McIndoes bypass was modified for smolt passage and testing was done in 2003 but we do not yet have the results. Similarly, smolt studies were done in 2003 on the Deerfield but results are not yet available.

### **Dam Removals**

Planning is underway for removing the West Swanzey Dam on the Ashuelot River. Preliminary discussions have begun to surrender the license and remove the first dam on the Ashuelot (Fiske Mill). Investigations of dam removal are underway at other sites including the Johns River and the First Branch of the White.

### **Other**

Entergy, the new owner of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Plant is proposing to relax thermal discharge limits that may impact anadromous fish migrations. Agency staff continues to review their proposal.

### **Salmon Studies Workgroup**

A total of 43 adult salmon was counted at fishways this year. All of the returns were from fry stocking as expected because of lack of smolt stocking the prior two years. Production of smolts from fry stocking as estimated from index station electrofishing surveys and the mark-recapture estimate at Cabot and Holyoke continues to be high but marine and/or estuarine survival continues to be much lower than previous years.

Four of the salmon captured at Holyoke were radio-tagged and released. Three of the four eventually passed back downstream of Holyoke and were recaptured at lower fishways and retained for brood stock. One was captured at Rainbow on the Farmington, one was captured at DSI on the Westfield and one was captured at Holyoke in the fall. The other salmon reached the Cabot area but passed back downstream and its current location is unknown.

The NU/GCC smolt mark-recapture estimate at Cabot and Holyoke resulted in a high estimate (80,000) but wide confidence intervals due to relatively low numbers of smolts marked and recaptured due to high flows. This is the second highest estimate in the time series but may not be truly higher. However the index station smolt data also showed high production in the habitat prior to migration.

Index site data collected this summer and fall have not been completely analyzed. MAFW was not able to do any index station assessments this year due to lack of seasonals. It appears that

densities of both young of the year and yearling parr are in the normal range throughout the basin and size/growth is above average due to the wet summer.

### **Shad Studies Workgroup**

A total of 287,000 shad were counted at Holyoke, down about 100,00 from last year. As previously mentioned, shad passage at Vernon and presumably at Turners Falls was very low. Shad counts also declined at DSI (2,800 to 1,700) and Rainbow (110 to 80) from last year. Blueback counts were very low again, only 1,400 passed Holyoke.

A total of 869 shad were trucked above Vernon, 1,000 were trucked to the Ashuelot and 850 shad were trucked to CT. Bluebacks were trucked to the Westfield (88) and Ashuelot (47) rivers.

### **Other**

The American eel management plan draft is still being worked on and should be ready for CRASC review sometime this winter.

The Connecticut River Migratory Fish Research Forum was held in February USFWS Regional Office. The forum had 9 research presentations, 3 poster exhibits, and 85 participants. We intend to hold another in winter/spring 2005.

## **4. Proposed Amendments to Existing Fishery Management Plans**

Ms. Rowan presented three amendments to existing CRASC fishery management plans for consideration and possible approval by the Commissioners. She provided background explaining the need for these changes: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) implemented a Fisheries Information System (FIS) a few years ago. This electronic reporting permits field stations to report accomplishments and propose field level projects for funding. The system has been evolving over time and is becoming increasingly important as a reporting tool. The Service is currently aligning this tool to better address funding and expenditure accountability within the context of the goals and objectives of existing fisheries management plans. In other words, projects that are clearly identified in plans will be considered competitive for funding. Thus it is very important to ensure that activities conducted by the Service are justified in existing, revised and/or new management plans.

The following amendments are proposed to the existing Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Commission (Commission) fisheries management plans to ensure that Commission priorities for cooperators are appropriately addressed:

### **Strategic Plan for the Restoration of Atlantic Salmon to the Connecticut River**

Add new strategy

Strategy 5.A.6. Continue population assessment and monitoring on those migratory fish populations in the Connecticut River that may impact salmon survival.

## **A Management Plan for American Shad in the Connecticut River Basin**

Add new Management Objectives:

H. Enhance and maintain shad access to historic habitat.

I. Enhance, restore and maintain shad habitat in the four-state basin.

## **CRASC Management Plan for Blueback Herring in the Connecticut River Basin**

Add new objectives:

6) Enhance, restore and maintain river herring habitat in the basin

7) Establish baseline genetic characterization of Connecticut River stocks of herring for use in developing management plans to guide trap and transport and other restoration activities

Discussion: Mr. Tisa proposed an additional amendment – that of editing the existing CRASC Management Plan for Blueback Herring in the Connecticut River Basin to include consideration of alewife such that all references to blueback herring would now read river herring, as appropriate.

Mr. Charlie Thoits motioned to approve the original amendments and the discussed modification. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bob Jones and approved by the Commission.

### **5. Update and Discussion about CRASC Congressional Initiative**

#### **Initiative Summary and Recommendations**

Mr. McInnes provided the following update on the CRASC Congressional Initiative – what has already happened, where the Commission is and where it is going with this initiative.

Mr. McInnes reiterated thanks to all who helped with the Initiative. He gave special recognition to Mr. Jim Carroll for his participation in the education program in Connecticut and for assistance throughout the initiative as an invaluable NGO, representing the Connecticut River Salmon Association. Mr. McInnes recognized and thanked Jim's brother, Mr. Pete Carroll, who used his contacts to help open doors for the Commission in Washington. Mr. McInnes thanked Ms. Rowan for the significant role that she played in anchoring and coordinating the effort.

Mr. McInnes also thanked the Commissioners, especially Mr. Parker, for both allowing and trusting the Committee to do what needed to be done. He acknowledged the Commissioners for providing assistance to the Committee and for supporting the Initiative directly when specific help was needed. The cooperative effort was critical to the success of the Initiative.

The Congressional Initiative ad hoc committee (McInnes, Carroll and Rowan) represented a mix of NGO, state and federal agencies. Committee members worked very well together. The individual Committee members started the process without experience or training. They met the challenge of a steep learning curve together. Their contributions were unique and complementary and, to an extent, interchangeable. The Committee adopted a strategy after consulting a number of people on what might work. Sometimes, the Committee received

conflicting guidance and information and, in those instances, the Committee stuck to its plan. Sometimes the Committee sat tight and waited patiently for results. The Committee met with a variety of people, including legislators and their staff in Washington and locally.

This process worked. The Committee has created name and sight recognition for the Commission in Washington. The basin legislators seem to have accepted that the Commission is the right entity for the job. And, the legislators believe that the Commission has a legitimate need. The Commission benefited from the Initiative in receiving the \$250,000 DOI allocation, a first ever in the history of the Program. The amount of funding is less than the Commission member agencies identified as the need and is only a one-year appropriation but it is a start in a process that the Commission needs to continue.

The existing ad hoc Committee has tentative plans to travel to Washington again in January 2004 to start the process all over again for 2005. A number of issues should be addressed. The Commission would benefit from knowing why its funding recommendations were reduced in Appropriations and in Conference. There is a concern that “hatcheries” carries a negative connotation in Washington though this is not an issue with legislative staff. There is a need to meet again with Ms. Loretta Beaumont. There is a concern that the Commission needs to give more voice to the diversity of its fisheries and fisheries restoration efforts rather than talking only about salmon – something identified by Senator Kerry’s staff and Representative Olver.

In the future, the Commission should consider the membership of this Committee in light of its recent success. The mix of state and federal representation in combination with an NGO has been ideal. Succession of membership to the Committee will be facilitated by the experience gained and retained by the current members. Consideration of concerns may justify additional membership on the Committee for specific assistance, like adding a public affairs specialist, for example, to help convey the Commission message more effectively. The Commission should convert the ad hoc Committee has a permanent standing Committee.

Mr. Carroll added his thoughts to the ad hoc Committee summary. He said that the three Committee members are very different people and yet they worked very well together. He indicated that Ms. Rowan was a good administrator and writer and that Mr. McInnes’ role on the Commission gave the Committee needed latitude. He reiterated that the Committee now had enough institutional knowledge to make this work in the future even if membership changes over time. He recommended that the Committee have permanence. Mr. Carroll suggested that the Committee meet with Mr. Bruce Evans during its next visit to Washington. He also said that he’d a lot of fun in the process!

Ms. Rowan agreed and further acknowledged that working on this Committee was a good experience because the three members functioned well as a team, producing a better result together than any could have done individually.

Discussion:

Mr. Rick Bennett pointed out that the partnership made the process work. He applauded the Commission on its efforts. He also agreed that there is concern about funding hatcheries in Washington and he thought that the key to dealing this was in the House with Loretta Beaumont.

Mr. Jones also applauded the effort. He indicated that Committee should have permanent status if that is appropriate. He acknowledged Mr. Carroll in particular pointing out that he was especially glad to have the Connecticut River Salmon Association involved. And, he asked if there were any technical or legal concerns about lobbying that the Commission and/or the Committee should address?

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Bennett to look into the legal question on how the Federal government views lobbying by non-profits. Mr. Bennett said that he would provide the Commission with regulations. He added that the Commission should not use the term "lobby" rather it should conduct outreach and education. It is important for the legislators to understand what the Commission does and how it is done so that they can support the Commission with the resources to do the job.

Mr. Jones moved that the ad hoc Committee continue the Congressional initiative beginning with the January meeting. Mr. Thoits seconded the motion and the Commission approved.

### **Allocating the Funds**

Next the discussion focused on how the Commission would allocate the \$250,000 in 2004. Mr. Jay McMenemy provided a summary of recommendations developed at an ad hoc meeting of the Technical Committee last week. The recommendations were designed to maximize fish returns in the future.

The fund total will be reduced by \$19,100 of non-negotiable overhead charges before it leaves Washington. No Regional reductions are expected. An listing of the charges follows:

0.64% - overall cut to federal budget voted by Conference Committee

1% - deferred allocation for the USFWS Director

3% - CAM or administrative cost

3% - Washington Office assessment

7.64% - expected overhead = \$19,100, leaving \$230,900

plus

5% - Region 5 assessment (may or may not be assessed) = \$12,500

Potential Total overhead = \$31,600, leaving \$218,400

The CRASC Technical Committee developed the following draft funding recommendations (highlighted in red font) for the \$250,000 allocation.

Fully Support USFWS Commitments

USFWS Funding	
USFWS Field Station	Activity Funded
Operations	Funding
<b>Pittsford NFH (VT)</b>	<b>1. Vaccine costs required for smolt production</b>
	2. Rehab Disinfection Facility for Safety <b>\$9K</b>
	<b>\$5K</b>
<b>White River NFH (VT)</b>	<b>1. 2 Temps (confirm what this will accomplish)</b>
	2. PIT tags for 2003 brood
	<b>3. Heated Water</b>
	<b>4. Genetic evaluation of returning brood stock and outmigrating smolts at USGS lab – 3,000 samples</b>
	<b>5. Use of chiller-fall2003</b>
	<b>6. PIT tags for 2004 brood stock</b>
	7. 10 Replacement Pool Covers
	<b>8. Replace egg incubation chiller</b>
	9. New UV unit for isolation incubation
	10. Rehab egg banks
	11. Spare well pump
	12. 10 Replacement Pool Covers
	<b>WRNFH total \$20K</b>
	<b>\$14K</b>
	<b><u>\$4K</u></b>
	<b><u>\$12K</u></b>
	<b>\$6K</b>
	<b>\$14K</b>
	<b>\$20K</b>
	<b>\$12K</b>
	<b>\$14K</b>
	<b>\$20K</b>
	<b>\$20K</b>
	<b>\$20K</b>
	<b>\$20K</b>
	<b>\$68</b>

---

**North Attleboro NFH (MA)** 1. Fish feed/drugs

SubTotal

2. Evaluation of Kelt Diet

Total

3. Produce 30,000 smolts (Can't do this year and maintain kelts. Possibility for next year with well development if Merrimack program does not use space.

4. Maintenance staff \$8K

\$8K

\$9K

\$17K

\$30K

\$75K

---

**Richard Cronin NSS (MA)** 1. PIT tags (confirm number needed)

2. Hormones for NANFH egg bank and RCNSS sea runs

SubTotal

~~3. Truck to haul CT sea runs (if WSS closes) (use CTDEP truck)~~

Total \$1K

\$2K

\$3K

\$35K

\$39K

---

**Sunderland FRO (MA)** 1. 1 Seasonal hires to stock fry, conduct field work

SubTotal

2. Baseline genetic characterization of CTR blueback herring

Total \$10K

\$10K

\$10K

\$30K

**Connecticut River Coordinator's Office (MA)** 1. Habitat Restoration - apply CRASC funds to project that will be completed in 2004

2. Invasive Species - a) Monitor X# lakes and ponds in MA and CT for spread of water chestnut, 2) Control water chestnut by hand pulling in X# ponds in MA and maybe CT; CRASC can provide nominal funding to SOCNFWR/New England Wildflower Society for this or supply in-kind/volunteer assistance for a limited number of sites

3. Invasive species - CRASC can supply the SOCNFWR water Chestnut fact sheet to all schools, probably at the cost of postage, or CRASC can develop its own aquatic nuisance species fact sheets for distribution

4. CRASC can complete the CRASC eel management plan, getting public input at a Tech Meeting? For the cost of printing the plan or offering it at a website

5. Claim habitat restoration work that is ongoing by the USFS \$2K

\$XX

\$XX

\$XX

\$XX

---

**Total** \$109K

Retain genetic variability, health and production of salmon to maximize returns

---

**State Funding**

---

**State Funded Activity Funded Operations Funded**

---

**Massachusetts** N/A \$XX

<b>Connecticut</b>	<del>Retain WSS for one more year, or</del> <del>If fill Andy's job filled with seasonal, save ~\$40K, or</del> If keep Ravita in program and have him serve as a rover - Maintain CTDEP capabilities to transport and manage sea run brood stock, spawning, egg banking, shad and herring management – relieve need for spare seasonal and truck at Cronin Joe goes to trout program – lose CTDEP capabilities to manage sea run brood stock, spawning, egg banking, shad and herring management or Hire seasonal – lose expertise, can truck fish but lose planning and other CTDEP capabilities that are valuable to the program\$200K \$160K  \$80K  \$0  \$10K
<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>Chiller at WSFH (check cost)\$12K</b>
<b>Vermont</b>	N/A\$XX
<b>Total</b>	\$92K

Improve accountability through evaluation monitoring and assessment

State Funding		
State Funded	Activity Funded	Operations Funded
<b>Massachusetts</b>	<b>Fishway Monitoring at Turners Falls and DSI</b> Index site assessment for salmon\$10K \$10K	
<b>Connecticut</b>	Evaluation work for eelpass at new eelpasses for ASMFC Evaluate improvements in herring run on Mill Brook – Mary Steube Fishway\$XX \$XX	
<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>Fishway Monitoring at Vernon and Bellows Fishways\$6K</b>	
<b>Vermont</b>	N/A\$XX	
<b>Total</b>	\$26K	

USFWS - \$109K  
State - \$118K  
Total - \$227K

With \$3900 for anticipated administrative costs including paid accounting/travel to DC, contingencies, and any additional costs.

Discussion:

Mr. Parker thanked Mr. McMenemy and the ad hoc Technical Committee members for developing the recommendations recognizing that it was not an easy task.

Mr. Tisa thanked Mr. McMenemy for the summary. He asked the Commission for additional time (two weeks) to review the recommendations since Mr. Wayne MacCallum was out of the country.

Mr. Bennett was agreeable to the delay and pointed out that the funds would not be available before January 2004 anyway. Additional time would also permit the potential funding recipients to consider how best to get the funds to where they need to go. And, it would provide an opportunity for further consideration of reporting and accounting requirements.

Mr. Parker said that the Commission was at an important cross roads with this decision. He agreed that more time was needed to evaluate the recommendations and related impacts. He was concerned about the potential intended and unintended impacts of closing the Whittemore Salmon Station. For example, closure of Whittemore Salmon Station would require the transfer of the remaining biologist to a trout hatchery because of other vacancy concerns in CT. He asked if this is this the message that the Commission wants to send to Congress now that Congress has provided some funding? Will there be a ripple affect within the state and/or elsewhere within MA or the program from reduced effort in Connecticut? Is there an advantage to retaining the Whittemore Salmon Station and closing the Richard Cronin National Salmon Station? Would this increase the likelihood of problems for the remaining salmon station in CT (Kensington).

Mr. Jones did not think that closing the Whittemore Salmon Station would send the wrong message to Congress since there is a gap between what the Commission identified as its needs and what Congress funded.

Mr. Parker acknowledged that the closure could be described as a better use of limited resources but pointed out that the facility is in Representative Johnson's district and that she had been supportive of the Initiative. He reiterated that he fears losing support and noted that there is a constituent base in CT that does not see benefits from the anadromous fish restoration program.

Mr. Tisa pointed out that Mr. MacCallum is strong supporter of this program. He then motioned that the Technical Committee review the priorities, with additional Commission guidance to look at the bigger picture, and develop potential alternatives. Mr. Perry seconded the motion and added a charge that the Technical Committee should define the outcomes of the funded actions. All agreed that the review and subsequent approval by the Commission are needed very soon and should be completed as early in December as possible. The motion was approved.

Mr. Bennett added that the Commission could impact the total available funding since the USFWS Director has a discretionary fund that is distributed to projects later in the year (this represents 1% of the Washington overhead but could yield a greater percentage back to the Commission if the Director chooses). The Region as well as State Directors can be influenced in this decision of the Director in this process.

#### **6. Commission Officers and Staff**

The CRASC Statement of Practices and Procedures says that officers shall serve for one year and may be re-elected. Mr. Parker was selected as Chair and Mr. MacCallum was selected as Vice Chair of the Commission in January 2002. Mr. Lee Perry motioned to re-elect Mr. Parker. Mr. Thoits seconded the motion and the Commission approved not just Mr. Parker but also Mr. MacCallum in an election double-header.

Discussion on the possible election of a Secretary/Treasurer was postponed until the next CRASC meeting to permit the Commissioners to consider past practices as well as pertinent portions of the Statement of Practices and Procedures.

#### **7. Other Business**

An ad hoc team of Technical Committee members and Commissioners will meet the week of December 1, 2003 to review funding recommendations with a follow-up meeting of the Commissioners on December 8, 2003 to make final decisions.

Official CRASC meetings are scheduled for January 26, 2004 and October 18, 2004.

Mr. Thoits moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Jones seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at noon.

**CRASC Meeting Attendance**  
**November 18, 2003**

Janice Rowan	USFWS
Ed Parker	CTDEP
Rick Bennett	USFWS
Paul Pajak	USFWS
Thomas D. Menard	MA Public Representative
Mark Tisa	MAFW
Duncan McInnes	NHFG
Lee Perry	NHFG
Charlie Thoits	NH Public Representative
Caleb Slater	MAFW
Darleen Cutting	USFWS
Phil Herzig	USFWS
Darren Desmarais	USFWS
Jay McMenemy	VTFW
Eric Palmer	VTFW
Peter Basta	VT Public Representative
Robert Jones	CT Public Representative
Dan Call	Westfield River Watershed Association
Rick Jacobson	CTDEP
John Warner	USFWS
Jim Carroll	Connecticut River Salmon Association
Steve Gephard	CTDEP
Mickey Novak	USFWS
Gabe Gries	NHFG
Aaron Martin	USFWS Volunteer
Jim Ostrowski	Concerned Resident
Ken Gillette	USFWS