ASSOCIATION OF
MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
30TH ANNUAL MEETING

JULY 8,9, 1963

COLUMBUS, OHIO
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

Members

Colorado
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Manitoba
Michigan

Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
North Dakota
Ohio
Ontario
South Dakota
Wisconsin

1963 Officers

Hayden W. Olds-----------------------------President
Lester P. Voigt-----------------------------Vice-President
Carl L. Mosley, Jr.------------------------Secretary-Treasurer
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday Morning, July 8, 1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements, Hayden W. Olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Ohio, Benjamin Pierce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Pheasant Council Report, Robert Chambers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Technical Dove Committee Report, Kenneth Johnson</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Report; Dove, Tom Evans</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Public Works Progress, John R. Langenbach</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin’s Outdoor Recreation Act Program, Walter E. Scott</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund Progress, A. Heaton Underhill</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Conservation and Development, Frank C. Edminster</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense Fish and Wildlife Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the New Outdoor Recreation Concept, Eugene A. Oren</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Conservation on Corps of Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Control Projects, Harold L. Blakey</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday Morning, July 9, 1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer’s Report, Carl L. Mosley, Jr.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-State Relations Committee appointed</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-Aid Committee Report, Wilbur Bolt</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation Committee Report, George Moore</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Farm Program, Willard Barbee</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl Situation, Art Hawkins</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Committee Report, Tom Evans</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolutions Committee Report, Larry Gale</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule-Klamath Resolution</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing Committee Report, Woodrow Fleming</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations Committee Report, Carl L. Mosley, Jr.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Past Meeting Places and Officers</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Roster</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30th Annual Meeting
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners
Columbus, Ohio

Monday Morning - July 8, 1963

PRESIDENT OLDS: Gentlemen, I am pleased to call to order the thirtieth annual meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. My part in the program will be to provide some announcements. In the interest of saving time and my throat, I am going to leave more time for some of the participants. There are some announcements of importance: In registering, we called to your attention two scheduled luncheons, one this noon and one tomorrow noon. We are committed to the hotel to participate in these luncheons as our payment for the use of their meeting rooms. If you can do so, stay for both luncheons. This afternoon transportation will be provided to the Southeast Conservation Club. We can accommodate all of you by the Division bus. If you intend to drive your own car, there are maps at the desk. The Club is five miles from the hotel. We are certainly grateful to the Southeast Conservation Club for the courtesy.

For the information of committees, Room 800 is available to you. It is composed of several rooms with comfortable seats. The key for the rooms is at the desk.

I certainly want to express appreciation to the League of Ohio Sportsmen who entertained us last night in Room 147. If you did not participate in their hospitality last night, you can tonight. After the fish fry, we are returning you to the hotel about 8 or 8:30. There are other things you can do on your own. We are suggesting the Scioto Downs. We have been providing transportation by state cars but not to the race track. A bus runs there from the Greyhound Bus Station from 7 to 7:30 or a taxi can take you out. Tickets from the registration desk will get you into the grounds—from there you are on your own.

If you desire a field trip for tomorrow afternoon, we can provide you a guide.

I want to express a few more thanks to Mr. Mosley and others who worked with him on the arrangements; especially Mrs. Jane Cooksey. I am sorry that there aren't more women and children here since there is a specially prepared program for them.

I will close my remarks with one more thing: Following noon luncheon tomorrow, a commercial dealer will have in the lobby a machine which dispenses hunting and fishing licenses. I haven't seen it but it sounds like something that will be of interest. I imagine it is on the order of the machines that sell life insurance at airports.

Governor Rhodes has instituted a policy of having his cabinet meet with him
in various cities of the state. Today, they are meeting in Toledo and Fred Morr is at that meeting. Speaking in his behalf this morning will be Ben Pierce. Mr. Pierce has been a close companion and thinks in the same manner as the Director so I am pleased to introduce Mr. Ben Pierce, Assistant Director of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

WELCOME TO OHIO
by Benjamin Pierce

President Olds, officers, members and guests of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. Governor Rhodes, the people of Ohio and the Department of Natural Resources take pleasure in welcoming you to Buckeyeland. Not since 1948 have you met here and we consider it a good omen that you are in Columbus again just as we embark on a broad new program of conservation and outdoor recreation.

Conservation has been a super-charged word in Ohio this spring. The Administration fully realizes the importance of natural resources to our spiritual, physical and economic well being. That basic resources are vital to our livelihood is certainly widely recognized. Land, water and minerals are the building blocks of conservation. But there is a growing realization in Ohio, and elsewhere, that the song of a Carolina wren, a leaping bass and a shady trail through a woodland are also "resources," and we all will be vastly poorer if we lose them. Hunting and fishing play a large part in the growing outdoor recreation picture of today, and one of the knotty problems we face is how to finance a lengthy list of outdoor activities on so-called wildlife lands and waters.

One of the exciting things to us is that acquisition of park lands and reservoir sites is being accelerated in Ohio at this crucial time. We expect to provide outdoor recreational opportunities for our own growing population, for future Ohioans and for visitors who travel through the state. Furthermore, we expect to help attract new industry and jobs into Ohio by offering as much fun in the sun and resource management as hard work and detailed planning can produce. Natural resources are not on the sidelines here, but have won a place on the first team. And I promise you that we'll earn our letter before the season's over.

In welcoming you to Ohio, I should have warned you that you have come to a conservation hot spot. But since game and fish administrators are used to being under fire, I trust that you are not gun-shy. We really are forging ahead here--spearheading if you please. "But how can you," I've been asked, "when the statistics are so gloomy?"

We accept the statistics as a challenge, and in doing so we face problems that you people from other states will have in the future. Ohio, in reality, is a conservation frontier.

Let me set the stage a little. You are sitting this morning near the center of a rather small state; 35th in rank of the 50 states. Yet, 10 million people call this state home, making us fifth in population. Not only do we have people, but
we are third in industry and 12th in agriculture. The statisticians say there are 236 people per square mile, with bordering states averaging 141.

In this county, the metropolitan area of Columbus, live nearly 750,000 people--more than the individual populations of several western states. Why do I emphasize these figures? Because Aldo Leopold defined conservation as "Man in harmony with land." We must work harmoniously with more people on less land than nearly anywhere on this continent.

To take up the challenge of conservation in Ohio, we need tools. And the General Assembly that has just concluded its 105th session has given us some. The Department of Natural Resources has itself been streamlined to keep in step with the changing times. I mention this change proudly, for I think it is a further refinement of a Department that has been accepted far and wide as model resource organization. There is no need to go into details, but all forms of outdoor recreation will receive the added emphasis that I mentioned earlier, and resource management, particularly water, will continue at its already-accelerated pace.

Another tool is money, and we have good reason to believe that considerable additional funds will be available for our work. In November, Ohioans will have the opportunity of voting for a constitutional amendment to issue $250 million in bonds for capital improvements. Of this amount, $25 million would go to the Department of Natural Resources to assist in the development of the state by acquiring lands for water impoundment sites, park and recreational uses and conservation of natural resources.

This is another example of the outdoor awareness that is in the air these days. Governor Rhodes has said that the $25 million would "get Ohio moving in the direction of providing impoundment of water--the lifeblood of business and industry and a vital element of outdoor recreation." He also foresees the "strong possibility of federal matching of these funds."

Ohio citizens played an important part in sparking this financing program, and a similar group would certainly hold promise in other states seeking additional revenues. The Citizens Committee for Ohio Parks and Water Development is an 89-member body composed of men prominent in conservation, business and agriculture. We expect favorable reaction at the polls this fall, for no new taxes are involved.

Another legislative action of importance was the passage of three bills dealing with watershed conservancy districts. We believe in the watershed concept of water management, and that any movement in this direction is real progress.

Legislative tools are often not spectacular. Take the case of changing the word "of" to "in," which was done this past session. The word has to do with the waters where a fishing license is required to fish. Formerly, you needed a license to fish "in water OF the state." The courts decided that this meant in state-owned or state-controlled waters. Now you need a license to fish "in waters IN in state," with some exclusions such as farm ponds. This will have an important effect on future license sales in Ohio, and we consider it a valuable tool for our work.
The Department may now let its own contracts, by way of new legislation, which may not seem like a big point. But it will streamline and speed-up the development of state property, and give us more control as construction progresses. Believe me, this is a big one.

What might be termed an experimental tool, is the law that broadened an existing statute dealing with the issuance of revenue bonds. They now may be issued to acquire land AND develop it with the repayment coming from park admission fees and facility use fees.

There are other tools given us by the General Assembly, including a restricted channel law for streams to prevent additional flood damage, and a system for construction permits for dams 10 feet or more high.

In 13 years our park attendance has increased from 3 million visits annually to 20 million. To accommodate these, we now have nearly 12,000 picnic tables instead of 500; 135 vacation cabins and three lodges instead of 35 cabins. Campsites were not counted in 1950, but we had a little over 60,000 campers that year. In 1962 we had 784,000 campers.

Here are a few more recent resource highlights: state cooperation and participation in the topographic mapping of Ohio, all or part of 23 counties are now covered by modern soils maps, we have one of the model strip mine reclamation laws in the nation, all 18 water drainage basins in the state have inventory reports either completed or in progress, ground water maps of the entire state are now in manuscript form, Ohio has been a leader in watercraft licensing and standardizing markers, there has been clear-cut cooperative progress up and down the valley in cleaning up the Ohio River, and the Department of Health has a similar story to tell on inland streams and along Lake Erie.

Permit me to name just a few more that will perhaps interest you: liberalized fishing—the first state to open up completely; a statewide, either sex deer season, after 40 years of no hunting; quail hunting after a nearly 50 year closure; reintroduction of wild turkeys with a possible open season in 1965; an open beaver trapping season; a predator fish stocking program that has brought good angling for trophy species—muskies, northern pike and walleyes; and multiple-use—some say this word was coined here—as a planning guide throughout the Department.

These are but a few that we could list, and I bring them to your attention only to show that recent history gives us basis for hope and optimism. There is no room for defeatism in conservation today or ever. Challenges have been met in the past, and we are meeting them today. Progress has been made in the past, and we are making progress today.

But this is not a singular battle. We offer whatever knowledge and experience that we have in addition to our hospitality here today. It is our hope that you will profit by your meeting in Ohio, for be assured that we will profit from your being here. We are going to listen and make notes and use your ideas every way we can. In the name of conservation in each of the states and Provinces of Canada that you
represent, we wish your meeting God speed.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLDS: Thank you, Mr. Pierce. I shall report to Fred Morr that you represented him very well indeed.

During the last Ohio Wildlife Council meeting, I stated that I might be a little embarrassed if some of our members did not show up at these meetings when it came to our own home state. You will pardon me if I introduce three of these people: Mr. Leonard Yochum, a past member of the Council; Dr. Joe Cross; and Mr. Norman A. Amstutz, who was with us last evening and who many of you met.

So far this has been an all-Ohio show and you'll have to bear with us a little longer. On your program the next report deals with the Midwest Pheasant Council. Mr. Sandfort could not be here so I have asked Mr. Robert Chambers, a biologist with our Department to present the report.

MR. CHAMBERS: I am giving this as the Ohio representative to the Midwest Pheasant Council. Mr. Sandfort expected to have a report for each of you but they are somewhere between here and Fort Collins, Colorado. If they arrive sometime between now and tomorrow afternoon, we will see that each of you receives a copy.

MIDWEST PHEASANT COUNCIL REPORT
by Wayne W. Sandfort

The Midwest Pheasant Council was authorized by your Association on June 11 and 12, 1957, and our organizational meeting followed in Madelia, Minnesota on January 14 and 15, 1958. During the five and one-half years that the Council has been active, we have held meetings in Minnesota, Ohio, Ontario, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Colorado and Michigan. Important segments of the midwest pheasant range have been observed and the management problems characteristic of each have been thoroughly reviewed. Additional discussion, planning, coordination and conduct of pheasant research and management studies, relating to all sections of our pheasant range, have been a major aim and function of our organization. Dissemination of information to you, the administrators, has been a principal goal, and over 15 technical reports, as well as minutes of annual meetings, and reports of past chairmen have been distributed. A list of these will be forwarded soon by our Council secretary, Dr. Eugene Klonglan, Iowa. Plans are being made to have copies of past reports available upon request.

The purpose of this report is to summarize our activities and accomplishments of the past year. It should be pointed out here that these activities have not resulted solely from guidance of the original Constitution and By-laws, but in part from your recent suggestions. At our meeting in Fort Collins in April 1962, Director Harry Woodward questioned the adequacy of Council reports. He suggested that we consider
four main points: (1) taking a greater part in the drafting of actual hunting regulations, considering both the game and public relations, (2) tailoring pheasant management to the all-important Federal farm programs and determining how to produce as well as harvest birds, (3) intensifying studies on pheasant ecology and biology, including investigations of winter mortality and winter feeding and, (4) disseminating more information, particularly in brief reports. Assistant Director for Research in Colorado, Mr. Laurence Riordan, suggested that we develop breeding and late-season population status reports along with season recommendations, to provide a picture of the range-wide population status. At our meeting in Michigan in April 1963, Dr. Justin Leonard pointed out the value of coordinating research studies and the importance of publishing data derived therefrom. This is the kind of direction the Council desires, and we need and solicit additional suggestions for our activities from each of you.

Following our Fort Collins meeting, questionnaires were distributed for the purpose of gathering information on spring breeding populations, and, later, the fall population status and hunting season recommendations. Through the excellent cooperation of Council members, range-wide data were assembled, and you received these status reports during the past year. It is impossible to prepare the fall population report and distribute it in time to be of greatest value in formulation of hunting season regulations. Despite this, the consensus of opinion at our recent meeting in Michigan, was that this information was useful in comparing the situation in any specific state or province with the range-wide status. Mr. Vic Janson, the current Council chairman, is proceeding with preparation of the 1963 spring population status report which will be available shortly. In the way of a preliminary, unofficial report from our Michigan meeting, all states and provinces in the Midwest indicated that normal or below normal pheasant losses occurred during the past winter and all were optimistic regarding 1963 population prospects.

Several interim committees were active prior to our Michigan meeting. Mr. Carl Wolfe, Nebraska, brought Mr. Phil Agee's original report on "A summary of Pheasant Hunting Seasons in the Midwest, 1958" up to date and distributed this material at the annual meeting. His findings show that season lengths have become more liberal, with an average length of 11 days in 1950 and 35 days in 1962. During the same period, the average bag and possession limits have not changed significantly. There has been an impressive increase in non-resident license sales from 1954 through 1960. During this seven-year period, non-resident license sales rose 66 per cent; resident license sales increased only four per cent. An average of 8.9 hours was required to bag a pheasant in 1954, but only 4.3 hours were required in 1961. While 54 per cent of the member states harvested hens some year during the 1940's, only two states, Kansas and Ohio, now permit the harvest of hens with certain restrictions.

Mr. Dick Nomsen, Iowa, continued his review of Federal land retirement programs during 1962, and presented a brief report at our meeting in Michigan. He pointed out the importance of including provisions in land retirement programs which insure that sufficient, undisturbed cover exists during the nesting season.

Free interchange of research ideas among Council members was provided
at our April meeting in Michigan through special reports on current research. These included:

1. Influence of various dietary levels of calcium on the physiology and egg-production in the female pheasant with special reference to osteoporosis in the female pheasant (Glenn Chambers, Missouri).

2. Value of wing and foot collections in pheasant management (Bob Chessness, Minnesota).

3. Comparative results from varied pheasant census techniques (Carl Trautman, South Dakota).

4. Rhythmic pheasant population fluctuations in South Dakota (Bob Dahlgren).


Detailed information given on all of these studies will be included in the minutes of the Michigan meeting, which will be mailed in the near future. Of particular interest was Bob Dahlgren's report which indicates that pheasant populations are cyclic, with highs occurring every third year. His report also shows that relatively high pheasant losses, compared with other periods, occur from late summer to the first of the year. Maynard Nelson reported that predator control has resulted in benefit to pheasant populations and hunter success, but that the expense of such activity, from a management standpoint, is probably prohibitive.

In addition to current research reported at the Michigan meeting, Mr. Vic Janson, current Council chairman, is preparing a summary of all current pheasant research projects in the Midwest which will be distributed soon.

The effect of pesticides on pheasant populations was discussed briefly, and all agreed that we should keep abreast of current studies. A committee including Mr. William Anderson, Illinois Natural History Survey (Chairman), and Mr. Harold Swope, Colorado Game and Fish Department, was appointed to summarize investigations in this field, and to point out specific problems that should be brought to the attention of the Council and the Midwest Association.

One of the highlights of our annual meeting was a panel discussion on "Hen Pheasant Shooting." Hen pheasants were legal game last fall in the Province of Ontario, and in the states of California, Utah, Montana and Kansas. Although this practice does not appear to be harmful to pheasant populations in some portions of their range, it was the feeling of the group that we cannot as yet recommend a common, widespread practice of legal hen harvest. The Midwest Pheasant Council suggests that hen seasons be established only if they are part of a well-conceived experimental research program, designed to determine the actual, immediate and long-range effects of this practice.

Considerable discussion at our meeting in Michigan pertained to the development
of proposals or resolutions relating to significant problems and controversial
issues in pheasant management. We felt that such material would be a major
contribution from our group and would aid you in making administrative decisions
on the management of this resource. Mr. Robert Dahlgren, South Dakota, was
appointed as sessional chairman on resolutions. Members of his committee are
Mr. Ed Ginn, Indiana, and Dr. Eugene Klonglan.

One of the main considerations of the resolutions committee was a "Proposal
for Changes in Federal Land-Conversion Programs to Benefit Pheasants and other
Wildlife Species," developed by Mr. C. D. Besadny. This proposal was prepared
following considerable effort and experience by Mr. Besadny in attempts to establish
a pilot project in Wisconsin under the new Federal Land-Conversion Program.
Following modification, the proposal was unanimously adopted by our group. A
copy has been given to your Resolutions Committee. Ideas in this proposal have
received the attention of the Western Association of Game and Fish Commissioners
who adopted the proposal, in resolution form, at their recent annual meeting in
Tucson.

Since our annual meeting, our committee has prepared a resolution on
"Pheasant Hunting Season Recommendations" which has been reviewed and adopted
by all Council members. This document has also been presented to your Resolutions
Committee for consideration.

The preceding represents a summary of our activities during the past year.
We hope the information presented herein, and the related reports and material,
will be of value to you.

Our recent annual meeting was marked by fine Michigan hospitality, enthusiasm
and perfect attendance. Council work is continuing under the leadership of Mr. Vic
Janson; Chairman; Mr. Carl Trautman, Vice-Chairman; and Dr. Eugene Klonglan,
Secretary. Our next annual meeting is scheduled for South Dakota in April 1964, and
all are eagerly looking forward to this meeting and to the work ahead.

PRESIDENT OLDS: Thank you very much, Robert. I think this paper
illustrates the reason why we have the states organized into regional groups. There
are some that do not have pheasants as game birds, but every one of you should be
quite interested in this paper. The Council is to be complimented on this study.

We are quite a bit ahead of schedule and we have time now for comments from
the floor. If there are no comments, we will proceed with the next report. Bob,
I want you to listen carefully to this paper as I am going to have to leave. We worked
for thirty some years to get quail shooting back in Ohio and now we are trying to get
dove. We have put a bill in every legislature but nothing has resulted.

After the next speaker, there will be a coffee break and then Mr. Voigt will
call the meeting to order.

MR. VOIGT: Thank you, Hayden. I have very little to do but introduce the
next speaker. The dove is equally important as the pheasant so we are now going
to hear from the Chairman of the Midwest Technical Dove Committee, Mr. Ken Johnson.

**MIDWEST TECHNICAL DOVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

by Ken Johnson

A 25-page committee report dated June 1963 has been prepared and there are copies here for each of you. Here are a few highlights of that report.

The formation of the Midwest Technical Dove Committee was accomplished in 1961. A report of the first year's activities was presented at the 29th annual meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners on June 28, 1962. Activities for the first year consisted primarily of getting the committee organized and determining what projects should be undertaken.

Three projects were given priority. They were: (1) Randomizing dove call-count routes, (2) Dove disease studies, and (3) Banding of late summer free-flying doves.

Six states have been selected to have the dove call-count routes randomized in 1963. They are as follows: Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The randomized routes have been selected through the cooperation of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the states involved. The routes will be run during 1963. Both the previous years' routes plus the randomized routes will be covered in 1963 to provide a comparison in results with past years.

Collection of throat swab samples from nestlings and trapped doves for disease studies will again be carried on in 1963. As in past years, the throat swabs will be sent to the Patuxent Research Center for examination. *Trichomoniasis gallinae* has been found in doves throughout their range. Parent birds can infect nestlings by way of the pigeon milk. There is evidence that many nestlings succumb to this disease. There also is evidence that this disease is transmitted among older birds.

Late summer banding of free-flying doves will be conducted by various member states. Emphasis will be placed on this phase of banding by several states.

Several independent studies were carried out by various member states. The results of these studies are reported on for the purpose of bringing the information to the attention of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. They include "Mourning Dove Migration Patterns in Colorado" by Wayne Sandfort; "Wisconsin's Winter Mourning Dove Survey of January 1962" by Jim Hale; "Some Relationships Between Mourning Dove Production and Levels of Trichomonad Infection" by John M. Allen, as well as studies conducted by the Cooperative Wildlife Research Units in Colorado, Iowa, and Missouri.

Unsuccessful attempts were made to enact dove hunting legislation in five of the nine midwestern non-dove hunting states. The dove was given song bird status
in one state.

This report was made possible through the assistance and cooperation of various state and federal agencies. The writer is indebted to these persons for their assistance and quick response to questionnaires.

MR. JOHNSON: I did not attend the meeting in Washington, but Mr. Tom Evans did and he will present a report from that meeting.

MR. EVANS: Before I begin I would like to comment that the Mourning Dove is highly important to some of the states but not to all. There are only six states out of 14 who do not hunt the Mourning Dove. I might just say that the data for 1963 that there was a somewhat greater drop in the hunting states than in the non-hunting states as compared with just the opposite in 1962. This thing can vary from year to year in the two categories.

The opening date cannot be changed unless there is a change in the treaty. It can be set back to a later date—that is where the pressure is. It has been delayed to October 1. I can assure you there was some mighty erroneous information presented by members of the bird lover groups. Some were so far off it was ridiculous. When they talk about killing doves in September: During the fourth nesting period, August 5 to September 20, less than two per cent of the total nesting effort occurred during that period. Even going up that early, only two per cent or less of the total nesting effort was found. This shows little justification of this argument. Finally, you are shooting flock doves and the few birds that are nesting are not bothered.

As to the proposed regulations—the season runs from September 1 to January 15. The United States is broken down into four management units. We are concerned with two of these—the Eastern and the Central Units. For the Eastern Management Unit in Illinois and Kentucky, the population is down about four per cent from last year which is not considered significant. On that basis, it was proposed that shooting hours remain the same from 12 noon to sunset, that the season consist of 70 consecutive half-days or three periods of not more than 70 half-days total, and that bag and possession be changed from 12 and 24 to 10 and 20.

For the Central Management Unit—I don’t recall what the drop in population was. For some it was considerably more than in the Eastern Unit. Illinois indicated an increase. The proposed season is 60 consecutive full days, with the exception of Texas which has their own restrictions, or three periods totaling not more than 60 full days; bag 10 and possession 20. Shooting hours—one-half hour before sunrise to sunset. I think those are the only ones in which we are interested here.

I think the one thing we have to concern ourselves with is getting all the information to counteract these groups who are trying to close the season because of the supposed effect on the Mourning Doves. I think we are fortunate that they are
trying to hang their hat on the Mourning Dove itself. There were people at the meeting who had some pretty strong statements. The Audubon Society itself introduced no objections; however, it seemed the better part of discretion to accept a minor reduction since very few hunters bag the limit anyway.

MR. VOIGT: Thank you Tom and Ken. We are still ahead of schedule—is there any discussion.

--- There was an eleven per cent decrease in the Central Unit this year over last. This is pretty significant since only five states out of the midwest hunt doves, the most sought after game animal in the United States. I think we are going to have to be on guard against the growing strength of the preservation leagues in the country if we are concerned about the future in hunting. Here is an area where we can go to work to see that doves remain or get on the open list in our states where they are closed.

MR. VOIGT: It has been suggested that this would be a good time for picture taking.

MR. MOORE: Could the Legislative Committee meet with me at about 8 tonight in Room 340.

MR. VOIGT: Any other announcements? If not, we will adjourn to the display exhibits for pictures and then return at 10 for coffee. The meeting will resume at 10:15.

After the coffee break

MR. VOIGT: Members of the Association, I think that we have a very interesting session. There are a number of very important last minute announcements that we can disclose here. I am starting right on time as I am anticipating there will be a number of questions at the conclusion of the remaining reports. We want to keep this as informal as we can. The next speaker is a friend of mine. I can attest to his ability on the topic as he has unraveled many of the problems connected with the Public Works Act on which he will speak. I am hoping he will unravel some of these problems for you today. I am delighted to introduce my friend, John Langenbach, Regional Supervisor of the Branch of Federal Aid, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, who will speak on the Accelerated Public Works Program.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM
by John R. Langenbach

Public Law 87-658 of the 87th Congress was signed by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962, and was entitled "Public Works Acceleration Act." This Act authorized to be appropriated by the Congress not to exceed $900,000,000. The President to allocate such funds to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in "eligible areas." "Eligible areas" were to be determined by the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce and are briefly described as follows:
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5a areas - Determined by the severity of the rates of unemployment and the duration of such employment.

5b areas - Determined by the income levels of families. These are normally rural areas.

LS areas - Areas of relatively continuous substantial employment.

The President was authorized to initiate work projects in "eligible areas" by allocating appropriated funds to the head of agencies of the Federal Government administering approved grant-in-aid programs, and some funds to be used as direct Federal expenditures where they could alleviate unemployment.

In October 1962 the Congress appropriated $400,000,000 of the authorized $900,000,000 to be obligated in Fiscal Year 1963. Congressional leaders also indicated that should the program be executed efficiently they would consider appropriating additional money not to exceed $500,000,000 for obligation during the next fiscal year. The Department of Commerce was assigned overall responsibility for administering the Accelerated Public Works Program.

All State Fish and Game Departments were contacted promptly. Lack of detail on the use of the funds and many other facets brought on by the short notice proved to be a handicap. Consequently, only two states indicated they would be in a position to accept some of this money. Accordingly, Illinois was apportioned $500,000 and Wisconsin $30,000. Wisconsin promptly submitted documents for a project in Iron County which was the first state Grant-In-Aid Accelerated Public Works project approved in the country. Approval was granted on November 21, 1962, for 75% Federal participation. This was the only Accelerated Public Works project approved at this ratio of participation, as in early December 1962 the Acting Secretary of Commerce advised that all future projects must be held to 50% Federal participation.

In mid December 1962 details for administering the Accelerated Public Works grant-in-aid program with the State Fish and Game Departments were prepared through the cooperation of personnel of the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Department of Commerce. Through these groups a formula was prepared by which the respective states became eligible for a portion of the funds to be allocated for use in this grant-in-aid program. The formula to be utilized in the apportionment of funds was as follows:

1. $10,000 to be apportioned to each State and Territory.

2. The remainder of the allocation to be apportioned on the basis of
   (a) 65% on the ratio of the number of unemployed persons in the eligible areas of each state to the total number of unemployed persons in the eligible areas of all the states and
(b) 35% on the ratio of the number of 5(b) areas in each state to the total number of 5(b) areas in all the states.

3. Not more than 10% of the allocation will be apportioned to any one state.

In mid January 1963, the President authorized $6,000,000 to be used by the State Fish and Game Departments under the General regulations of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act. On January 16, 1963, Secretary Udall wrote to all states advising them of the program and on January 17, 1963, Director Janzen wrote to all states.

Director Janzen's letter transmitted the following material:

1. A tabulation of apportionments of Accelerated Public Works funds to each state and territory.


4. Publication entitled "Maximum Grant-In-Aid for Eligible Areas." Department of Commerce, October 1962, with Supplement No. 1 dated December 1962.

5. A copy of Public Law 87-658, the Public Works Acceleration Act.


During the next several weeks, all states in this Region were contacted and the procedures and ground rules for using these Accelerated Public Works Program funds were discussed. The various documents submitted with Mr. Janzen's letter were reviewed and where clarification was necessary, the Washington Office of this Bureau was contacted.

Specific enabling legislation by the State Legislature was not necessary for use of Accelerated Public Works Program funds because the Accelerated Public Works Act specifically permits activities under the jurisdiction of the two Federal Aid Acts on which enabling legislation has already been passed by the states.

The first apportionment of the $6,000,000 was made to the respective states and territories on the basis cited above except that Illinois was not apportioned additional funds. However, specific deadlines for obligation were established as follows:

1. All states must advise the Secretary of Interior within 30 days of the receipt of the apportionment notice whether they could use, in an "eligible area," none, any or all of the amount apportioned on a 50-50 State-Federal matching basis.
2. The amount that the state indicated it could use must be obligated by approval of a Project Agreement by April 1, 1963.

3. The amount any state indicated it could use and the amount not obligated by April 1, 1963, would be pooled and reapportioned to those states indicating they could use additional money for obligation by June 30, 1963.


5. Any funds not spent by June 30, 1965, will revert to the United States Treasury.

There were some variations in the procedures for apportionments as some states continued to return funds to the Secretary. This resulted in apportionments being made to some states in this Region on January 17, March 1, April 19, May 15, and June 10, 1963.

One of the problems encountered by many states was the mandatory certification which stated "The non-Federal expenditures involved in this project represent a net increase in the total amount planned and budgeted for capital improvements (exclusive of land acquisition) by the State of______ for the current fiscal year." This statement had to be signed by a state official outside of the Fish and Game Department. It could be the State Treasurer, State Finance Officer, State Budget Director, etc. There were two instances in this Region where the Governor's signature was accepted. The reasoning behind this certification was that the Department of Commerce believed that an official acquainted with the total Accelerated Public Works Program in the state should be in a better position to make this certification. He should know the status of all Accelerated Public Works funds allocated in the state, including those apportioned directly for use by the State Fish and Game Departments. Some State Officers were hesitant about certifying, but explanation from the Regional Office removed major doubts and the certifications were signed.

Documentation of the Accelerated Public Works Program projects were to be under the same format as that used for Fish and Wildlife Restoration projects. In addition to the standard documentation, the following information was also required in project documentation:

1. The estimated man-years of employment for the project.

2. The project cost per man-year.

3. The estimated starting time in weeks after approval of the Project Agreement.

4. The estimated completion date.

5. A listing of the "eligible areas" (usually a county), the category (5a, 5b, LS), the estimated cost in each, and the Congressional District for the area.

The states in this Region were apportioned a total of $2,349,958. Some states
were unable to obligate the funds apportioned in accordance with the stipulated
time table and advised the Secretary accordingly. Three states in this Region,
Iowa, Ohio and South Dakota, indicated that they could not use any of their
apportionment. In addition, Indiana, Missouri, Nebraska and North Dakota
returned portions of their apportionment. The total amount returned was $485,383
leaving a balance of $1,864,575 obligated by eight states.

Inability to obligate funds was not because the state did not have opportunities
to use the money, but in most instances, because the number of eligible areas, as
prescribed under the formula, were limited, or the state did not have any holdings
within an eligible area. In addition, some states lacked the matching money to carry
out the program. After all there was little logic in obligating Accelerated Public
Works funds on a 50% Federal reimbursement basis when insufficient matching
money was available to obligate the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration
funds at 75% reimbursement.

Table 1 indicates the status of the 1963 Accelerated Public Works Program
for the eleven states in this Region.

**TABLE 1**

**STATUS OF ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM**

**GRANT-IN-AID FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE**

**JUNE 30, 1963**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Apportioned</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Balance to Obligate</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>$ 589,551</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
<td>$ 589,551</td>
<td>$ 589,551</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>152,637</td>
<td>128,737</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>17,138</td>
<td>17,138</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>790,298</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>790,298</td>
<td>790,298</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>175,035</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>175,035</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>209,842</td>
<td>114,840</td>
<td>95,002</td>
<td>95,039</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>64,412</td>
<td>41,412</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. D.</td>
<td>13,170</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>163,698</td>
<td>163,698</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>12,888</td>
<td>12,888</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisc.</td>
<td>161,289</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>161,289</td>
<td>161,261</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,349,958</td>
<td>$485,383</td>
<td>$1,864,575</td>
<td>$1,864,549</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As you have been advised, additional funds under the Accelerated Public Works Program have been apportioned to the states on the same formula as that used for the first appropriation. The President signed the "Supplemental Appropriation Act - 1963" (P. L. 88-25) on May 17, 1963. This act apportioned $450,000,000 of the $500,000,000 balance previously authorized under the original Public Works Acceleration Act. This money must be obligated by January 31, 1964.

Table 2 compares the first apportionment for the two years. The current apportionment of Accelerated Public Works funds for grant-in-aid for fish and wildlife is $6,000,000. This is $530,000 less than the first apportionment on a national basis. For the eleven states in this Region, there is a decrease of $485,001. This probably reflects the increase in employment in the north central United States.

### TABLE 2

**ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM**

**GRANT-IN-AID FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE**

**FIRST APPORTIONMENT DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 1963</th>
<th>FY 1964</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>$ 500,00*</td>
<td>$ 107,504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$392,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>152,637</td>
<td>136,807</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa.</td>
<td>17,138</td>
<td>16,611</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>522,170</td>
<td>494,284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>85,082</td>
<td>83,641</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>1,130,242</td>
<td>100,637</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>42,714</td>
<td>46,472</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. D.</td>
<td>10,389</td>
<td>16,819</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>163,698</td>
<td>155,064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>12,888</td>
<td>10,258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisc.</td>
<td>78,879*</td>
<td>62,739</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,715,837</td>
<td>$1,230,836</td>
<td>$10,188</td>
<td>$495,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes funds apportioned prior to establishment of formula.
Illinois $500,000. Wisconsin $30,000.
Each state will have an opportunity to determine how much of the apportionment can be obligated by January 31, 1964. It can be assumed that there will be additional apportionments as the respective states make commitments on ability to use this money.

As of this date, it appears that the "ground rules" will probably be the same. It is important to remember that the personnel in the Branch of Federal Aid have made every effort to obtain approval of Accelerated Public Works Projects submitted. In some instances, the submissions were certainly "border-line" and probably would have been rejected had they been submitted under the Pittman-Robertson or Dingell-Johnson program.

There are indications that the Department of Commerce will release new dollar quotas for obligations in "eligible areas." Recent newspaper accounts indicate that some "eligible areas" may already be oversubscribed. Therefore, it is recommended that the states make every possible effort to SUBMIT PROJECTS EARLY. A Preliminary Project Statement will suffice to clear the submission in the Department of Commerce.

Please have the Coordinators review the instructions on the Accelerated Public Works Program which were forwarded from the Regional Office.

MR. VOIGT: I will ask the first question--give me a history on the reapportionment of funds which were allotted to other agencies and then reallocated. In other words, the project and history.

MR. LANGENBACH: Some of you will recall that last fall we contacted you to attempt to explain a program we knew nothing about. On that basis, only two states went along with it. Illinois said they could use one million dollars so they put them down for five hundred thousand. They came up with a thirty thousand dollar project in a county and the county put up the matching money. On January 17 the first appropriation was made. States had thirty days to reply whether they could use any of the funds. When the answers came back, there were "x" number of dollars left to be apportioned to the states who said they could use more money. As a state said "no, we cannot use any more money," it was put back into the pot and redistributed. Originally it was said no state could receive more than 10 per cent but later that was changed. Michigan received almost eight hundred thousand dollars.

The source of the matching money comes from agencies within the state such as forestry, counties, direct appropriations, funds available outside of hunting and fishing licenses, or those earmarked by legislation.

MR. VOIGT: You even anticipated one of my questions about the new money proviso. I will exercise my prerogative and ask another question--we have dealt with the forest and fish and wildlife, I am curious as to the same program administered by the two different agencies with two different sets of rules.

MR. LANGENBACH: (His answer was not transcribed.)
MR. BERNER: Who is going to sign the certification?

MR. LANGENBACH: I know what the situation was in Wisconsin, Les, I was loaded for "bar" when I went to Washington. The statute which established the APW program says the signee of this certification must be a state official and must be the State Treasurer or budget officer. How does the Forest Service get away from it--they don't raise the question? In some states the governor has signed it. The relationship of the availability of funds is tied in with it.

MR. MOORE: Should a state reject the money, can they later request it?

MR. LANGENBACH: If you say you cannot use any, I don't know whether you can come back and say you can later on. If you said you cannot use it all, you can get more later. When it is getting to January 31 and everybody is trying to get the money obligated, if you came up with a project and there was money available, you definitely could get it.

One other thing while I am here--the Department of Commerce has devised a "monster." If you participate in this you must submit a report of 214 line items of 7 items per line. It took us 7 man days to complete. The only reason for it is so that the Department of Commerce can put out a little dope sheet for Congress.

MR. MOORE: What are these funds based on?

MR. LANGENBACH: These funds have no relationship to state departments. They are based solely on unemployment. In counties that have different rates and are combined under one project, I imagine separate projects will have to be set up.

MR. TOWELL: I want to take John off the hook a little. I was in on the planning of the ground rules of this thing so we had a voice in it. We looked after your interest as well as we could.

MR VOIGT: Thank you, Bill. Any further questions?

Since we had applied for the funds, we do have some property. I assume we can reapply for that money. We probably can't use more than the minimum.

MR. LANGENBACH: The Department of Commerce would like to see contractors from the various areas but if the area is in that status, there probably isn't one. The contractor can be from other areas--the state is responsible under their statutes. In addition, he can use his own key personnel, however, the contractor is supposed to pick up his labor from the area. He should check with the local unemployment office for the rest of the labor.

Thank you gentlemen and your staffs for helping me get this program off the ground in less than five months.

MR. VOIGT: Any further questions or comments:
MR. MACMULLAN: What relief is there in sight for the reporting system? Can we help?

MR. LANGENBACH: I don't know other than Congress demands it. The reporting requirements could be the same as required under other acts--when work is completed, we submit a report of so much work done--so many man hours. It would cut down on the volume tremendously. Maybe you'll have to see your Congressman.

MR. KING: I assume there is no restriction as to where the matching money comes from.

MR. LANGENBACH: They like to know where it comes from. As long as the project is carried out in an eligible county the matching money can come from anywhere. Also, if work is done within the county, distribution can be anywhere in the state but costs for distribution cannot be listed.

MR. VOIGT: Any further questions?

[Speaker]: Elaborate on where the line is drawn on eligible projects. Are they such as programs that have not been done before?

MR. LANGENBACH: If it is not in your current budget. Some states have certain documented things on the shelf on their 25-year building program, etc. The certification is certifying that the capital improvements have not been specifically budgeted.

MR. VOIGT: Anything further:

MR. BARNES: Would you state the position on maintenance.

MR. LANGENBACH: The law is specific. You cannot do normal maintenance, but you can build things which can be maintained in the future with these funds.

MR. VOIGT: Further questions? I would like to thank John for a very excellent job well done and express my appreciation particularly to the main office, Bob Burwell and John for the sympathetic manner in which they have expedited this work.

The second part of this program concerns Wisconsin and we are flattered that the committee asked us to report on our Outdoor Recreation Act Program. It is in a state of flux as there are changes being made and we hope it will be interesting to you to hear about them. I would like to ask Gerry Eddy to preside and, Walter, I know you will do a good job with your presentation.

WISCONSIN'S OUTDOOR RECREATION ACT PROGRAM
(With special reference to the contribution of this cigarette tax fund revenue in fish and wildlife benefits)
by Walter E. Scott

Fish and game management administrators continually are searching for new
sources of funds to be used in the big job of restoring and protecting the wildlife resources for which they are responsible. Twenty-two months ago, on September 1, 1961, the Wisconsin Legislature, with bipartisan support, enacted Chapter 427, the Outdoor Recreation Act Program which usually is called "ORAP." Based on a 1¢ tax on each pack of cigarettes sold in the state, revenue the first month was well over a half million dollars. Income the first ten months averaged almost $400,000 per month. The plan was publicized as a ten-year, $50 million resource development and outdoor recreation program.

Even though ORAP started two months after the beginning of the new fiscal biennium, the Wisconsin Conservation Department’s allotment of about 90% of the available funds constituted more than a fifth of its total budget. The original Act appropriated $9,896,000 for the full biennial period but this was reduced by $800,000 when the program start was delayed by two months. An additional half million dollars was taken from allotments when revenue did not equal estimated receipts. The Conservation Department absorbed most of these reductions although several other state agencies were members participating in a newly created State Recreation Committee which administered this program. In spite of this, the Conservation Department did receive over $7 1/4 million for land acquisition and management in the last 22 months of the 1961-63 biennium. Even more is expected in the new 1963-65 biennium, although new legislation appropriating the cigarette tax receipts has not as yet been enacted.

What has been accomplished with these new monies which augmented the traditional hunting and fishing license fee revenues of the Wisconsin Conservation Department? As the new program primarily was aimed at the acquisition of land or land control through conservation easements, these summary statistics for the first 22 months of ORAP (see attached detailed report #12) tell the story:

--753 parcels of land secured of which 162 were by conservation easement and the rest by fee simple.

--Almost 67,000 acres costing more than $6 million were purchased.

--Over 250 miles of frontage along lakes and streams were secured for future protection.

--The new effort to get conservation easements involved only about 6,355 acres of land at a cost of approximately $170,000, but guaranteed control and public access for all time on about 88 miles of lake and stream frontage.

Two things must be explained here for clarity:

(1) The land acquisition listed under ORAP accomplishments does not include over 30,000 acres purchased in fee simple by W. C. D. with its regular budget during the last biennium. This brings the total to over 97,000 acres at an expenditure of more than $7 million.

(2) These land acquisition statistics include acquisition for forests and parks as well as fish and game management. The Fish and Game Management Divisions
alone acquired all but one of the conservation easements and a total of over 42,000 acres at a cost of more than $3 million under ORAP.

When the ORAP bill was passed in 1961, it contained a list of 306 specific projects which were to receive priority treatment for acquisition. At the end of the biennium, some land control had been secured on all but 15 of these projects. In addition, there were two general categories of "remnant fish habitat areas" for the Fish Management Division and "scattered wetlands" for the Game Management Division under which well over 100 parcels of land were purchased. As a result of this accelerated land control acquisition program, the Wisconsin Conservation Department's land acreage for administrative purposes expanded by more than 16% to over 687,000 acres. Public waters or lands under contract or lease for management purposes are not included in that figure and would add better than 3 million acres to the total.

Fish and Wildlife Benefits

The special benefits for fish and wildlife projects and programs as a result of Wisconsin's new cigarette tax revenue can be listed as follows:

(1) Preservation of urgently needed wetlands and marshes along the edges of lakes and streams to preserve fish spawning potential on thousands of acres of public waters.

(2) Acquisition of access to public waters and to public lands surrounded by private property through special efforts to secure right-of-way access and to complete projects of long standing.

(3) Stress on use of these new funds for projects in the most heavily populated areas where the price of land was highest and increasing most rapidly. Many of these projects were located in the state's best agricultural areas and will have not only a greater wildlife productivity potential, but also assured heavy use by sportsmen and the general public.

(4) "Fishing Easements" taken on 126 parcels by the Fish Management Division acquired perpetual rights for the public for 66 feet on each bank of about 35 miles of trout stream. Average cost of these easements was 39¢ per foot of water frontage and this included public access, use and right to develop the area for fish management purposes.

(5) "Wetland and Hunting Easements" taken on 35 parcels by the Game Management Division on about 3,840 acres of land include perpetual trespass rights for hunting as well as assurance that the land never will be drained. The average price paid has been about $5.45 per acre but this included wetland protection on only about half of the acreage involved. It was found that hunting rights are very difficult to obtain under the conservation easement program.

(6) Miscellaneous wildlife benefits which will be explained in more detail later included new funds (both directly and indirectly) for land and water management and development work on both state and county lands; for long-range planning in the
outdoor recreation field; for the preservation of scenic beauty and wildlife habitat along state highways paralleling public waterways; for development of recreational lakes on flood control structures; and for a new opportunity in conservation education through a Youth Conservation Camp program.

**State Recreation Committee Plan**

Under the new Outdoor Recreation Act, a State Recreation Committee was created with the Governor as chairman ex officio and five members, namely; Director of the Conservation Department, Chairman of the State Highway Commission, Director of the Department of Public Welfare, Chairman of the State Soil and Water Conservation Committee, and Recreation Specialist in the Department of Resource Development. Each of these individuals was to represent an agency which received funds for work under the program. The Governor (especially former Governor Gaylord A. Nelson who originated and sponsored the program) actively participates in the committee's deliberations and encourages the work. Meetings were held every three months or so with a secretary handling the business in the interim.

As stated earlier, the programs of the other agencies, although involving a small percentage of the available funds, also have some significant wildlife benefits. These include:

- **State Highway Commission:** Securing of scenic easements along state highways thereby protecting cover and habitat especially as it occurs near public lakes and streams.

- **Department of Public Welfare:** Establishment of three Youth Conservation Camps for High School boys during the summer months with a potential total capacity of 600 during two separate periods. The boys are paid $18.00 per week plus their room and board while working on Conservation Department projects under supervision of our field personnel. One day each week is given over to a planned conservation education effort. Two camps are operating this summer and the third is being constructed now.

- **State Soil and Water Conservation Committee:** Creation of about 30 new small lakes in southwestern Wisconsin's "driftless" and lakeless area is proposed through the use of federal aid funds under the small watershed flood control act. This program would build permanent recreational lakes in conjunction with flood control structures. Although none of these projects has been completed as yet, funds assigned for the first biennium have been committed. The Conservation Department would be involved in these projects through technical ownership of the land and responsibility for management of the public waters created both from a fish and wildlife standpoint.

- **Department of Resource Development:** This agency is responsible for production of a State Comprehensive Plan and the State Recreation Committee also assigned special funds to them for preparation of a long-range recreational plan. The Conservation Department is collaborating in this effort and attempting to coordinate its own long-range conservation planning efforts with this project. A program of outdoor recreation state aids for metropolitan areas also is administered by this department.
Miscellaneous Conservation Department Funds: Fish and wildlife programs benefited in a number of ways through miscellaneous projects and fund assignments in the ORAP legislation. Probably most important was the return of about one-half million dollars previously transferred from the Conservation Fund for state park purposes. This money was then reassigned to land management and related projects. About a million dollars was designated for development of state park and forest recreation areas including campgrounds, picnic areas and improved access. Although state parks are not open to hunting, they do provide important fishing opportunities and state forest land development improves hunting and fishing. Funds were made available for the establishment of two permanent and two mobile tourist information centers and all but one permanent center now are in operation at key locations near adjacent states. They are especially valuable for assisting nonresident fishermen in their search for good fishing chances—anda nd Wisconsin has sold more nonresident fishing licenses than any other state for a decade or more, with about 325,000 fishermen last year.

Not only did the ORAP legislation give the Wisconsin Conservation Commission new and extensive powers for taking conservation easements of all kinds under all conditions and virtually anywhere, but it also established a new program of County Recreational Projects Aids. These state-aids for developing camp sites and similar recreation areas in county forests are important to the state's fish and wildlife program because these forests constitute over two million acres of land entered under the Forest Crop Law which requires that they remain open for hunting and fishing at all times. Recreational planning assistance is offered and actual development costs are shared on a 50-50 basis. Sixteen counties already have asked for help under the program and much of the available $100,000 fund has been used. Better access and parking opportunities for hunters and fishermen alone are worth the price to assure wildlife harvest opportunities in these extensive forest areas.

Some Specific Examples

Last August 17, the Wisconsin Conservation Commission approved acquisition of 89 parcels of land totaling over 7,000 acres and costing more than $625,000. Included were 26 conservation easements and guaranteed protection of about 55 miles of water frontage. One of the easements approved at this meeting was on an entire island in Lake Michigan--Rock Island--off of the tip of Door County with 775 acres of land and 23,760 feet of Lake Michigan shore frontage. That easement assured an option to buy at an agreed price and saved this acquisition opportunity until more funds are available.

Another exceptional project, this one purchased by the Game Management Division, was Wallace Grange's 9,000 acre private game farm in central Wisconsin. Because of the special opportunity presented at this location with most all of the land surrounded by a deer fence, the Sandhill Wildlife Demonstration Area is being developed with wildlife and nature study trails and exhibits, observation sites and guided tours. With over 3,000 acres of water once held in private ponds now available for public management, an extensive waterfowl refuge will be maintained. Plans also include managed hunting and a continuous research effort based on collected harvest data.
ORAP has made a significant difference in the attitude of Wisconsin sportsmen toward the Conservation Department. Where they were impatient with the slow progress made on important projects such as those aimed at waterfowl restoration, they now could see the possible completion of land blocking so that development could begin. They were so thrilled with these possibilities that they often contributed additional funds from their organizations to help pay for unusually costly parcels of land or for special management projects. We now plan on more than $100,000 worth of such gifts each biennium for fish and game activities.

With these new funds it has been possible to block out holes which have existed in the State Forests so that better management for multiple uses is possible. Dozens of parcels--some at well over $300 per acre--were secured in the Kettle Moraine State Forest near the Milwaukee Metropolitan area. Although these lands eventually may have limited value for hunting, they frequently have vital access to public lakes and streams and preserve fish spawning habitat which otherwise might be destroyed through land draining or filling activities. In another case, large holdings of the State Land Commission in the Flambeau River State Forest were purchased to improve blocking for good management and to assure continued public ownership.

Except in special cases where private professional appraisers are hired to work on a large or complicated project, all of the appraisal and negotiation work is done by our own personnel. Each division involved in land acquisition work has its group of men who have been especially trained through University of Wisconsin extension classes to do such work. As we didn't expand our field nor our office staff to carry on this stepped-up program, some of our fish and game management projects temporarily suffered. However, we believe that this work can be picked up again after the lands we need have been secured. And we hope that some of the cigarette tax revenue will be available then to help us do a faster and better development job. It should be mentioned that we also participated in a "Conservation Easements and Open Space Conference" by way of training in this new technique and copies of the proceedings are available.

Problems Encountered

I don't want to leave the impression that there have been no problems in the administration of ORAP. There have been areas of conflict with other agencies and misunderstandings both in official circles and by the public. It would be virtually impossible to start so large an operation so fast without some flying of sparks and some spinning of wheels. Among the questions which have been asked and on which more consideration is needed are the following:

(1) How much land should the state set aside for natural resources preservation and outdoor recreation activities and to what extent should taxes or aids in lieu of taxes be paid to local units of government?

(2) Should perpetual conservation easements taken by the state, which reduce land values for local taxation, be considered in the same category as land control in fee simple?

(3) To what extent should funds from ORAP be used for development work and
how long should management of public lands be deferred in favor of a crash acquisition effort due to limited funds?

(4) Will it be possible to keep undesirable projects from getting priority assignment for action in future biennial budgets established for ORAP by the Legislature?

(5) To what extent will state agencies responsible for natural resource management be given an opportunity to participate in preparation of the second phase of the Comprehensive State Plan?

(6) When is it best to purchase conservation easements instead of land in fee simple in relation to the long-term needs and possible future management considerations?

(7) Should some small percentage of these ORAP funds be set aside for practical research and/or education to help determine the best course of action and improve public understanding of the program's purpose in relation to public recreational demands?

(8) To what extent should outdoor recreation developments be encouraged for private initiative with private capital?

The Future

The Wisconsin Conservation Commission has authorized land acquisition work in almost 800 locations although possibly only half that number are well defined projects. In the future even more effort will be concentrated on the so-called "scattered wetlands" for game management and "remnant fish habitat and spawning areas" for fish management. The new outdoor recreation bill now pending in the Wisconsin Legislature which is sponsored by the State Recreation Committee names over 280 specific projects for priority acquisition consideration. This measure also includes the following changes in emphasis for the 1963-65 biennium:

(1) Allows the State Recreation Committee to add projects to the priority list.

(2) Permits the Conservation Department and other agencies in the program to expend ORAP monies for long-range planning work.

(3) Provides funds for development of fish and game lands.

(4) Increases the appropriation for county forest recreational aids and changes the formula to 75-25 with the larger share paid by the state.

(5) Increased appropriations for the Highway Commission scenic easement work and for recreational lake construction.

(6) Designates County Park Commissions and similar County groups to receive metropolitan aids.

(7) Eliminates an exception which required local County Board approval before
new State Park lands could be purchased in that county.

(8) Expands acquisition efforts to include natural "scientific" areas possessing unusual ecological characteristics.

(9) Decreased amount of funds restricted for use in purchasing conservation easements. In the first biennial ORAP budget over a million dollars had been designated for taking conservation easements which much less than 20% of this was spent and the remainder was transferred for fee simple acquisition.

It should be explained that there also is pending in the Wisconsin Legislature a substitute amendment for the new ORAP bill recommended by the State Recreation Committee. This substitute, which already has passed the Assembly and now is being considered by the Senate, essentially allots the same amounts of money to each agency, but makes several significant changes as follows:

(1) Eliminates the State Recreation Committee, transferring their responsibilities to the Conservation Commission.

(2) Deletes the extensive list of project names on the grounds that land prices have been affected to the detriment of the state by such priority designation.

(3) Transfers the function of establishing and coordinating a long-range recreational plan to the Conservation Commission.

It is important to note that Wisconsin's cigarette tax is continuing to collect 1¢ per pack under the present law and this amount is being held separate from the State's General Fund even though the new biennium started without passage of another ORAP bill appropriating funds to the several agencies involved. Expectations are that such a measure will be enacted soon and that appropriations will be made in full. Amounts assigned to the several agencies and projects for the 1963-65 biennium from $9,515,736 estimated as available under Substitute Amendment I, A., to Bill No. 480, A. (the measure which now is moving forward toward passage) are as follows:

**Conservation Commission** - $8,159,564

**General** - $744,000 to be used in place of Conservation Fund revenues heretofore appropriated for park purposes.

**Land Control** - $7,048,226 for acquisition, development and maintenance of land and rights in land including

- **Parks and Forests**, $4,860,412 ($1,750 for capital development and not less than $133,412 for easements);
- **Fish Management**, $867,236 ($200,000 for development and not less than $100,000 for easements); and
- **Game Management**, $1,320,578 ($125,000 for development and not less than $50,000 for easements)
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Tourist Centers - $126,113

Long-range Recreational Plan - $54,000

County Recreational Projects Aids - $187,225

State Soil and Water Conservation Committee - $300,000 for recreational lakes

State Highway Commission - $374,436 for scenic easements program (also to include development of historic markers, overlooks, waysides, etc.)

Department of Public Welfare - $481,736 for Youth Conservation Camp Program

Department of Resource Development - $200,000 for aids to metropolitan park land acquisition

As both ORAP bills in the present Wisconsin Legislature are practically identical in the assignment of available funds, the Conservation Department is looking forward to about 85% of the available receipts from the 1¢ per pack cigarette tax. It is true that revenue to date has not quite equaled expectations and there are some indications that the lung cancer reports will reduce cigarette sales even more, but over the ten-year period the full $50 million still is expected because of population increases. Originally it was planned to use most the available funds in the first decade for land control acquisition and then to shift the emphasis to development work in the second decade. However, there now is a new proposal for use of these funds.

The State Recreation Committee with encouragement from the Governor has had a bill draft prepared to set up a funding program through sale of bonds supported by this cigarette tax revenue. Under such a plan, land acquisition scheduled for the next eight years would be completed in half that time. The argument for the proposal is that lands needed to meet future outdoor recreation demands are being taken up rapidly for other uses and developed so that they are lost for public use due to increased valuation. Also, wetlands which are drained or destroyed by filling are difficult or impossible to restore to their original condition.

In conclusion, it safely can be said that the importance of Wisconsin’s 1¢ per pack cigarette tax dedicated toward increasing outdoor recreation opportunities hardly can be overestimated. Results obtained under ORAP in the first 22 months have been substantial and will have lasting effect. The program’s reception by the public generally has been enthusiastic and support on a bipartisan basis still is running high. There is every reason to believe Wisconsin will continue in its leadership role with this new source of cigarette tax revenue which has more permanence and less future problems than most bonding plans. It is noted that several other states are considering somewhat similar legislation and Minnesota already has enacted a cigarette tax for this general purpose.

In Wisconsin it is a common saying that once a new tax is started it never is rescinded. So long as this one finances our Outdoor Recreation Act Program we certainly hope it will continue!
Summary Totals on Land Control Acquisition

Through the June 14 Conservation Commission meeting we have purchased (encumbered or secured by gift) under ORAP 753 parcels of land control of which
591 were fee simple and 162 easements. These 753 parcels included 66, 726.99
acres at a cost of $6,062,756.36. They contained 1,335,886.50 feet of frontage on
lakes and streams (over 250 miles with stream shore counted on both sides) plus
over 3,641 acres of private ponds. All of this was in fee simple except 6,355.455
acres costing $169,715.78 with 462,946 feet of water frontage in 162 conservation
easements.

Breakdown for the several divisions involved was as follows:

Game Management: 32,185.765 acres fee simple for $2,277,683.73 with
289,416 feet of water frontage plus 35 conservation easements of 3,843.19 acres
costing $20,734.64 with 57,120 feet of water frontage.

Fish Management: 9,862.21 acres fee simple for $750,787.13 with
307,250.50 feet of water frontage plus 126 conservation easements on 1,736.465
acres of land costing $143,981.14 with 382,066 feet of water frontage.

Forests and Parks: 18,136.56 acres fee simple for $2,856,169.72 with
276,274 feet of water frontage plus one conservation easement of 775.80 acres
costing $5,000 with 23,760 feet of water frontage.

Information and Education: 7 acres for $8,400 for a permanent tourist
information center in Kenosha County.

Total Land Control Acreage (both ORAP and Non-ORAP)
Since July 1, 1961

Land control acquisition (encumbered) by the Conservation Commission since
July 1, 1961, totals 97,447.07 acres for a cost of $7,123,655.78. This means that
lands purchased other than under ORAP (all fee simple) totaled 30,720.08 acres for
$1,060,899.42. By divisions all acquisition since July 1, 1961 is as follows
(figures in parentheses are amounts by Non-ORAP):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game Management:</td>
<td>58,459.275</td>
<td>$2,933,165.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22,430.32)</td>
<td>(634,747.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Management:</td>
<td>17,047.735</td>
<td>$1,183,813.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5,449.06)</td>
<td>(289,045.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests and Parks:</td>
<td>21,933.06</td>
<td>$2,998,276.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,840.80)</td>
<td>(137,106.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Education:</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>$8,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MR. EDDY: How did you get the tax allocated to conservation?

MR. SCOTT: I would like to say that I did it single-handedly but I am afraid that our former governor would say that he did it. The politicians needed something to tax and they say they used the cigarette tax because it was a disorganized group. They are going to raise the tax and use it for other purposes.

MR. EDDY: The floor is open for further discussion.

MR. UNDERHILL: I have two questions: Has the legislature reduced your appropriations, and are you realizing the full $4,500,000 a year or has this been shunted to another part of your program?

MR. SCOTT: We have not lost money. Our forestry funds are earmarked by our constitution. We have not suffered at all.

MR. VOIGT: We also had hunting and fishing license increases. This served to accelerate the program.

MR. UNDERHILL: In the neighborhood of 10% is earmarked for development. This is under serious controversy. Have you run into much demand that a greater percentage of this fund be used for development—balancing the two over a 20-year period:

MR. SCOTT: Practically all of the money was for acquisition. There was a lot of feeling that you could not operate without development money. After we buy land and buildings, we have the responsibility to do some maintenance. There had to be some money for development and maintenance immediately. The politicians felt we should use it all for acquisition and the next ten years for development. This was not realistic. It might be shifted later to a larger percentage. We have run into trouble buying lands.

I want Lloyd and King to jump in if they would like.

MR. LEDIN: Do you have the approval of a commission? We have a commission of seven that have to approve our expenditures.

MR. SCOTT: We had some problems with the State Recreation Committee, but as a rule we were in on listing the projects and our Conservation Commission did the work. We generally had a clear go-ahead when it was acquisition. One trouble was getting permission to charge promotion and background costs for the acquisition.

________: Were there specially trained people sent to acquire land?

MR. SCOTT: We have classes on land appraisal and negotiating work. There is a class of 30 or 40 people going on right now.

MR. LEDIN: Most of our money was appropriated for parks and very few people do any acquisition work.
MR. SCOTT: Some of our men got training and left us when the federal government had positions open. Training is handled through the American Association of Realtors. The school is run by an institute and the people who achieve certain standards receive certification.

MR. BURWELL: There are certain disadvantages of taking easements— you devalue the land. Is that reflected in lower property taxes?

MR. SCOTT: That's an interesting question. You take half the rights and pay him half the value and tax roll should be reduced one-half. We have had scenic easements taken and assessors did not give any reduction. Let us take easements and leave land on the tax rolls. But when you take a lot of easements, it is a question whether it would stay forever without an argument. There is a bill in the Wisconsin Legislature that there should be some taxes paid on easements. You might get opposition from local committees. Sometimes they oppose your project. You must remunerate in some way. We pay some taxes but Michigan pays more.

__________: Do you think you will be going to fee simple or to the easements?

MR. SCOTT: We have succeeded most in easements in fish management work. Where we are taking easements from rural areas where fishing pressure has not been too heavy and people are using streams without payment. It is difficult to take easements in urban areas for hunting, it might effect the value of the land. This easement program has not been the ball of fire it should be. We still have a headache where easement is concerned, but I think we are going to continue to take them where possible.

MR. UNDERHILL: There is the classic argument that in protecting an easement you increase the value of the adjacent land and, therefore, balance out the tax problem.

MR. SCOTT: This is important in taking scenic easements. The State Highway Department is taking scenic easements and admit they had trouble along the shore of Lake Superior. They had to pay for the entire right. There are cases where you have to pay fee simple. So it is a very complicated situation; in one case it is easy, in other cases you have to pay fee simple.

__________: Are overhead costs connected with easements the same as with fee simple?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. VOIGT: We found that the success of the easements depended upon how well informed the land owner was. A large owner, well informed, was easily dealt with, but a small owner was difficult to get to understand the concept of easements and it was easier, in this case, to talk about fee simple.

MR. SCOTT: If any of you have more questions, I'll be glad to talk to you later.

MR. EDDY: We still have John if you would like to take a crack at him.
MR. MOSLEY: Registration will close at the desk in the next ten minutes. If you decide to purchase tickets later, see one of us wearing these green ribbons.

MR. EDDY: We will now adjourn for lunch.

Monday Afternoon - July 8, 1963

MR. TOLVELL: This appears to be quite a small audience this afternoon, but I know it is an important one. I am also sure that we have an important topic. This new emphasis upon outdoor recreation is long overdue. It took states like Wisconsin, California, and Minnesota to point the way for the rest of us. We in fish and wildlife have to take it at look at the total picture and we still have a long way to go in our thinking. I don't know of anything that looks more favorable than we can hope for in the new federal emphasis and the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation bill before Congress.

I am very pleased to introduce the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the United States Department of the Interior, Mr. A. Heaton Underhill.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRESS
by A. Heaton Underhill

Thanks Bill. It is a pleasure to be here. I had to join the federal service before I could get to the Midwest meetings but I am glad to be here.

In starting our discussions, I yield to an old failing of mine that I like to tie in some kind of a quote. One hundred and fifty years ago, and I'm sure most of you know about it, William Wordsworth said: "The world is too much with us; late and soon, getting and spending, we lay waste our powers: little we see in nature that is ours.''

This points out the problem that many of us are facing in this, the world's richest and most bountiful society. We have developed the world's greatest standards of living and we in turn resent any demand on our resources for communal activities in the form of taxes. What tax dollars we have are competed for by highways, by defense, schools, social welfare until conservation facilities have been well down the scale. Two sides to the coin: we don't want to spend our private money, and our public voice has not been loud enough.

And yet, as our society increases, there is more and more of a demand for outdoor recreational opportunities. More leisure, more money, more people, and then less places to find recreation. As our population centers in urban complexes, there is greater difficulty in finding the outdoors. There is not real lack when you have two weeks or a month to get away. With the addition of Alaska, we have a fairly large acreage per person. But unfortunately, most of us can't get to where most of these places are. The half-day, weekend use is becoming more and more of a problem. One of the answers, without going through a history of the formation of the Bureau, let me just talk briefly of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and how it fits into this picture.

The bill was in the form of legislation last year and was modified. Senate 859
is a bill which would establish a Land Water Conservation Fund. It is the first attempt for a sizable earmarking. It would concern revenue from: (1) The sale of surplus real estate; (2) federal tax on gas used in pleasure boats—at the present time 4% is refundable, 2% is reclaimed and the rest goes into highways, $30,000,000 a year. This is about .8% of the revenues to the highway fund. Most of you will agree that $30,000,000 is a sizable amount for conservation purposes; (3) It authorizes a system of user fees for the recreational use of federal lands. It doesn't spell out specific fees but basic thought is that some type of stamp should be sold for $3 to $5 for affixing to a car entitling the occupants to federal land. This would replace entrance fees. The charges would be authorized for specific facilities such as a developed campsite, picnic area, swimming area, etc. The total revenue would be somewhere around 60 to 70 million. The states' objection to the bill lies in the area of the percentage of matching money—70% state, 30% federal—or somewhere along that line. Most states favor the proposal but not the percentages. We have taken no stand other than to present the bill. Secretary Udall feels it is up to Congress what percentage would be best. The considerations are: (1) How much money is needed? (2) How much is needed at the federal level to provide stimulus?

If the program is 75-25, states are going to put a lot less into the program since they are operating from a fixed amount. If the states can match it, you are better off to lower the percentage. Some say it should be 50-50. Some say 25% state and 75% federal.

A feature of the bill is that during the first ten years only 10% of grants are used for development. This is a controversy and is yet to be decided. In many of the western states there is plenty of public land, they need more money for development. Even in some of the eastern states, you have to use the "squeaky wheel" and show the people what you are accomplishing. Even in New Jersey we had to allocate between 25 and 30 per cent for development to keep people coming along and supporting the program.

Before money is allocated, the state must have a plan for outdoor recreational needs of the state. Many people feel if they have an adequate plan, acquisition will take care of itself. Many should also reflect on the over-all picture and comprehensive plan. So much in brief for what the bill will do.

Where does it stand? The Senate and House have held hearings. They have been favorable. In the House, it was almost a love feast. It was the best hearings on any particular legislation in years. In the Senate, there was some controversy particularly over the user fee aspects. In general, however, the reaction was favorable. There are hearings Wednesday in the House Ways and Means Committee. One feature in this hearing will be the diversion of the gas tax. They want to hear the justification for taking it out of the highway fund and putting it into this fund. Most conservationists feel that the federal tax paid on gas used in pleasure boating can more justifiably be used for a land and water conservation fund than for the highway fund.

The House then plans to consider the bill in executive session and what amendments should be made on the bill. From here on your guess is as good as mine, as to what will happen. I would guess that they will amend the bill. They will
consider the shares, the percentages, they will consider the 10 per cent limitation on development and will probably come out with an amended version. Then the Senate will wait to see what the House does.

In general, the bill has been supported in the Senate. Forty-four different states are on record as supporting the bill--in the House, the record is even better. What happens from there on, I don't know--you've got civil rights, tax cuts, possible railroad legislation. Who knows how Congress will react to the various bills before them. My own feeling is that this is perhaps not the best or only version but this is the first time in my memory that there has been an attempt to be realistic in providing for outdoor recreation. Or is it too little, too late?

We have been through the cycle when we operated strictly on legislative appropriations and didn't have money to do anything. Then we got the money through licenses. We've gone through the resistance of the public and seen the bonanza turn into a millstone because we were tied to the license money and today it is not adequate to do the job. Here is an opportunity to tie into a broader program, get in on the ground floor to see that wildlife has an adequate place in the state plans. I can speak coming from a state like New Jersey where we used to think we were guinea pigs. We saw our percentages of hunters and fishermen dwindle, total numbers went up but percentages declined. A year ago they constituted about three per cent of the total population of the state. This is hard to realize when in states such as Colorado close to 50 per cent buy hunting and fishing licenses. A high percentage in the rural states buy the licenses but as we become more urbanized the percentage goes down. It seems to me if hunting and fishing is going to maintain its rightful place, if you are going to provide adequate facilities, then you have got to broaden your base and tie in hiking, picnicking, bird-watching, or just sitting in the woods listening to the wind in the leaves.

This measure, which broadens our base and gives us an opportunity to tie into a bigger program, could be a turning point. We must adequately provide for recreational living for the future.

MR. TOWELL: Thank you, Heaton. You certainly told us that we better get on the ball or we will be left behind. Would you ever think that hunting and fishing licenses would be described as millstones? You must have expected some questions and comments.

MR. GALE: What will be the basis for selecting the state agency to handle this federal grant? Could you wind up with two or three state agencies handling portions of this money?

MR. UNDERHILL: At the present time the bill indicates that the state will designate an agency or agencies. It is certainly possible that there may be more than one agency. We hope that if a single agency cannot be designated, that the governor will establish a coordinating committee. This will perhaps depend on an acceptable plan. If the administrators should submit a program, we will see that it is a comprehensive plan. It will make it much simpler for us to deal with a single agency or a committee or council or commission which represents all agencies. If there is no such council we will have to look at the plan and say it is good for hunting
and fishing but there is no recognition for swimming or skiing or picnicking, etc., so take it back and get them in the picture. This is just an example but you can see how much simpler it would be to have a comprehensive plan to begin with. This can best be done by a council with all the interests in mind.

MR. VOIGT: You mentioned under point number three that all types of recreation would be required to pay. That takes in the hunters and anglers who use forest service lands too?

MR. UNDERHILL: Yes. There have been many attempts to move them from it; the federal agencies have resisted. Where there is an agreement between the forest service, persons holding the special license would not be required to buy a sticker. The sticker concept will be applied only where there is a clearly defined boundary. Except for the states that have the agreement for a forest hunting and fishing license they will not be singled out as exempt. This is not spelled out in the bill.

MR. VOIGT: Probably our state is an exception. We want our deer hunters to use the federal land.

MR. TOWELL: The sticker applies to the vehicle and not to the individual hunters. They can enter on foot.

MR. VOIGT: It's very hard to get anybody to go anywhere on foot these days.

MR. MOORE: I understand the agreement idea but where a piece of land has been turned over for hunting, is that going to be taken back and administered by a federal agency?

MR. UNDERHILL: In the case of lands around reservoirs where there is an agreement, they will be treated as state areas and the sticker requirement would not apply. There is still a gray area pertaining to the reservoir itself. They have been built with millions of dollars of federal money. People who are going to pull their boat should be required to have a recreation use sticker on their car. This has not been resolved. Where the Bureau has entered into agreement with a state, people coming into that area would not need a sticker.

MR. MOORE: I am not opposed to sticker but on small areas, it could be a headache.

MR. LANGENBACH: How about the use of the sticker on military reservations?

MR. UNDERHILL: This will not be necessary.

MR. SCOTT: How about on Mississippi locks and dams? The federal government spent a lot of money and time on them. What would you be charging for? The right to navigate or the right to go in?

MR. UNDERHILL: There is no contemplation that a sticker will be require on the channel improvements. On the other hand, take Fort Pick on the Missouri. That
is surrounded by federal lands. Use of that for recreational purposes would be considered one where the sticker would be required.

The basic concept is that this is a revenue-producing measure. Where users are being asked to contribute so that more and better facilities can be provided for recreation. Rather than an entrance fee, some type of recreation use sticker was the best means of providing funds. Secretary Udall said that this can develop into almost a voluntary contribution. Most people will feel that this is their contribution to the United States recreational facilities.

MR. TOWELL: Thank you, Heaton. Every discussion centers on this sticker. We need to broaden our concepts. We are talking about $30,000,000 of gas tax. We are going to have to change our concept and our thinking. I am not trying to cut this but I want to defend you rather than let you go on and on. We are going to keep him here but right now we will go on to the next paper.

MR. TOWELL: One reason that fish and game managers have been successful is that they have recognized their responsibilities in conservation. They have enjoyed recognition because they have dealt as much with resources as they have with specific species of fish and game. I remember my predecessor in 1956 said two things had done more for fish and game in the United States than any other: the Soil Bank and the Small Watershed program. As our next speaker, I would like to introduce Mr. Frank Edminster, Assistant Director of the Plant Technology Division of the Soil Conservation Service.

ROLE OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE IN RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
by Frank C. Edminster

(Note: the following is an outline which Mr. Edminster agreed could be used since his talk was inadvertently not recorded.)

We live in a rapidly changing world - true in conservation too.

Background for USDA concern with recreation:

1. Crop surpluses - need for land use changes.
2. Low farm income and decline of rural areas.
3. Need for recreation for increasing population - ORRRC.

Agricultural Act of 1962 and Secretary's Orders:

1. Recognize recreation as an agricultural land use.
2. Cropland conversion program.
3. Loan authority for FHA in recreation - two kinds.
4. Resources conservation and development projects.

5. Rural renewal projects.


7. Watersheds projects - recreation cost-sharing.

Kinds of private outdoor recreation enterprises:

Vacation farms, picnicking and sports centers, fishing waters, camping and nature areas, hunting areas, shooting preserves, cottage (or site) rental or sale.

Place of wildlife in private outdoor recreation:

Basis of three categories and important in the other four. Hunting, fishing and nature observation are three forms of recreation directly using wildlife. The quality of recreation on vacation farms, rented cottages, picnicking and camping areas is often strongly related to fish and wildlife.

Economics of wildlife to the rural landowner:

What the "American Game Policy" said: "...compensation to the landowner in some form or other is the only workable system for producing game on expensive private farm land." Of the seven items in the program of the American Game Policy, - four: extension of public ownership of game lands, research, training of professionals in wildlife management, and provision of funds - have been carried out to a degree probably undreamed of by the Committee. The other three - recognizing the landowner as custodian and paying him, experimenting with ways of bringing together landowner, sportsman, and public, and sharing cost of wildlife conservation between hunter and non-hunter - have made little progress. What are the alternatives for the future of hunting on private land? The Committee answered it as well in 1930 as we can now.

1. Buy him out and become the owner - impractical.

2. Compensate him for producing game and the harvest privilege.

3. Cede him title to the game - English system.

4. Laissez faire and posting.

There is only one right way. Let us get on with this vital part of the job of good hunting to the public lands.
MR. TOWELL: That was thought provoking and ties in with the theme that the user is going to have to pay. This is a concept that many of us have resisted.

MR. EDMINSTER: They will be paid a fee for the privilege of hunting and an access privilege. An individual enterprise would not entail much country. It would have to be cooperative when it would involve many farms.

MR. LEDIN: In Minnesota I wonder if it will speed up paying for hunting.

MR. EDMINSTER: Yes, it will speed it up. Only where the hunting is good will this system work. We are basing our attitude that the landowner is going to manage his land to produce good hunting.

MR. LEDIN: I am at a loss on the change of program. In Minnesota we had a good deal on what we had.

MR. EDMINSTER: We will not advocate it unless they want to do it. In many places this will come slowly if at all.

MR. SCOTT: In Wisconsin we have close to six million or more acres of public lands so we think we will encourage development. These people have done their development without the government's help.

MR. STOCKDALE: This program is geared to the innovator and can spread to other operators.

MR. EVANS: One comment: In Illinois we have been trying to promote the idea of cooperatives. It is not taking ahold too rapidly but we will certainly welcome all the assistance you people can give us in working with the farmers. I have a question which may have been clarified earlier. This applies to three counties in Illinois. As I recall the payments ran in excess of $50 per acre. Doesn't this seem rather high?

MR. EDMINSTER: This must have been the total payment of conversion plus assistance and development.

MR. EVANS: No, conversion rates plus additional rates. It was $52 or $56 for one county.

MR. EDMINSTER: Some of these farms conversion plus development payments together apply to acreage of land.

MR. EVANS: If you would combine them it would exceed the soil bank.

MR. EDMINSTER: The intention is that this payment will be approximately one-half of the soil bank rate.
Considering cost sharing, are the acquisition costs considered as eligible?

MR. EDMINTER: They are. There is one aspect of the new farm bill which concerns resources, conservation, and development projects: something parallel to a watershed project based on a problem area of some sort. No projects exist yet, but the agriculture appropriation bill does include some money for this. This will involve a variety of sponsors and cooperating agencies.

MR. TOWELL: The schedule does not call for a break but I will call for a shift. Because of the slides coming up, let us shift over in front of the screen.

Now we move on to the military and I think every game manager in the room is aware of something recent in enactments regarding our defense installations. We are very happy to have with us, Gene Oren, Conservation Advisor of the Army who will discuss fish and wildlife management practices on Department of Defense installations.

MR. OREN: It is a real privilege to be here today to discuss this with you. We feel this is a contribution to the outdoor recreation program in its new concept. For every man that knocks at the gate of a military installation, there is a hundred people knocking at the gate to hunt or fish. Recent statutes have been enacted to promote hunting and fishing on military reservations. There are three parties involved: The Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, and the appropriate state fish and game agency.

After we got this talk prepared we got copies of three plans from California and the Director was so proud of these plans he sent a letter to Defense Secretary McNamara about them. They consisted of the standard format, a detailed game management plan and a detailed fish management plan. They covered what would be done, who would do it, and how it would be done. They were scheduled year by year. It was very complete and a very fine job. One thing about it worried me: the basis for their construction was not contained in these plans. There was no reference to standards or specifications for these plans. You couldn't tell whether it was a compromise or a step in the right direction. In other words, a lot of these wildlife practices have been more of a sergeant's dream than a practice put into use by a trained person. In many cases, you couldn't tell whether it was because their granddaddy was a coon hunter or whether they had real training in setting up these things. I might put out a word of caution--if you haven't done it yet we would like to see you give some consideration to standards and specifications in these detailed plans.

We have to depend on you to get technical guides into these plans. The military will want to know where is the technical validity. In my own mind, I think these standards should be related to existing standards.

I would like to show you some slides on practices at some installations. (Slides were shown.)

After agreements have consummated, they will get a report on them. When
the report comes in we will assume that it is satisfactory to you people and we hope that it is. Where public access is denied, and you are not satisfied, of course, you know the subsequent steps to take. We feel that security will be a factor only in a few places.

We have had an effective program where the installations has cooperated. This agreement is a permanent basis upon which all installations must base their programs. These slides aren't necessarily appropriate to your various states but they show the kind of thing that can be done on a military reservation and the scope of the work that can be done. It shows that money and resources are available to do this kind of work. A lot of scrounging is done to put these wildlife programs over the hump. Funds are available from many sources. When the budgeting is done, it will be in conflict with many things that have to be done and will be in direct line with the interest of persons in charge.

Sometimes fees are collected from rod and gun clubs. Any fees of this sort must be plowed back into the installation. A conservation fund cannot be applied to a military reservation unless that particular is changed.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
FISH & WILDLIFE ROLE IN THE NEW OUTDOOR RECREATION CONCEPT
by Eugene A. Oren

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, it is a pleasant privilege to be with you on this occasion to discuss Department of Defense activities in fish and wildlife management and their contribution to outdoor recreation.

With over 27 million acres of land in the United States under military control, we have, in addition to our main mission, the responsibilities inherent in a land management agency.

The military departments are rather proud of the accomplishments made in the field of conservation of natural resources. An active program in conservation of soil has been underway since about 1942. The professional management of woodlands has been given active support for about 10 years. More recently, subsequent to the enactment of the Sikes and Engle statutes, the DoD has established uniform conservation polices including fish and wildlife management. Due to the outdoor recreation demands being imposed on military lands, all conservation programs are being oriented toward optimum fish and wildlife production.

We are rather proud of the public relations we are establishing in most areas we occupy. We have many installations where hunting, fishing, boating and other recreational activities by the public are encouraged.

Our various resource programs have fluctuated greatly in the past due to varying degrees of military interest and also because of the national and international situations. Prior to and during World War II large land and water areas were acquired for airfields, posts, troop training areas, and proving and testing grounds for new weapons systems. Despite consistent efforts to return military lands to
private use after World War II, significant situations such as the Korean conflict and the advent of the Space Age, still require the military departments to retain control of large land and water areas. With changing requirements, and an appreciation for our responsibilities in this important matter, the Defense resource programs have progressed from mere rules for hunting and fishing to well defined policies on management of wildlife and its habitat.

Many of you are familiar with the Department of Defense policies contained in our Natural Resources Directive 5500.5 which prescribes policy in the management of fish and wildlife. To implement this directive, many of you have ably assisted military commanders in the development of Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Plans for their installations. Thus far we have received samples and informal reports of the development of many of these tripartite agreements by installation commanders, state fish and game commissioners, and the Department of Interior as required by the Sikes Act (PL 860797). By September of the year, formal reports will give us a complete picture on the progress in this cooperative planning effort. It is apparent that the 1963 Defense Conservation Award contest entries, which cleared the first hurdle this spring, showed intensive participation and support by the state fish and game organizations.

At this time let us review briefly the major policies on fish and wildlife management as reflected in Department of Defense Directives on natural resources.

-----Personnel at all levels of Command must support national wildlife conservation policies and programs.

-----All commanders are required to take the initiative to seek help and work effectively with Federal, State and local conservation officials trained to render professional advice and assistance.

-----All military reservations shall be managed to protect and preserve the watersheds, the soil, the beneficial forest and vegetative cover as vital elements of an optimum fish and wildlife program.

-----Military installations will care for and utilize natural resources by providing maximum multiple use of land and water areas and access to them for the proper use and enjoyment by the public.

There must be reconciled, within these policy highlights, the primary interest of the military Commander--his military mission. Present indications point to widespread successes in developing plans that recognize adequately the military mission, Department of Defense Natural Resources policies, and the philosophy of our Chief Executive.

You and your counterparts in other wildlife organizations assisted the Department of Defense in the development of their conservation policies, so I think it would be appropriate at this time to shift our attention from broad policies and broad programs to specific problems, in which we have a common interest.

First, we would like to call your attention to the cooperative plan agreement
format (inclosure 1, copies distributed) developed by the Fourth US Army in cooperation with the Texas Game and Fish Commission and the Southwest Region, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. We think this represents a fine piece of work. The Fourth Army letter that transmitted this format to its subordinate installations contained the following significant paragraph:

"It is emphasized that the Cooperative Plan Agreement is not intended to be a detailed Plan, within itself, for the development and management of fish and wildlife resources. It is essentially a Cooperative Agreement which will provide the framework for developing and executing a long-range wildlife management program for your installation as provided by Article II of the inclosed Cooperative Plan."

We especially liked the part of this agreement that provided for the attachment of detailed fish and wildlife management plans which then become a part of the Cooperative Agreement. Presumably periodic revisions of the detailed management plans can be made without too frequent changes in the basic provisions of the cooperative agreement.

We hope that technical personnel from fish and game agencies will continually review military fish and wildlife programs and recommend needed revisions. Most military installations have soil conservation programs and woodland management programs. Interest on the part of both civilian and military personnel has required these programs to be wildlife oriented. For example, woodland fire breaks are being constructed with sufficient width to establish the kind of vegetative cover that will benefit wildlife. Fire hazards are kept at a minimum on both woodlands and open lands by controlled burning, which enhances wildlife food and cover. Lakes and ponds, originally constructed for soil and water conservation are being cleaned, deepened, fertilized and managed for fish. Active conservation clubs, such as the one at Fort Benning with 5000 members, are promoting such work at most installations. Nearby Fort Knox, which recently won the 1963 Department of Defense Conservation Award, has an outstanding outdoor recreation program, established with the assistance of the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources. At Fort Campbell, I recently reviewed a game program for a large number of the general public. Local hunters harvested 15,000 quail during the past season. It is a well established trend at most military installations that all conservation activities are being oriented toward habitat improvement for fish and wildlife, in an attempt to satisfy local demands for outdoor recreation.

Our panel chairman has requested that the balance of my time be reserved for questions from our panel members and audience. Before opening discussion for questions, I would like to quote an appropriate statement made recently by the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, who summed up the DoD conservation policy by saying: "Natural resources are not only vital to the welfare of the American people, but their conservation and wise use is an important of our national security."

Thank you.

MR. TOWELL: Thank you, Gene, for that very interesting illustration of what is being done. We hope we can look forward to more of the same in the future.
MR. EVANS: In regard to the cooperative plan and the attachment—the plan is much too broad and consisted of something like a blank check, the attachment being signed by the installation commander. We have another plan in effect at the Joliet Arsenal where we have much more to say in the agreement.

MR. OREN: We think this basic agreement should have a clause in it to provide for an annual revision of the fish and wildlife plan. It should also require the personnel to make a revision and give them authority to sign the revision. You may want to look at this and approve it or you may want a biologist to do the job. Perhaps the Department of Interior would want to delegate their authority to you. It may turn out to be just two signatures. Do I make myself clear?

MR. EVANS: Yes, to some extent, but if these are to be renewed annually that should be signed by the state division and not the military only.

MR. TOWELL: We will hold any more questions till after our next speaker. This subject cannot be covered without consideration for the Corps of Engineers. I think all of you read that there are more visits to their projects by groups than any other. So we must consider very carefully the Corps of Engineers projects that exist and those that are under consideration. I have talked to our next speaker and I know that he speaks our language. I find that there are lots of opportunities if we will go after them. So I am very happy to introduce Mr. Harold Blakey, Chief of the Conservation Section, who will speak to us on fish and wildlife conservation on Corps of Engineers water control projects.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS WATER CONTROL PROJECTS
by Harold L. Blakey

Director Towell, members of the Association: I would first express the regrets of Mr. Eugene Weber, Assistant Director of Civil Works for Policy, Office of the Chief of Engineers, who was invited by Mr. Barnes, Chairman of your Program Committee, to participate in these discussions, but was unable to do so because of prior commitments that require his presence on the West Coast at this time. Mr. Barnes was kind enough to accept my substitution for Mr. Weber.

Having been born and reared in Missouri and experienced my beginnings in the field of conservation in your region, I feel very much at home with your people and with their problems and aspirations.

That background is studded with a number of "firsts" for me that lead up to the present interests of your Association. I assume I was first or in the forefront of the first of those who sought academic preparation at two of Missouri's educational institutions for a career in fish and wildlife management, research and administration. I was privileged to be the first full time technical biologist on the staff of the old Missouri Fish and Game Department and served the U. S. Forest Service in similar capacity at the time of the establishment of the 3 1/2 million acres of National Forest Purchase Units in the Missouri Ozarks. My first association with Federal conservation programs was in service to the old Bureau of Biological Survey in this region. It was nearly thirty years ago that I attended one of the early meetings of Midwest conservation planners and administraters at Urbana, Illinois, and I have been able
to at least keep track of the workings of the Midwest Association since its beginning. But today, it is urgent that we focus our attention not on where we have been but on where we are going from here.

The Corps of Engineers is fully cognizant of the important role played by the Midwest Association in representing the views of those concerned with preservation, development, and utilization of fish, wildlife, all outdoor recreation, and other important natural resources of great economic and social significance. Nearly 40 per cent of the land and water areas of the 123 large reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers in operation during 1960 are located in the North Central Geographic Census Zone which encompasses the Midwest region. Area-wise, fish and game interests have fared comparatively well in this program. Out of 4.6 million acres of such areas, which are composed of 3.4 million acres of water habitat and 1.2 million acres of shoreline uplands, 1.4 million acres are under management for fish and wildlife purposes, and approximately 1/4 million acres are subject to administration by state and local governments for public park and recreation purposes.

I shall take only a few minutes of your time to emphasize some of the over-all policies and procedures that provide us capabilities for working with state and local interests in basin-wide planning for development of water resources, with the expectation that your questions may bring forth further discussions of matters of greatest interest to you as individuals. It is not new that we are called upon to discuss the activities of the Corps of Engineers that make up its Civil Works Program for development of water resources, but I trust that you will permit me to interject some comment on what your responsibilities in that program may be as individuals and as representatives of state and local governmental agencies.

First, let us take a look at what lies ahead in the field of water resources. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources had indicated that we will need to double our facilities for use of water by 1980 and recommended that basic plans for development of the river basins of the country should be prepared by 1970. The President adopted this recommendation as a policy of his administration. Based on the Committee's projections, the Corps of Engineers has estimated that planning for the portion of the total water resource program for which it has responsibility should proceed with the view of providing over the next 20 years, some 320 million acre-feet of storage in more than 300 new reservoirs, 13,000 miles of new or improved waterways, some 60 commercial harbors, 30 million additional kilowatts of hydroelectric power; some 11,000 miles miles of levees, flood walls and channel improvements for flood control; and recreations facilities for perhaps 300 million visitors annually at the projects involved in this program.

The achievement of these goals will require a concerted effort by all concerned in formulation of the projects that make up such a program and a financial outlay for construction of from 2 to 3 times the present rate of development in recent years. Of even greater meaning is the fact that as the physical possibilities for water improvements become more scarce and the competing demands of more and more purposes for these fewer and fewer possibilities increase, our planning must become more and more precise to insure the most practicable and effective use of our limited resources.

How can we accomplish this formidable planning and development job to meet
increasing demands without impairment of some existing resources?

Fortunately, developments in recent years facilitate realization of satisfactory answers to some of these questions so far as they concern fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation interests but they also place important responsibilities on those interests for participation in the planning for water resource development and in the rationalization of conflicting interests that necessitate the formulation of balanced plans that are less than perfect for meeting the needs and desires of any one interest.

I shall mention a few of those significant policy changes effecting water resources that are important to our considerations this afternoon.

The Corps of Engineers was granted the broadest possible authority for construction, operation, and maintenance of public park and recreation facilities in reservoirs under its jurisdiction by the Flood Control Act of 1944. In the beginning this legislation was intended only to permit the addition of recreational facilities to dam and reservoir projects constructed for other purposes in order to realize additional collateral recreational benefits in the public interest at reasonably small cost. It was not until last year that this legislation was amended by Congress to apply to all water resource development projects of the Corps of Engineers.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1946 provided for incorporation of means and measures in water resource projects for prevention of loss or damage to fish and wildlife resources but it was not until 1958 that this Act was amended by Congress to grant those of us concerned with water resources the necessary authorities for the first time to deal with fish and wildlife conservation and enhancement as a purpose of water development projects on an equal basis with other functions.

There are three features of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act that have far reaching significance. First, the Act provides for coordination of fish and wildlife conservation as a purpose on a par with other uses of water. That requires that the potentialities of water and land resources in sites for development be fully studied, fully evaluated in monetary terms that make it possible to incorporate fish and wildlife in the economies of a project as a purpose, and planned in detail as to the nature and extent of improvements that may best meet the needs for the future.

Second, it plans equal responsibility on the state and federal fish and wildlife agencies for carrying out these studies, providing the basic data necessary for the planning of a federal water resource improvement, and for making specific recommendations for development of fish and wildlife features of project plans. Obviously, fish and game interests will receive proper consideration only to the extent that all fish and game interests participate directly in the project planning.

Third, the law places definite limitations on what can be provided as an integral part of the water resource project for development of fish and game resources. These provisions are limited to acquisition of lands, and modification of the water control project structures and their operation, but does not include the construction or operation or maintenance of specific fish and wildlife facilities. While the project may make the broad base of lands and waters available for the first time for fish and wildlife purposes, the accomplishment of the ultimate objective depends upon
incorporation of the project area and its development in state and local, regional, and national fish and game conservation programs. This, in turn, requires that a framework for statewide, regionwide, and national fish and wildlife development be prepared in considerable detail if the best possible advantage is to be taken of the potentialities of water control projects in any one site. This places a stupendous task upon the responsible fish and game agencies.

The Water Supply Act of 1958 authorized storage of municipal and industrial water supply in federal water improvement projects. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 authorized similar storage for regulation of downstream flow for control of water quality and adequacy for all beneficial purposes. Taken together, these two legislative enactments greatly expanded the opportunity and authority for conservation and enhancement of resources both upstream and downstream from water storage projects and throughout river systems effected by dams.

The President's messages to Congress in 1961 and 1962 announced the objectives of the Administration to develop long-range programs for improvement of water resources to meet recreation and fish and wildlife needs.

Shortly thereafter, the Departments of the Army and Interior adopted new land acquisition policies to assure that adequate lands are acquired for federal reservoir projects to protect the recreational and fish and wildlife potential created by such projects for future public use and development.

In 1962, the Federal agencies concerned with water resources, at the direction of the President, developed new standards for evaluating water resource projects within the framework of existing legislation making it possible to do more for the interests of conservation than could be accomplished under former standards for planning water projects.

Those of us concerned with water resources have now been given the authority and the means for dealing with conservation interests in the planning of new projects as purposes of such projects and to provide for enhancement of resources as well as make provisions for prevention of damages to such resources.

All of this raises the question of primary interest to those of us gathered here this afternoon—what responsibility does it place upon those interested in natural resources.

First, it is essential that citizen conservation groups and responsible state and local governmental agencies make themselves and their interests a part of the planning of water development projects from the very beginning. The Corps of Engineers endeavors to make this possible by notification of all interests at the start of the planning, inviting them to participate in investigations and to submit their recommendations together with any information pertaining to the problem under study, and by holding public hearings.

It is the responsibility of conservation interests not only to present their views as to what should be done but also to show how such measures can be economically justified, and how such measures can be reconciled with other interests.
that are involved.

It is not enough that project plans be reviewed to point out deficiencies. Instead, conservation interests can best be served in a positive way by suggestion of the ways and means by which planners can resolve problems with which they are faced in meeting all water development needs.

It is the intention of Corps of Engineers procedures to offer these opportunities to all interested conservation groups and individuals. It is our hope that these interests through citizens groups and local, state and federal agencies will accept the responsibility.

Above all, we hope that these groups will share the responsibility of water resource planners to develop plans that will satisfactorily meet all needs for conservation and wise use of our water resources.

MR. TOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Blakey. Are there any comments or questions?

MR. ROSE: I have a question on flood control. At the last meeting of this organization in Lincoln, Nebraska, there was a resolution passed concerning streams as a means of flood control--channelizing streams. We wish that this would be implemented somewhat through legislation. We have thousands of miles of streams in Iowa. Some have been removed from recreation to flood channelization. We have a program of 3 1/2 million dollars in one of the finest catfish areas in the United States and we cannot keep in the conservation business if this continues. Channelization is the expedient means of taking care of it. There must be other ways that would give conservation a little more emphasis from this standpoint. It puts us in a bad spot. We spent a lot of time and effort justifying our position. I wish you would comment a little.

MR. BLAKEY: Your remarks are about conflicts that exist in every situation. They could be alleviated if you would make us a party to the planning. The Corps of Engineers are responsible for making decisions but we must be responsible for helping them make those decisions. Get the solutions out in front.

MR. ROSE: We try to attend every hearing and we present our objections. At a hearing that was held back in 1952, we presented no objections at the time but now we have some. There seems to be a need to reappraise the plans.

MR. BLAKEY: A resolution in the Congress would do that.

MR. TOWELL: Are there any further questions? Any on the previous speakers?

MR. FLEMING: To Mr. Oren. Would you explain what the Department of Defense considers public use of a military reservation. Is that the use of the property by the local rod and gun club or special use of the military personnel and their guests or beyond that?

MR. OREN: We have defined public access as open to everybody on a first
come first served basis. You might decide that only 75 hunters might hunt at any one time. It is possible that "limited use"--limited to military and civilians connected with the military and their guests--might be specified. However, this is not desirable. We would like to have the installation open on a first come, first served basis.

It may be desirable for the military to reserve 30 spaces leaving 70 open for the public. This is because the special services are trying to promote military facilities to keep the men on the bases and out of the towns. The military themselves are opposed to having hunting confined to the military people plus the rod and gun club people. They are against this.

MR. EVANS: A rod and gun club does admit anyone to membership.

MR. OREN: Yes, this could be the means of getting into the reservation. The fee they charge is called a nominal fee--this needs to be defined.

MR. FLEMING: We are in agreement there. For example, we charge $5 for a deer hunting license and on a military reservation, they are charging a $4 fee for a one-day hunt.

MR. OREN: You're not in agreement with that charge?

MR. FLEMING: It seems a little more than nominal.

MR. TOWELL: Any more questions:

MR. RUHL: I understand that the regulations of the department are that there must be flood control involved in every project.

MR. EDMINISTER: Recreation or fish and wildlife alone cannot be the primary basis for the project.

MR. FLEMING: Two were offered, one in Illinois, that was strictly fish and game.

MR. EDMINISTER: I thought you meant justification for the whole project. If the project is within an existing reservoir, a separate structure can be built.

MR. RUHL: We had trouble in Michigan.

MR. OREN: That couldn't be subsidized by 556, could it?

MR. RUHL: Yes. Fifty per cent, but it has to be open to public access.

MR. TOWELL: Your problem was that it was not in a watershed situation.

MR. RUHL: It was in a public owned park.

MR. TOWELL: You can have a recreation area in a project which is specifically
devoted to hunting and fishing.

MR. RUHL: Flood control must be part of it.

MR. EDMINISTER: Flood prevention includes a storage pool for settlement. Then if you want to raise that and store a lot more water, you can. If you want cost sharing on the purchase of land, the amount of interest has to be 50 per cent or more.

MR. TOWELL: If you move somewhere else in the watershed and you want a development for fish, etc., it can be done by flood control.

MR. EDMINISTER: The cost of the acquisition of the land can be cost shared if--I'm not sure. I think for recreational developments.

MR. RUHL: I think that is right.

MR. TOWELL: Unless there is a compelling question, I am going to adjourn right on time. I do want to express my personal thanks to these four panelists. We will board the bus for the fish fry in front of the hotel. I also want to express my appreciation to Bill Barnes for his fine program.

Just one more reminder--we will meet again at 8:30 in the morning for the business meeting.

Tuesday Morning - July 9, 1963

PRESIDENT OLDS: Good morning, gentlemen. For very evident reasons (laryngitis), I am going to turn this meeting over to Mr. Bill Barnes.

MR. BARNES: Hayden has just asked me to chair this session. I am getting a little hard of hearing, so talk up. We will try to hold this to schedule. The first is the Secretary-Treasurer's report by Carl Mosley.

MR. MOSLEY: Checks totalling $1,825.95 were received in January 1963, from C. Phillip Agee of Nebraska, the past Secretary-Treasurer. All member agencies have paid their 1962 dues.

Two bank accounts were opened in the name of the Association on February 8, 1963 following consultation with the President and two bank managers. The sum of $1,325.95 was deposited in a savings account with the Park Federal Savings and Loan Association which currently pays four per cent interest. The remaining $500 was deposited in a checking account with the Ohio National Bank.

The Federal Internal Revenue Service assigned the Association the identification number of 316034979 for the purpose of identifying Federal business tax returns. It is understood that the interest from savings account is not taxable since the Association is a non-profit organization.

Expenses as of this date total $21.80 for the following items: a rubber stamp,
name badges, printing of programs, and corsages for the ladies and children attending this meeting. Sixty-three people have registered at this meeting.

It is estimated that expenses for this meeting, as well as printing and mailing of the proceedings will be covered by charges made to each of you at time of registration with the exception of about $210.

Statements for 1963 dues will be mailed this month. It is estimated that these dues and interest from the savings account will provide revenue amounting to $610.

Therefore, it is anticipated that the balance on hand as of December 31, 1963 will be approximately $2,226; an increase of about $400 for the year. Respectfully submitted, Carl L. Mosley, Secretary-Treasurer.

MR. BARNES: Is there a motion to accept this report subject to the report of the auditing committee?

(The motion was made, seconded, and passed.)

MR. BERNER: Gentlemen, it is a little out of order to bring up an item of new business, but I think it is important. The motion is this: I move that a special committee of federal and state relations be set up and that the incoming president be instructed to name the members of this committee. Why? The primary objective of this committee would be to improve relations between states and federal agencies operating in those states. There are probably at least six federal agencies active in the broad field of recreation in each of the states represented at this meeting. Probably all have had disagreements with these agencies. We are generally and frequently acting as individuals in these fields. This committee could come up with some guidelines that all would agree upon in dealing with the federal agencies. A report could be given next year at the meeting of this organization and at that time, it could be decided whether or not this committee has been worthwhile and if it should continue. For these reasons, I would like to move that a special federal and state relations committee be authorized and that the incoming president be instructed to name the members of this committee.

_______: I would suggest to the new president that Mr. Berner be named as a member of this committee.

MR. ROSE: I second the motion.

MR. BARNES: You have heard the motion. All those in favor, give your consent by saying aye. Those opposed. Motion carried.

Next is the Federal Aid Committee Report by Wilbur Bolt.

MR. BOLT: The Federal Aid Committee recommends that the Branch of Federal Aid explore other methods of simplifying the auditing system. I don't think it is necessary to pass a resolution on this. I recommend the acceptance of this report.
MR. GALE: I second it.

Motion passed.

MR. BARNES: Next is the Legislation Committee Report by George Moore.

MR. MOORE: This committee met with Bill Downs of the international committee and sifted through many bills and boiled them down to those we think are most important and ones that we, as an organization, should lend our aid as individuals and as an organization in getting action from Congress. Some are possible to get through, some are quite doubtful. If any individual has a bill he thinks is important enough to be presented to the group and discussed and the group thinks action is necessary, we will take it up. I will give the numbers of these bills to refresh your memory.

One of the most important bills is Senate 1363 and there are other numbers of that same bill with different versions. This bill is to pay 3/4 of 1 per cent in lieu of taxes. It is important because it has slowed up the wetland acquisition program. This one is the nearest version of the one submitted by the organization. The major difference is the amount of 3/4 of 1 per cent rather than 1 per cent.

Senate 649, also H.R. 3167, are very important bills. These bills are mainly to strengthen and amend the Federal Water Pollution Act. We all have this problem.

Senate 859 was discussed yesterday. Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill. Tomorrow, the Ways and Means Committee is hearing one session on transferring the gas tax from the highway fund to this fund. We recommend that a telegram be sent to Chairman Mills recommending that this transfer be made by his committee.

Senate 1508, H.R. 2390: Surplus property bill which would permit fish and game departments to participate in the use of the federal surplus property. Some states have been able to use much of this property for their purposes. The association has been trying to get this bill passed for a number of years.

Senate 784, 793, H.R. 3817. These bills have no real significance to this group except in the overall picture. It has received favorable reports from the Senate committee and was passed on June 27 with amendments recommended by the Bureau. We can consider that it has significance to the overall water power picture. Due to the rush to do nothing and then get home, it didn't get passed.

Senate 1250, H.R. 2857. These bills mean very much to all of us. They are pesticide coordination bills. It behooves all of us to get behind these bills so that use of these pesticides can be controlled. A companion bill--Senate 1251, H.R. 4487--requires the correct labeling of all chemicals used in pesticides and insecticides as well as removing the limit that is put on the funds available for research. This bill is only good business to see that these materials are correctly labelled and to receive sufficient money to carry out research.

Senate 468 is another bill that is of considerable interest to some states. No particular problem in my state, but there are some where it is a problem. This is
the Highway Coordination Bill. The crux of the bill is that any state highway department, on roads that use federal funds, must coordinate the planning of those roads with the fish and game departments to part-way alleviate danger to fish and wildlife. The Bureau is not supporting this bill because they feel it can be done through administration, but an expression from this group might make it a little stronger. If it was put in black and white, there would be no choice but to follow the law.

I have one other which we think important and quite a few others not important enough to take any more time.

H. R. 5159--Multiple Use Bill. This bill puts lands under the same multiple use program that the forest service has to work with. Many in the Bureau of Land Management in the western half of the country have had this problem. In many cases, they have not been recognizing full and adequate multiple use. This bill spells out steps they will have to take regarding all types of use and in particular, recreation.

Those are the bills we consider most important--nine of them--and I recommend that we support these bills as an association and as individuals. I move we adopt this report.

MR. VOIGT: I will second that motion if we will amend it to include the authorization to send a telegram to the committee and its chairman, Mr. Mills, who will be hearing H. R. 3846 tomorrow, endorsing the bill and particularly that transfer of the motor fuel tax. A telegram should also be sent to Mr. Penfold of the Izaak Walton League from the Midwest Association so that he will have something in writing when he testifies tomorrow.

MR. BARNES: Is there any further discussion? All in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion passed. Thank you, George. Next is the Federal Farm Program Committee Report by Willard Barbee.

MR. BARBEE: This committee recommends continued endorsement and support of the international committee report as presented at the annual meeting in 1962. These points were made:

1. Retired crops should be retired for more than one year or at least one full year so that the benefit of the retirement would be realized.

2. That the incentive payment rate be high enough to induce farmers to retire their crops.

3. The entire farm unit be eligible for participation.

We also recommend support of the following bills:

1. Senate 1588--H. R. 6491 which provides for holding 7.4 acres of land.

2. Small Watershed Program.
We urge the Department of Agriculture to provide for the cost share the same as for wildlife.

We commend the Midwest Pheasant Council on their report and recommend that other technical committees prepare and submit similar reports. We also recommend that other state agencies maintain the initiative in planning in their various states. I move the acceptance of this report.

MR. VOIGT: I second it.

MR. BARNES: If there is no discussion, all in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carried.

We are running ahead of time and it has been suggested that at this point we hear a report on the waterfowl situation. I don't know who could give that, perhaps Art Hawkins.

MR. HAWKINS: I am afraid I cannot be too specific. We are faced with an uncertain situation. The general picture as it appeared in May was that in Minnesota the habitat conditions were the best in a number of years. Birds returning to this area are good, population levels are the best in the last five years. In Manitoba habitat conditions are quite favorable. Water conditions are the best since 1960; there was more water then but the over-water nesting cover is in better shape now.

As you go west from Manitoba, there is the best nesting area in Canada. They had some flooding, one overnight rate totalled about five inches and resulted in a loss of some Canvasbacks. About twenty per cent were destroyed overnight.

Going west, good water shaves off rather rapidly. There is some good water but it is of the marginal type, only a foot or a foot and a half. There is not enough for a carryover because evaporation runs from two to three feet so you have to have a large rainfall to begin with. There are a large number of migratory birds but it is a nip and tuck situation whether they will have enough space for broods. The rains in May also benefitted this area. I don't know whether there was enough rain to affect the pothole situation; the July surveys will tell.

The latest topical report portrays the situation very well. There is a very spotty situation in Saskatchewan. Some areas are worse; some are better. Northern Alberta is in excellent shape. As you go south, they are still suffering a severe drought.

It adds up to this: The potential is better but I am in no position to say how much better, and it is going to be important to know what happens in July to say whether conditions are better.

MR. BARNES: Thank you, Art. Perhaps Bud Morgan can add something to your remarks.

MR. MORGAN: I can't say any more than Art has told you.
MR. BARNES: Are there any other comments? Since we are still running early, I think we can take up the Wetlands Committee Report by Tom Evans before coffee break.

MR. EVANS: The subject of wetlands and the necessity of preserving them has been the concern of numerous committees and reports for many years. As early as 1930, Aldo Leopold referred to the need for preserving wetlands in both Canada and the United States. In 1931, Seth Gordon, in a report to the International Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, stated: "COOPERATION WITH CANADA: Provides that any part of this fund may be expended in the establishment of migratory bird breeding grounds in Canada under a workable plan to be evolved by the officials in charge, or by an International Migratory Bird Commission established for that purpose." In recent years the preservation of wetlands, particularly for the production of waterfowl, has become a matter of grave and urgent concern. For the past 4-5 years very specific recommendations have been made as to possible approaches to the business of saving enough wetlands to insure waterfowl hunting for the future.

This report of the Wetlands Committee, Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners, will not recount all the facts and information of the past. It will report some of the work being done in the United States and Canada and summarize some recommendations.

Since the Migratory Bird Committee of the International Association has, in the past, made strong recommendations for a large-scale international program of waterfowl management, it seems well to present some information on what the United States and Canada has done and is doing at present.

CANADA

The Canadian Wildlife Service had a program ready to go into operation in 1961 which provided for pilot projects to test the feasibility of a wetland acquisition program. Although not large, the objective was to provide some data and guidelines for an expanded program on either an individual or international basis. Unfortunately, it was caught in the austerity program of the past administration and could not be implemented at that time.

This program has now gotten under way with the present administration making some funds available for easement taking on potholes and wetlands. This work is centered in one block of land straddling the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border near Virden, Manitoba. To date, 20 year easements have been secured on 1,011 acres of potholes at an average cost of $13.86 per acre. This is about as large as the program is intended to be since its purpose is to determine the type of approach most acceptable to landowners and, therefore, most likely to be successful on a large scale.

Interest in the possibility of a duck stamp in Canada remains high and would provide the funds to finance a future wetlands acquisition and easement program.

One interesting development has been the creation of a Council of Ministers for Natural Resources, made up of the Provincial Ministers responsible for resource
management in their respective provinces.

On the depredations front, the Canadian Wildlife Service administered a program, cooperated in by several states, aimed at getting answers to this problem which is so closely allied to the preservation of wetlands. Some positive approaches to control of depredations were found and although the cooperative program has ceased, the Service is continuing its studies. In fact, the program of scaring devices (exploders) has now been supplemented by utilization of lure crops, some of which are contracted for in the spring while other key fields are purchased and left as feeding areas.

In Manitoba some work, however small, has been done. Since 1930, some 52,000 acres have been acquired and additional work on depredations control has been carried on. A major project in Manitoba, destructive to waterfowl breeding habitat, is the Grand Rapids hydro-plant development in the Summerberry Marsh area of northern Manitoba. A minimum of 500,000 acres of productive marsh will be destroyed. Another 500,000 acres could be affected and probably lose its productive capacity unless protected from periodic flooding. Fortunately, the provincial minister, from whom the power company must secure a permit to close the dam and fill the reservoir, took a firm stand in favor of waterfowl. He refuses to grant the permit unless and until the company agreed to construct a levee which would prevent the flooding of the additional 500,000 acres. Latest word is that the company has agreed to do so. This is positive, effective action aimed at wetlands preservation.

UNITED STATES

We are all familiar with the new program of wetlands acquisition financed by the $105,000,000 authorization. $7,000,000 of this was appropriated for fiscal year 1963 along with $3,400,000 of Duck Stamp monies. An additional $10,000,000 has been appropriated for fiscal '64, plus the Duck Stamp revenue which will probably be less than $3,000,000.

Due in part to the necessity of gearing up for a large scale program, progress was slow initially. Operating on a "willing-seller" basis and in the face of opposition by states and counties over loss of tax revenues, the Bureau has made some progress. However, the program has speeded up and the appropriated funds are being utilized. The entire $7,000,000 from the Loan Fund plus the $3,400,000 Duck Stamp revenue for fiscal '63 has been obligated. In addition, the Bureau has $1,000,000 worth of options, signed by landowners, awaiting the new 1964 appropriations so they can be accepted. The Migratory Bird Commission has already approved $15,000,000 worth of acquisition projects so there is this backing of approvals which will obligate funds.

As of June 30, 1963, the Bureau has acquired 76,000 acres in fee and has taken easements on 11,945 acres.

From the standpoint of preserving breeding grounds habitat, the picture is not quite so rosy. It is in the states of Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota that opposition to the acquisition program has been met. Removal of lands from the tax rolls is the primary obstacle.
Figures were available for this report through March 31, 1963, only so the total for fiscal '63 would be somewhat above the following. In the three states mentioned, 47,678 acres had been acquired in fee and easements taken on 11,945 acres by March 31. Total cost was $2,599,315.00. It would appear that it has not been possible to utilize more than 50 per cent of the Loan Fund monies on the breeding grounds. The balance has gone for additions to refuges and other high value waterfowl habitat on the migration routes and wintering grounds.

Despite the fact that support for the loan fund was based on its being used primarily on the breeding grounds, the use, at present, throughout the flyways is not without justification.

Current restricted seasons, due to reduced populations and poor production, are resulting in the disposal of highly valuable privately held and managed aquatic habitat. Duck clubs throughout the Mississippi Flyway are losing interest in keeping their expensive holdings. For example, in one area in the Illinois River Valley, a minimum of 4,000 acres of prime habitat is being offered for sale. It should not be allowed to pass into ownership which will result in its conversion to other uses. The Mississippi Flyway Council is planning a study of the role and value of private lands in waterfowl management.

Despite the progress that has been made, this program is not on schedule as authorized. It can't possibly go too fast, when viewed from the standpoint of the welfare of waterfowl, and any possibility to speed it up should be utilized. Actually, the authorization provides for appropriation of the entire $105,000,000 in seven installments of $15,000,000 each, beginning with fiscal year 1962. Appropriations to date are or will be: 1962 - none; 1963 - $7,000,000; 1964 - $10,000,000. Thus, of a potential $45,000,000 to date, only $17,000,000 has been appropriated for the first three years.

Other ways in which this fund could be utilized to achieve the same objectives are presented in the recommendations in this report.

Minnesota has made some notable progress through its program of wetland purchase financed by a $1.00 surcharge on small game hunting licenses. The State has acquired 1,300 tracts totalling 117,900 acres at a cost of $3,600,000. In addition, 60,000 acres have been developed for waterfowl on major wildlife land units. During the next two years, there will be available $342,000 per year from the $1.00 surcharge plus $400,000 from the Natural Resources Program financed by the one-cent per package surcharge on cigarettes.

Other aspects of wetlands use and other approaches to maintaining adequate wetland acreages particularly pertinent to some states such as Minnesota are:

1. Studies to determine productive possibilities and (work of this kind has begun) to evaluate forest wetlands since these are less apt to be drained than those in farming country and will probably be more important for waterfowl production in the future. A study indicates good results from the use of nesting boxes for goldeneyes on such areas.
2. Joint use of wetlands by several game species. In farming country, wetlands are also of great value as wintering areas for pheasants. More investigational work is necessary to determine the best type of pheasant cover on such areas. Practical methods for gathering such information are now being considered. Another approach to this same problem is planning acquisition of wetlands in a pattern that will allow proper spacing for pheasant cover in farming country. A start has been made on this in a watershed survey program.

3. Tying in wetlands with other human activities. Creation and preservation of some wetland areas can be tied in with other human activities. In Minnesota, often towns and cities select small lakes and marsh areas to receive affluent from sewage treatment plants. These are fertile water areas that are highly productive of waterfowl. It is likely that the same use can be made of some industrial wastes such as those from sugar beet processing plants.

4. Wild rice and waterfowl. Wild rice harvesting is an important commercial industry in Minnesota bringing in an income of about two million dollars a year. Future plans of the Department include creation and improvement of existing rice stands by water level controls. These stands should also serve as breeding, feeding and resting areas for waterfowl. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also has some similar plans for waters on Indian lands.

5. Wetlands as wildlife seeing areas. A program is now under way, sponsored by several organizations, for the creation of a wetland bird sanctuary area connected to Fort Snelling State Park in the Twin Cities. This approach has possibilities in that people other than hunters will help finance such areas.

Iowa, although no longer a major duck producing state, has been directing some of its effort toward restoration of production areas. In the past two years, 5,632 acres have been purchased and since the federal aid program began, over $3,000,000 has been spent in developing and improving some 73,000 acres of marshes.

These are merely some instances of what federal governments and some state and provinces have accomplished. Other states and provinces have accomplished much along the same lines, but this is not intended as a complete report, even for midwest states.

Which way we should go from here remains controversial. However, many seemingly sound approaches have been presented in the past and they are again presented here. The Wetlands Committee believes that in some instances strong action should be taken by this Association as a body and by the members individually.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Canadian and United States governments move more firmly and rapidly toward consummation of some cooperative internationally financed program of wetlands preservation in both countries.

2. That authority for expanded use of the $105,000,000 be sought, such authorization to provide for:
A. Grants to states for similar acquisition, lease and easement taking programs on a non-matching basis.

B. Development of existing or potential wetlands safe from exploitation, to raise their production capacity.

C. Payments to taxing bodies in lieu of taxes.

D. Expenditure of any or all the funds in Canada if and when it is determined that a joint international effort in the prairie provinces is necessary and desired.

E. Incentive payments to landowners, as supplements to USDA subsidy payments, to retain, restore or create water areas which do or would have value for waterfowl production.

3. That this Association and its members take strong action to secure passage by Congress of legislation providing for payments to local taxing bodies in lieu of taxes lost through public acquisition of wetlands. The current bill S. 1363, is currently supported by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

In summary, we can no longer write reports, make recommendations and then sit back and hope something happens. We must take positive action. Whether or not we believe firmly that acquisition of wetlands will guarantee the future of waterfowl and waterfowl hunting, we can be assured of one fact. Wetlands, drained, filled, or otherwise destroyed, will not produce waterfowl, serve other forms of wildlife or provide other valuable wetland uses. Do we, therefore, have any alternative to saving all we can by whatever means we have at our disposal?

Respectfully submitted, Wetlands Committee: Earl Rose, John Moyle, G. W. Malaher, Tom Evans, Chairman.

I move acceptance of this report.

MR. ROSE: I second it.

MR. BARNES: All in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carried. We will now have our coffee break.

After the coffee break

MR. BARNES: The meeting will come to order please. There is a call for Kermit Morse; is he in the room? Next will be the Resolutions Committee Report by Larry Gale.

MR. GALE: There were quite a number of resolutions so we eliminated several because they were confined to a local situation. Others involved duplication. We tried to take the one we thought covered the situation in general. Other members of the committee were Mr. Voigt of Wisconsin, Mr. Welsh of Colorado, and Mr. Olds of Ohio.
We will follow this procedure: I shall read each resolution and as they are read if any of you feel discussion is needed, signify this and we will lay those resolutions aside. We will pass those not requiring discussion in one group and take the others separately.

RESOLUTION NO. 1

WHEREAS the pheasant is the number one game bird in most of the midwestern portion of the United States, and is pursued by millions of sportsmen, including a large number of farmers and their families who have inherent interest in the welfare of wildlife on the farm and the economic benefits connected therewith, and

WHEREAS agricultural land-use practices are becoming more unfavorable for pheasant and other game bird production through adverse effects on nesting and winter cover, as a result of wetland drainage, early hay cutting, or intensive farming, a trend toward more row crops at the expense of nesting cover types such as small grains and hay, a shift to continuous growing of corn on highly fertile soils in some areas, and destruction of available cover by brush clearing, uncontrolled burning, and grazing, and

WHEREAS the majority of land necessary for good wildlife production will remain in private ownership despite acquisition of many areas by State and Federal agencies, causing future pheasant and other game bird populations to depend to a large extent on the proper management of well distributed food and cover units on private lands, and

WHEREAS agricultural economists estimate that 50 million acres of good crop land should be converted to other uses within the next twenty years to reduce crop surpluses, a new land-conversion program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture will undoubtedly be developed to make it economically possible for land owners in highly productive agricultural areas to convert some crop land acreages to other uses, and

WHEREAS a well-designed land-conversion program geared to benefit wildlife would convert more crop land (total acreage) to other uses than would such projects as golf courses, picnic and camping areas, and farm ponds, and would establish areas which would not be greatly altered, permitting immediate restoration to agricultural crop production in the event of a national emergency, and

WHEREAS some modifications or adjustments in currently accepted land conversion practices are advisable and necessary in order to obtain maximum benefit for wildlife and sportsmen,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners recommends that the following points be considered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the development of new LAND-USE CONVERSION PROGRAMS:

1. Premium payments should be provided for conversion of land, based on wildlife values in addition to potential yield of surplus crops;
2. Conversion of land should be encouraged in areas where these lands will be most beneficial to pheasants and other game birds;

3. Attempts should be made to achieve a better distribution of smaller tracts of land on a large number of farms in good range rather than large tracts on isolated farms;

4. Land already in a preferred nesting cover type (grass legume) should be encouraged for conversion to wildlife use;

5. Practices permitted on converted acres should be better defined and include methods of weed control and use of selected forage species that will encourage high quality wildlife cover;

6. These land-conversion programs should be coordinated with state fish and game agencies directly concerned with managing wildlife, inasmuch as the conditions affecting management practices may vary from state to state.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in addition to current modification in U. S. D. A. programs to benefit wildlife, the following related adjustments should be made in A. S. C. S. practices for wildlife.

a. New ACP guide lines emphasizing wildlife values should be established to cover land conversion programs.

b. The land owner should be discouraged from converting present wild land to crop land.

c. Grazing rights should be regulated on all converted lands to a degree consistent with good wildlife management.

d. Cost sharing benefits should be provided for maintaining wetland and other habitat types for wildlife.

Is there any discussion or objections to this resolution? This is as worded by the Pheasant Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

WHEREAS many Federal properties, especially Department of Defense installations, when no longer needed for their original purpose, can well serve purposes of wildlife conservation, and

WHEREAS present laws permit the disposal of such surplus real property to state agencies at no cost for purposes of wildlife conservation, and

WHEREAS the General Services Administration seldom classifies such surplus property for wildlife conservation purposes, and

WHEREAS this surplus property is usually classified for agricultural and/or
industrial uses at full appraised value or for disposal at 50 per cent of the appraised value for public parks or recreational purposes, and

WHEREAS the sale of such surplus property for agricultural uses, places more land in production of surplus crops, and

WHEREAS the states must usually purchase land for wildlife purposes which is now in private ownership, displace present owners, and pay for expensive improvements,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that the General Services Administration consider disposal of land for wildlife conservation as one of the highest and best uses for available surplus Federal lands.

This policy varies between the district offices of GSA. We had difficulty in getting our office to do this. It is sufficiently widespread to warrant this resolution. Are there any objections to this resolution? If none, we will proceed to resolution number three.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

WHEREAS chemical rehabilitation of lakes and streams is rapidly becoming standardized in fish management practices, and vastly improved angling success usually follows well-planned projects, and

WHEREAS recent criticism has been leveled at the disregard for certain rare endemic species of fish and other biota which are obliterated from the treated areas,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that hereafter all chemical rehabilitation projects take adequate precautions to preserve the desirable rare species of fish and aquatic insects. Such precautions will include transfer of adequate stocks to suitable nursery areas for later restocking when toxicity levels have declined to permit safe re-introduction.

I think most of you have read the recent criticism of this in the National Parks Magazine and the rebuttal in the Sporting and Fishing Journal. No objections?

RESOLUTION NO. 4

WHEREAS those interested in the preservation of fish and wildlife recreation have endorsed the principle of recreational use of construction projects affecting the conservation of land and water and have further recognized the desirability of high quality water,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners reaffirms its position that maximum recreational opportunities must not be impaired by the thoughtless or deliberate polluting of our nation's water resources and recommends that Congress enact into law the principles of S. 649 which will strengthen the status of the federal water pollution control program as a proper and orderly
procedure to achieve this end. Are there any objections?

RESOLUTION NO. 5

WHEREAS in the past year the general public has become aware of the many threats to human welfare, as well as to wildlife, posed by the unwise use of chemical pesticides, and

WHEREAS the present administration is fully cognizant of the manifold aspects of the problem, and

WHEREAS the "Use of Pesticides," a report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, has presented a number of comprehensive recommendations thereto,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that these recommendations be implemented and that the passage of legislation to eliminate the "protest" registration of pesticides by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, such as H.R. 2857 or H.R. 5589 or H.R. 4487 or H.R. 5588, be supported, as well as other legislation that may be required to carry out the above recommendations.

Are there any objections to this one?

RESOLUTION NO. 6

WHEREAS the few remaining wilderness areas in the United States have become, or are likely to become, over-run by the public through the extension of roads and other transportation facilities, and

WHEREAS industry is looking to these areas for new sources of sawlog timber, minerals and hydroelectric power, and

WHEREAS opening these areas to exploitation by industries or developing them for the more intensive kinds of recreational uses will destroy their wilderness values, and

WHEREAS tapping these potential sources of raw materials is not essential to the nation's welfare, and

WHEREAS wilderness areas are essential for the continued existence of certain species of wildlife, and our only remaining laboratories where the ecology of plants and animals can be studied under primitive conditions, and

WHEREAS wilderness areas have played an important role in our American Heritage,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that an adequate Wilderness Bill be enacted by this session
of Congress.

Any objections?

RESOLUTION NO. 7

WHEREAS conservationists have been deeply concerned over the problem of waterfowl habitat preservation, waterfowl production, and the sport of wildfowling, and

WHEREAS no state or group of states, of itself, is in a position to obtain adequate land and water area for the protection of the overall waterfowl resources, and

WHEREAS the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife each year with the cooperation of many states, provinces, Canadian, and private agencies assembles the most complete data available on waterfowl numbers and habitat conditions on a continent-wide basis and has made decisions designed to provide for continuing supplies of waterfowl,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners support the Bureau in its current and planned program of wetland acquisition to meet the needs of the resource.

Any discussion of this resolution?

RESOLUTION NO. 8

WHEREAS public recreation lands and facilities throughout the United States are either over-crowded, undeveloped, or too far removed from centers of population to meet present outdoor recreation demands, and

WHEREAS the demand for outdoor recreational opportunities, both of an intensive and extensive character, can be expected to triple by the turn of the century, and

WHEREAS both federal and state governmental agencies have found it difficult to obtain sufficient funds by appropriation to finance the acquisition and development of land either for intensive park-use or extensive types of recreation that are easily accessible to centers of populations, and

WHEREAS lands of high recreational, wildlife, and scenic potential are rapidly becoming more difficult, if not impossible, to acquire, and

WHEREAS bills now in Congress (S. 859 and H. R. 3846) provide ways and means for financing the acquisition and development of lands urgently needed for outdoor recreation,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that the Land and Water Conservation Fund bills (S. 859 and
H. R. 3846) be supported in principle, and Congress be urged to enact appropriate legislation without delay.

Is there any discussion of this resolution?

RESOLUTION NO. 9

WHEREAS it is believed that enactment of H. R. 5131, or S. 1, bills to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, or similar bills to achieve the same purpose, will make a material contribution toward the conservation of natural resources, as well as provide healthful employment for young men in carrying out conservation programs,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners reaffirms its support of such legislation.

Any discussion?

RESOLUTION NO. 10

WHEREAS the Congress has authorized and directed the accelerated acquisition of vital wetland habitat for waterfowl, providing a $105 million advance in migratory bird hunting stamp revenue, and

WHEREAS the success of this essential program is severely jeopardized by the resistance of some state and local governments to removal of additional lands from the tax rolls, and

WHEREAS this resistance would be lessened by making payments in lieu of taxes from refuge revenues or other funds which may be available,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners affirm its support of the principle of payments to counties in lieu of taxes as set forth in S. 1363, and further

BE IT RESOLVED that the member states notify their respective senators and representatives of the importance of enacting such legislation.

We had a little bit of discussion about this resolution because we were in hopes we would have some specification of a certain bill to support. These bills are all similar but they vary in amount of payments. The Department of the Interior supports payment of 3/4 of 1 per cent while the Humphrey bill goes to 1 per cent.

MR. EVANS: Hold this one, unless you want to discuss it now.

MR. GALE: No, let's hold it and discuss it later.

(Note: This is the resolution as revised and adopted. See the discussion and action following Resolution No. 15.)
RESOLUTION NO. 11

WHEREAS Federal legislation is required to authorize the donation of surplus personal property of the United States to the various states for the promotion of fish and wildlife activities and for related purposes, and

WHEREAS the United States government periodically declares as surplus to its needs certain items of equipment and supplies which would be great benefit in developing wildlife restoration projects, and

WHEREAS H. R. 5161 and S. 1238 provide for the release of surplus Federal equipment, supplies, etc., to the states for fish and wildlife management activities and related purposes,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that the Congress be urged to adopt this legislation or similar bills to accomplish the same purpose.

This is a perennial. We have passed it every year for ten years. Possibly someday it will get off the ground.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

WHEREAS the accelerated highway construction program has resulted in significant destruction of fish and wildlife habitat, and

WHEREAS much of this habitat destruction could be avoided by proper planning,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners proclaim its support of S. 468, introduced by Senators Metcalf and Moss, to amend the Highway Act by requiring that the Secretary of Interior, after consultation with state authorities, approve federal aid highway surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates, so as to protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources, and further

BE IT RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Road, Senate Committee on Public Works, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Any questions about this resolution?

RESOLUTION NO. 13

WHEREAS there are several bills in Congress which would extend new Federal Aids of various kinds to the states, and

WHEREAS most of this legislation permits the Governors of the several states to designate the cooperating agencies or else frequently names such agencies without regard to those having direct responsibility for management of the subject, and
WHEREAS there is no assurance that fish and game management, forest, and park agencies will be assured of participation in such activities as outdoor recreation or water research under Federal Aid,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that every effort should be made to assure that full consideration is given in such legislation to the conservation departments or separate fish, game, forests, or parks agencies to assure their direct participation and control of any available Federal Aid funds. A copy of this resolution should be forwarded to all members of Congress and states represented by the Midwest Association urging them to work for amendment of Federal Aid legislation to this effect.

Any discussion of this resolution?

RESOLUTION NO. 14

WHEREAS Public Law 87-658 entitled "Public Works Acceleration Act" appropriated funds to the heads of agencies of the Federal Government administering approved grant-in-aid programs, and

WHEREAS these funds were to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in "eligible" areas burdened by substantial unemployment, and

WHEREAS the Department of the Interior received an allocation of APW funds for expenditures by the states under established P-R and D-J policies and procedures for capital improvement projects, and

WHEREAS the "ground rules" imposed upon the states by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce in the matter of reporting work progress are more stringent and frequent then those required for regular P-R and D-J projects carried on under the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Acts and which projects represent considerably more money, and

WHEREAS these special reporting regulations have created a frustrating situation for the operating agencies in having to compile and maintain two separate types of records for identical type projects,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners requests the Department of Commerce to revise or modify the reporting procedures so that they are the same as those required for all other P-R and D-J projects under the policies and procedures of the Federal Aid to Fish and Wildlife Restoration Acts.

Any discussion?

RESOLUTION NO. 15

WHEREAS the State of Ohio has provided a well organized program of interesting and informative activities for the 30th Annual Meeting of the Association of Midwest
Fish and Game Commissioners, and

WHEREAS the delegates, their wives, and families are most appreciative of
the hospitality provided by Ohio,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish
and Game Commissioners in its 30th Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio, July 7-9,
1963, expresses its appreciation and commendation to the host state of Ohio, and
further

BE IT RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Fred E.
Morr, Director, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and to Mr. Hayden W.
Olds, Chief, Ohio Division of Wildlife.

I move the adopting of all the resolutions excepting number 10 which is to be
discussed separately.

MR. VOIGT: I second the motion.

MR. BARNES: Any discussion?

MR. GLEN POWER: I think I am out of order on Resolution No. 8. Are you
abandoning the 75-25 split as recommended?

MR. GALE: The resolution deals only with the principle of the land and water
fund. It makes no mention of any percentage.

MR. BARNES: Is there further discussion? If not, it has been moved and
seconded that we accept these resolutions excepting number 10 which is to be discussed
separately. All those in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion
carried.

MR. GALE: Resolution number 10 is open for discussion.

MR. EVANS: My reason for asking for further discussion was that I note that
the resolution refers to the use of refuge revenues and I wonder why it is so
restrictive. Maybe it would be better to say to use any funds available.

MR. GALE: All of the bills introduced to date provide this sort of financing
and we are advocating these bills so this source of financing is mentioned.

MR. EVANS: What is the present feeling on the use of these funds? On a
national basis, some areas produce a lot; others don't.

MR. GALE: I think you have hit on the source of opposition to this legislation.
Some of these bills provide that all of the revenue acquired in fee would be pooled in
a fund and payments made to various counties all over the country from this central
fund. In any year where total revenue did not equal these payments they would be
scaled down accordingly. Some of the areas you mentioned are going to furnish the
bulk of this revenue. It is not on a state basis; the individual refuge would have to
support its own payments.

MR. EVANS: Considering some of the present situations, there might be some real opposition felt. We might reword the resolution to read: "or from other funds which may be made available for the same purpose."

MR. MOORE: It might eventually have the same effect as Tom is referring to—the Service has approved that any year the receipts fall below the fund necessary for 3/4 of 1 per cent, it would be reduced proportionately; and in years where more money is available it can be used for any other purpose. If that money is not maintained in the treasury as they continue to buy non-productive land, it will drop below the 3/4 of 1 per cent and some counties will raise an eyebrow. It would specify from any source or they should hold receipts so they can maintain a level. It can get serious in a few years.

MR. GALE: Based on recent years, the Bureau feels that refuge revenues should be entirely adequate to pay 3/4 of 1 per cent. If you go up to 1 per cent it may not be possible.

MR. BURWELL: Both have a point. Current receipts run $2,000,000 a year. Something less than $200,000 goes back to the counties. There is a surplus. Not all of the money is coming from the oil wells in Louisiana. A good share comes from up north. We are at a crossroads in this in lieu of tax business. One thing it has effectively stopped any expansion of wildlife refuge in the Midwest. The NWRP expansion is stopped until we get this in lieu of tax thing solved. The bill we favor is Senate 1363—a simple clear, clean bill advocating 3/4 of 1 per cent. One danger in the other bills: Some penalize different states and have unusual features in them if you would read them. Mr. Janzen is concerned as to whether there would be enough revenue over the years to pay, but when that day comes, another source of money will be found.

MR. GALE: Any further discussion?

MR. EVANS: We don't want to do anything to jeopardize this kind of legislation. I can't help but feel this will be an issue in the impending hearings. Perhaps a little giving on our part might be a little bit of a salve.

MR. GALE: I will accept a revision of Resolution No. 10.

MR. GUTERMUTH: The importance of the situation is this: The legislation is bogged down and we must do something about it. We are trying to find an alternative proposal. This is an unusual situation. $277,000 or some such amount goes to one parish in Louisiana. We are trying to find a formula that would amortize this in ten years. The formula is not quite worked out yet. I recommend that your resolution read something in support of the Metcalf bill in principle.

MR. GALE: I have a revision I would like to recommend. It reads as follows, (See Resolution No. 10)

I move the adoption of this resolution.
MR. EVANS: I second it.

MR. BARNES: Any further discussion? All those in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carried.

MR. GALE: I also move that the reference to the "West" in the first resolution be changed to "Midwest."

MR. LODGE: I second that motion.

Motion carried.

MR. TOWELL: Most of the states received a letter from the chairman of the subcommittee of the House who is in an important position on the subject of waterfowl. A series of hearings in Washington are to be held seemingly to embarrass the Fish and Wildlife Service and upholding the stand taken by Louisiana. Assistant Secretary, Frank Briggs, informed me today that the Service has not been consulted in any way and asked that we take advantage of this opportunity to go and testify in behalf of our own interests. The dates are uncertain. August 5 had been set for some hearing. He also had a questionable date of July 20. My purpose is to urge all of the states to stand up and be counted so that this hearing is not a one-sided affair.

MR. BARNES: I wish to thank the Resolutions Committee for screening these resolutions so that they did not take any undue amount of time for discussion. Are there any resolutions from the floor?

MR. MOORE: I want you to think about this a little. We have a serious problem of getting people to go to meetings out of the state. Is there a possibility of combining a lot of these little meetings into one day of meetings where each group could meet and have the privilege of attending each other's meetings. It would be easier to take two or three carloads out of the state at one time than to take one here and one there. Next year I may make a motion to this effect.

MR. BURWELL: Thanks to Mr. Ruhl and Mr. Towell for their fine comments. I came up here to tell you about the Northern Plains Waterfowl Research Center. Three years ago our Association supported the construction of that Center and solicited the support of Milton Young. The first construction contract is let and I would suggest that our Association send a letter to Senator Young and thank him for his support.

MR. BARNES: I think that can be done without any action on the part of this meeting.

MR. VOIGT: I have a resolution that was not considered by the Resolutions Committee. It is that our Association support the Tule-Klamath bill, Senate 793, as amended.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

WHEREAS S. 793 by Kuchel of California, as amended, would give Congressional
protection to the refuges, stabilize their boundaries, rule out further homesteading and dedicate them permanently to wildlife conservation, and

WHEREAS such action has been a priority legislative goal of this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Congress be urged to enact S. 793, as amended, without delay.

MR. RUHL: I second that motion.

MR. BARNES: All those in favor show your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carried. We have an obligation to the hotel to attend the luncheon. If anyone is interested in attending who has not purchased a ticket, he may pay at the luncheon. Any other announcements, Hayden?

MR. BERNER: Hayden Olds informs me that the gentlemen, William Reese, with his license writing machine is here and it might be appropriate for him to be introduced so the gentlemen will know who he is when they see him at the display.

Evidently, he is setting up the machine right now and will be in later.

MR. BARNES: Next is the Auditing Committee Report by Woodrow Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Walter Scott and myself met twice with Mr. Mosley in order to secure his assistance in auditing the Midwest Association's records. The organization's year is on a calendar year basis and our duty was to audit the records of the former secretary, so we were unable to discuss the records with the official who kept them. We strongly urge and recommend that the secretary-treasurer of the past calendar year be urged to attend the next year and be on the program and make the treasurer's report for the preceding calendar year.

We found the records in good shape but we did not find bills for all the expenditures. We are sure that Mr. Mosley will follow these procedures and he has agreed to prepare a procedure to be followed by succeeding officers. With these remarks, we want to move approval of the records, and that this report be accepted.

MR. BARBEE: I second the motion.

MR. BARNES: All those in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carried. The last report will be that of the Nomination Committee.

MR. MOSLEY: The members of this committee, Mr. Berner, Chairman and Mr. Omand had to leave early so I will give their report. The nominations are as follows: President, Lester P. Voigt, Wisconsin; Vice-President, C. H. D. Clarke, Ontario; Secretary-Treasurer, Walter E. Scott, Wisconsin.

By precedent this means that the annual meeting will be in Wisconsin next year and in Ontario the succeeding year. I move acceptance of the committee's nominations.
MR. LODGE: I second the nominations.

MR. FLEMING: I move that the nominations be closed.

MR. MOORE: I second the motion.

MR. BARNES: All in favor give your consent by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carried. I now turn the rostrum over to Les Voigt.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: Walter Scott and I are honored and privileged to be your officers for next year. Milwaukee will be your convention city. We have a number of new accommodations particularly the new Milwaukee Inn, adjacent to Lake Michigan, with many conveniences that will provide you with an enjoyable time.

Within a few weeks we will notify you of the dates and the final arrangements and I will be asking you to accept some committee assignments which I am sure you will accept.

Is there any other business to come before this Association while we are waiting for Mr. Reese? Mr. Reese would you care to come up and say a few words?

MR. REESE: I would like to thank you for inviting me to display this machine and if you will come up, I will be happy to demonstrate it for you.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: I am sure the members will be interested in looking over your machine. Is there any other business to come before this Association? If not, I call this meeting adjourned and I will see you all in Milwaukee next year. Thank you very much.

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS
(Office of the President)
Wisconsin Conservation Department
P. O. Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin
August 1, 1963

I am following up on my promise to let you know the details as to the 31st annual meeting of the Association at Milwaukee next year. Please mark your calendar as follows:

DATE: July 12 (Sunday) through July 14 (Tuesday), 1964
PLACE: The Milwaukee Inn - East State Street at Lake Michigan,
Milwaukee 2 (Telephone: BRoadway 6-8800)

Will see you there next year! Best wishes.

L. P. Voigt, President

(FACSIMILE OF POSTCARD RECEIVED AUG. 5, 1963)
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<td>1947</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>P. T. Gilbert</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Ernest Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd P. Vance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>1955</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Glen D. Palmer</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>James Kimball</td>
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