Proceedings
of the
42nd
Annual Convention

KFGC Library
PLEASE check out
before removing.

JULY 21-24, 1975

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

KFGC Library
PLEASE check out
before removing.

PROCEEDINGS

of the

42nd ANNUAL MEETING

of the

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

held at

TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN

July 21 - 24, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TUESDAY, JULY 22:

Call to Order 1

Roll Call and Announcements 1

President's Address - Charles D. Harris 2

Keynote Address - "Financing Fish & Wildlife Programs in Troubled Economic Times" by Howard A. Tanner, Director Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources 8

Speakers - "The Nature Preserve System in Indiana" by William B. Barnes, Chief Division of Nature Preserves 19

"The Sportsman's Organizations Role in Financing New Fish and Wildlife Programs" by Thomas L. Washington, Executive Director Michigan United Conservation Clubs 22

"General Fund Support for Fish and Wildlife Programs" by Honorable Russell Hellman, Chairman Sub-committee on Appropriation Michigan House of Representatives Joint House of Representatives and Senate Capital Outlay Committee 32

"Trends Toward Unions of State Employees" by Fred Lipinski, Director, Membership Services Division, Michigan State Employees Association 37

Panel on "Special Revenue Financing for Fish and Wildlife Programs" by Dale Haney, Chief, Division of Wildlife Ohio Department of Natural Resources and Robert L. Evans, Assistant Director, Management Division of Wildlife Colorado Department of Natural Resources 47

Welcome - Mayor Diane Gilbo, Traverse City 60

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23:

Committee Reports - Pro Hunt, Carl Noren, Missouri 62

Liaison with Pheasant Council, Willard Barbee, Nebraska 65

Legislative Committee, Larry Gale, Missouri 70

National Coordinating Committee, Carl Noren, Missouri 73

Water Resources Committee, Carl Noren, Missouri 73

Speaker - "Financing Fish and Wildlife Programs in the Canadian Provinces" by Ken K. Irizaws, Ontario 78

THURSDAY, JULY 24:

Speaker - "Cooperative Program, Waterfowl Habitat Development in a Mining Waste Disposal Area" by Edward R. Bingham, Cooperating Manager, Environmental Affairs, Copper Range Co., White Pine, Michigan 89

Committee Reports - Audit, Ken Loftus, Ontario 103

Treasurer's Report, Fred Warders, Kansas 103

By-Laws, Dave Vesall, Minnesota 104

Awards, John Popowski, South Dakota 106

Resolutions, Russell Stuart, North Dakota 108

New Business 118

Committee Reports - Nominating, Ken Irizawa, Ontario 119

Installation of Officers 120

APPENDIX A 122

APPENDIX B 125

APPENDIX C 127

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

ASSOCIATION
OF
MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

Holiday Inn - Traverse City, Michigan
July 21 - 24, 1975

First General Session - Tuesday, July 22, 1975

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m. by Charles D. Harris, 1975 President of the Association.

PRES. HARRIS: I would like to call this meeting to order. We will have roll call followed by some introductions. Secretary Gary Boushelle will call roll.

BOUSHELLE: As we go through the roll call, we'd appreciate that the representative from the respective state would also introduce the people they brought with them. Colorado. Illinois. Indiana. Iowa. Kansas. Manitoba. Michigan. Minnesota. Missouri. North Dakota. Nebraska. Ohio. Oklahoma. Ontario. Saskatchewan. South Dakota. Wisconsin. Kentucky. Mr. President, that concludes the roll call.

(All members were represented except Illinois, Manitoba, Oklahoma, Saskatchewan. See Appendix A for complete list of attendance.)

PRES. HARRIS: I'd like to make a few introductions. I might list the names of the Michigan people who are here so you know who they are.

Now we have some others outside of the organization people here and I would like to call on Jack Hemphill to introduce his people from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Max Holden is here from the National Park Service. We do have William Nesbitt from the National Rifle Association. One other fellow that is here from the U.S. Forest Service is Pete Petoskey. And last but not least, we are fortunate to have here this morning the chairman of our Natural Resources Commission, Carl Johnson.

I guess this is the time the President is supposed to give you his address.

I'll start off by saying Welcome to the Great Lakes State of Michigan. Although the mayor of Traverse City will officially welcome you to Traverse City this afternoon, I wish to point out that we Michiganders treasure the Grand Traverse area as something special. It seems that when it comes to special resources, God gave particular attention to Traverse City when he was creating this world of ours. It is a place one likes to come to and stay when you are once here.

It is truly a year-around playground--sun, sand, snow, and, of course, lots of water. There is hardly a weekend that all the motels are not full to capacity. It's a place where advanced lodging reservations are a must at any time of the year.

It is more than a tourist and recreation area, however. It is the world center for the growing and processing of tart cherries. In addition, there are many small manufacturing industries; and excluding Alaska, at the moment this general area of Michigan is the hottest oil and gas exploration area in the whole United States. I doubt many of you noticed that within 60 or so miles in the northeast or southwest direction of Traverse City, there are many new wells and support facilities, all constructed during the past six or seven years. But enough about the local area and its activities because I would like to tell you a little first about the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

Ours is one of those new trend, natural resource, integrated agencies which are popular at the moment in bringing environmental function and natural resources programs together.

The head of our department is a seven-person, citizens-appointed commission appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The commission appoints a Director and Executive Secretary, and then the Director appoints one of our Deputy Directors who serves as the chief of the resources branch. All other employees are Civil Service-procedure appointed including the second Deputy Director who is in charge of the environmental branch.

We have a staff-line type of organization. Immediately below the commission and the Director, there are two branches, five bureaus and twenty divisions. In addition, there are four offices which are adjuncts to the Director's office.

In the field we have three regions, fourteen districts, and many other field offices.

Our programs range from solid waste management to municipal recreational activities planning, from air and water pollution to oil and gas and mineral well development, from mine reclamation to land use and environmental review as well as the older programs of fisheries, wildlife, forestry and parks.

We have approximately 3,400 full-time employees plus approximately 925 seasonal employees reaching their peak at this time of year. In addition, we currently have nearly 600 comprehensive employment training (C.E.T.A.) acts or youth summer employment programs working for us at the present time.

The Michigan Legislature has not finalized our appropriations for the fiscal year which begins this July but it is expected to be not too different from the $75 million dollars which was appropriated in the year just ended this past June.

Less than half that amount or nearly $34 million dollars comes from the state's general fund. The larger amount is derived from federal grants and various revenue sources of which hunting and fishing licenses are the major contributor in the amount of nearly $16 million dollars. Our fisheries, including commercial fishing, and wildlife management are totally financed by game and fish funds as well as most of our law enforcement plus services to these programs from our support units including budgeting, accounting, data processing, engineering, comprehensive planning, surveys and statistics, forest fire control, geological survey, information and education, and legal and auditing.

There is much to be said for, as well as against, a large complex organization such as ours. But I do not wish to debate that issue this morning as it is a topic which could be the theme for an entire program. I will say, I do not believe it creates more problems but brings together problems in one organization that otherwise would be scattered among a number of separate agencies. It provides an easy input means to problems having concern of several interests and I believe provides for a better problem-solving and decision-making procedure.

Now to report to you as your president. I regret to say that I have not served you as well as I would have liked. First, I have not, due to our Governor's austerity order which prohibited practically all out-of-state travel, attended any executive committee meetings of the International. Our vice president, John Popowski, of South Dakota, represented you at the meeting of the International during the North American Wildlife Conference in Pittsburgh this past spring.

An important subject of that meeting, I believe, and one which we will hear and discuss more in the future, is consideration to expand the International Association's membership. Mr. Gordon Elliot, representing the National Association's Plans, Inc. gave a follow-up report on the feasibility and the effectiveness of expanding the organization. Mr. Elliot believes it can be done and provide a service not now met by the several fish, wildlife, and conservation organizations now in existence.

Several benefits from a large association membership were identified. To name a few: (1) broaden the scope of the national voice--multiply the

voice to tell the world what game and fish commissioners have done and what they are doing to perpetuate wildlife and fish by conserving green grounds, nesting areas, and habitat; (2) enable the International to effectively act as a counterforce to the growing anti-hunting and fishing activists by using additional funds for TV, public service announcements, free literature, public relations, speechmaking, and other ways of winning public attention and confidence in our program and keep their cooperation.

The basic purpose is not to make more money for the International, but to expand the effectiveness of the organization by means of a large resource base. It is estimated that the Association membership could be increased by 100,000 the first year and by 126,000 by the fifth year. I believe we all agree the International needs to be more effective in many areas in the United States as well as in Canada.

I'm sure we'll hear more of this in the future.

Ken Sadler, Assistant Superintendent of the Wildlife Research Section with the Missouri Department of Conservation, was our representative at the Annual Regulations Conference for Migratory Shore and Upland Birds in Washington, D.C. on June 24, 1975 and I want to thank both John and Ken for serving the association in this capacity.

Now, briefly, I'd like to identify one or two problems which I believe will be of increasing concern to the member agencies of the organization and suggest action which we may take concerning these problems during the coming year.

Foremost is the difficulty with regards to the rights of Indians to hunt and fish on lands and waters within Indian reservations as well as lands and waters ceded to the United States under certain treaties with the Indians.

To date, most of our problems, at least in Michigan, are with regards to the rights of Indians to fish commercially in the Great Lakes. We are involved in many legal cases before various levels of our state courts as well as a case brought against us by the Federal Government. Most of these will take a long time to solve and in the meantime the Indians continue to exercise rights and expand their fisheries with or without the aid of federal assistance. We are fearful, as I am sure you are, that this could expand to hunting, timber harvest, as well as mining on certain treaty lands outside of reservations.

I believe it is time we as states join together to at least keep each other informed of what is occurring as well as assisting each other in court cases when the outcome of the trial has a regional or even a national impact.

I would think this is of some interest to our Canadian members of the Association as well. I am not aware that you are experiencing similar problems but it is hard for me to believe that movements of this kind recognize boundaries between neighboring nations.

I will discuss with vice president John Popowski the appointment of a committee yet this year to serve as a clearing house to gather on a continual basis from all member states and provinces, information on the litigation, court decisions, province, state and federal policies relative to fishing, hunting and land use rights of Indians on off-reservation land. I believe the situation will grow more serious and the question of Indian rights will eventually have to be settled by Congress acting responsibly on this issue.

Another issue of concern to all of us is the level of PCB's now found in the fisheries of the Great Lakes. I think we can assume similar levels have or will be found in fishes of the inland waters as well.

The time may be very near that the sale of most commercial fish from the Great Lakes will be prohibited. Such as action could result in warnings against the eating of certain sport fish caught from all waters which in turn would have a very depressing effect on sport fishing.

If levels are found to be at concentrations which would endanger public health, we, as responsible public agencies, would certainly have to support whatever action is necessary.

More important is our supporting whatever action is decided by the states and EPA to further restrict or totally ban the use of PCB's for any purpose. If the latter action occurs, it will have a serious economic impact on the major users and you can be sure they will resist, with some force, a ban which would result in large expenditures for substitutes or a modification of their operations.

The Chicago regional office of EPA has just recently reactivated the Lake Michigan Toxic Substance Committee which is investigating the problem and will, I am sure, in the near future recommend immediate action as well as a long-term solution to the further use of this chemical.

There are other issues and problems concerning all of us which will demand more of our attention as time goes on, such as the operation of off-road vehicles, and particularly dirt or trail bikes which are ripping up the landscape and interfering with the more tranquil uses of the out-of-doors. Another is the need for regulations to reduce interference of one activity with another using the same resource, such as canoeing and river fishing. Others are commercial fishing vs. sport fishing, snowmobiling vs. cross country skiing, wilderness areas vs. forest management, and hunting vs. the non-hunter, and the recent court ruling that the Army Corps of Engineers has certain jurisdictions now over practically all the waters in the state, whether they are navigable or not.

All of these, and many more problems to which effective solutions have not been developed, will require skillful policy development by fisheries, wildlife and land managers.

I hope that each of you will find this meeting helpful and, following the theme of the conference, will take home with you new thoughts of sources of financing, fish and wildlife programs, and have a good day and a good time while you are here.

Thank you.

Gary, do you have any announcements to make before we get on with the program?

BOUSHELLE: On behalf of the Arrangements Committee that worked on our program in addition to the business meeting, we feel that we have put together a series of events that will add to your relaxation and pleasure while you are in the Traverse City area. First of all, I would like to ask all of you who have not registered to please register at the front desk. Also I would like to say that you have the opportunity to speak in discussion before our group here and you are to use the microphone to identify yourself. As we get into the process of handling the proceedings, we would like to be able to know who was doing the talking.

As you know, tomorrow on our program the business session is for the morning only. In the afternoon we have set up a couple of events that, if you'd like, we'd like for you to attend. One is the bus tour to go through the Platte River Fish Hatchery, the anadromous fish hatchery of our department and along with that to go on to the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore area. This tour is unlimited, for you and your wife and family. If you are planning on attending, please sign up at the registration desk.

Also we have made arrangements with the local charter boat association; for those of you that are interested in fishing, we would like you to sign up for that trip also. We feel that we can take approximately 40 people on that trip. It will be more or less on a first come, first served basis. There will be no charge for it, except for the $1 daily fishing fee.

I would also like to announce that the Department of Natural Resources fishery research vessel, Steelhead, is here if you would like to visit it. Myrl Keller and Lee Moffitt, Fisheries Biologists, will be available from 3:00 to 6:00 today and also all day tomorrow. The vessel is just walking distance over at the Maritime Academy Pier.

Tomorrow night after the bus tour or fishing trip, we have arranged to have a picnic which we welcome you and your families to attend. As you register, we will provide you with tickets for you and everyone in your

party. I don't know if we can duplicate the tremendous fish fry we had in Minnesota last year, but we will have a lake trout fish broil here.

I think, Russ, you might want to make an announcement about the resolutions and legislative committees.

STUART-NORTH DAKOTA: We will be meeting again immediately after the recess at 4:00 this afternoon in the Nordic Room and two or three states were not in attendance this morning. We would like to have all the states and provinces that are here in attendance at this resolutions committee meeting beginning immediately after the close of the session here.

BOUSHELLE: OK, Thank you, Russ. I would like to make one other announcement too. That is, if any of you people or wives would like transportation in the Traverse City area, please contact me so we can set this up. I understand that there are some ladies that would like to go to the Cherry County Playhouse tonight and see the play and if you need reservations or transportation, the sooner you make these plans, let me know and we'll be happy to work them out.

VONDETT-MICHIGAN: On the back of your nametag is a number; if you are lucky you will have one on there. That is the number we will use for door prizes which will happen a few times throughout the meeting. Please have your nametag throughout the meeting.

BOUSHELLE: Are there any other announcements at this time?

PRES. HARRIS: We will break for ten or fifteen minutes for coffee.

* * * * *

Reconvened Tuesday a.m. Session

PRES. HARRIS: Dr. Howard Tanner, I am sure, is known by most of you, is now Director of the Department of Natural Resources. He was appointed to this position, effective this year, on January 15.

Howard Tanner came to the DNR from Michigan State University where he held three positions: Director of Natural Resources in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Professor in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, and he was also Director of the Water Quality Management Project of the Institute of Water Resources. This latter intriguing project involved recycling wastewater from the East Lansing Sewage Plant by means of spray irrigation and a series of four lakes in which nutrients are taken up by the aquatic plants that in turn are harvested and removed from the lake.

At the time of his appointment as Director, Dr. Tanner was serving as chairman of the Michigan Environmental Review Board, a group which is appointed by our Governor to advise him on potential environmental impacts

of new projects which the various state agencies plan to undertake. He now serves as the Department's representative on that board.

He was known to us earlier as former Chief of our Fisheries Division of which I had the pleasure of employing him in that position back in 1964. He retired from there in 1966 to accept the position I mentioned with Michigan State University. In 1968, he was named Conservationist of the Year by the National Wildlife Federation for his leadership in establishing the Lake Michigan salmon program. Prior to his DNR career, he was at Colorado State University from 1953 to 1961 and was Chief of the Division of Fisheries Research of the Colorado Fish and Parks Department from 1961 to 1964.

Howard was born in Kalamazoo on September 4, 1923. He attended Western Michigan University and is a graduate of Michigan State University where he received his B.S. in 1947, his masters in 1950, and his Ph.D. in 1952 majoring in fisheries and limnology. He is a veteran of World War II and served in the U.S. Army Signal Corps in New Guinea in the Phillipines. He has served as president of the Michigan Natural Resources Council, is a member of the American Fisheries Society, and a fellow of the American Association of Fisheries Research Biologists, the Wilderness Society, and numerous other professional organizations.

Dr. Tanner's home is in Haslett with his wife, Helen, and three sons, Mark, Carl and Hugh.

It gives me great pleasure at this time to present Dr. Howard Tanner for the keynote address. Howard.

FINANCING FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAMS IN TROUBLED ECONOMIC TIMES

By

Dr. Howard A. Tanner, Director
Michigan Department of Natural Resources

Thank you Chuck and Mr. President. I appreciate that introduction. I would point out that you left out the fact that I earned two merit badges as a cub scout.

I am going to talk about financing of fish and wildlife programs in troubled economic times, and I am going to do this with a good deal of hesitancy. You already know that I have been in this assignment now some six months, and 10 days or something like that, and I really hesitate to tell you how to do something like this with that much experience. I do that--and I am reminded that I should be very careful--when I suggest to somebody that they do something.

I have to point out something that I was reminded of in talking with one of my old Colorado friends during coffee break. Many years ago, one Bob Evans and I were pheasant hunting in Colorado. At the close of our pheasant hunt, somewhere northeast of the town of Fort Collins, I had occasion to suggest to Bob, of course most respectfully, that he ought to practice. I had very good reasons for making that suggestion. Bob now carries several titles as trapshooter breaking some 200 in a row and competing nationally and regionally in that capacity. So I am well aware of what impact I have on people when I suggest that they do something. You know the old phrase: Baby, you've come a long way. So now I will proceed to talk to you about financing.

I am privileged to welcome you to Michigan. I am sure you have been welcomed many times before. I welcome you as your keynote speaker. My experience is limited. I have already mentioned that. We have been in some bad ways and we will probably be in some future bad ways. I will share insights, what I have. I will try to give you some, and I hope you will pass some to either me or members of the Michigan staff.

I am sure you did not pick this subject and Michigan because you wanted to pick a state that was economically troubled. However, if you had used that criteria, from my biased perspective, you would have had a hard time picking a better one, because we are badly troubled economically. Our unemployment rate is above 15 percent, nearly twice the national average, and it approaches 30 percent in parts of Detroit where over half our people live and work.

Obviously state government, our department included, depends upon taxes as the mainstay of revenue. When these revenues rise, or when these revenues fall, we cannot help but be impacted and impacted severely. We recently had a tax increase, an income tax, but that's only to make up for the fact that people decided by referendum to take off the sales tax on food and drugs last fall.

Welfare costs are going up; somebody just suggested that we pay $5,000 to people on welfare to leave Michigan. If anybody here would especially like to receive them, just give me your name; I will make that suggestion. We have already had a phone call from the Chief of the British Columbia provincial government saying that if any Michigan people show up there, he will pay them $6,000 to go back to Michigan. So you can see where that kind of thing would lead to. To keep going on this rather sequitous route of coming up to the subject, I would like to point out that the City of Detroit is essentially bankrupt; if it were a private corporation, it would be out of business.

Our State Constitution requires that the state budget be balanced; Michigan government cannot legally go into debt. The books were balanced at the end of the fiscal year just concluded June 30 by the device of postponing payment of some bills into the new fiscal year. To make ends meet during the financial year just begun, Governor Milliken proposes a

change in business tax payment schedules which would yield a one-time windfall of about $180 million. The Legislature is still making up its mind about that one.

Not being an economist or an accountant, I don't know how long you can continue to stay afloat by such manipulations, but common sense compels me to think there has to be a day of reckoning somewhere down the road.

So I think it is fair to say that we, the people of Michigan, are experiencing some very hard, and I prefer hard to troubled, very hard economic times.

As an administrator, I have to be concerned about these things, about these hard times, and when, hopefully, they may get better. I wish I knew the answer. I suspect there are 9,000,000 other people in Michigan who would also like to know the answer. If I could stand here and tell you I did, I would be most pleased. But I have to tell you that I cannot.

It's a cliche, but nevertheless true, when an economist says, "If the nation sneezes, Michigan catches pneumonia." And what it means is that we are the first to feel the effects of an economic slump, we feel them more severely, and we tend to recover more slowly later on.

I believe the reason for this is also obvious if you stop to think about it. Whether or not we have attempted to diversify is not the point; we are very strongly, and remain very strongly, dependent on the automobile industry. Sure, agriculture, tourism, and natural resource extraction are important to us, but basically we are manufacturers of goods and what we manufacture and sell are primarily automobiles.

In that sense, we are a one industry state. And if you will examine the place of the automobile in our lifestyle, you'll see exactly what happens. First of all, it is a very essential element to each and every one of us whether or not we like it. However, our people have developed, in prosperous times, the habits of turnover of automobiles somewhere between 25, 50, maybe 60 thousand miles, much quicker than is probably necessary with reasonable maintenance. So when they begin to feel a personal financial pinch, they begin to look at deferable purchase items and the automobile has got to be the largest one available to them. And that is exactly what they do--they defer to 75, 80, 100 thousand miles and that is where we are hit and hit hard. I am sure that we are going to go back to buying automobiles and when we do our income will improve. In the meantime, our crystal ball is clouded by a number of things from gasoline prices to Arab price control, etc.

Now if you want to pause for a moment and take a look at this as an environmentalist, you'd like perhaps to say that there are transportation alternatives to the automobile and I don't think I am standing here as a proponent of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce in telling you that there are

no alternatives. In fact, whether we like it or not, there are currently no alternatives to the automobile in our lifestyle. There are no alternatives in sight, let alone alternatives in being.

So I have to say that my optimism will survive and that Michigan will recover from economic pneumonia. When is the thing that we obviously cannot answer.

Now all of these things may seem remote to the subject of financing fisheries and wildlife programs. I have felt that it was necessary to set the stage in trying to point out some of Michigan's difficulties. I suggest most respectfully that your difficulties are not as serious as ours because if they were you would not be here. If this meeting were held somewhere else besides the state of Michigan, I'm afraid Chuck would be alone.

We, as a Michigan Department, are an "umbrella" agency so we have all the natural resource management plus all the environmental protection functions of state government. We are oftimes compared to Wisconsin or New York to give you that kind of perspective.

So, when talking to you about fish and wildlife programs, I have to separate that out. I hope you all appreciate that it is not possible to do so with complete precision. I'll do so and I'll do so as accurately as I can, but I cannot be completely precise. Too many people overlap.

Just for perspective, all of our fisheries and wildlife activities together with their accompanying law enforcement programs are financed almost totally from hunting and fishing license fees. We are talking about 16 or 17 million dollars in these categories, out of an overall department budget of 75-80 million dollars. So our revenues and our appropriations and our outgos of fisheries and game matters amount to about 21 percent of the department. These, of course, include the traditional Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson and anadromous fish funds.

We get a relatively small amount of general fund help in certain specific areas. They are apt to be in law enforcement, sometimes in capital outlay and some other special areas. They are nearly always line items.

All license income and associated federal monies go into what we call the Game and Fish Protection Fund; this is a restricted and earmarked fund which cannot be spent for any other purpose.

However, our Department does not have anything like what you would call "full control" over this fund. The Legislature makes the appropriations to us from this fund the same as it does from the General Fund, and it decides how much will be spent for fish, wildlife and law enforcement or how much will not be spent, and we have to match in revenue what they appropriate.

Sometimes they appropriate money to us in excess of the revenues that we have from these sources of income and as a result, at mid fiscal year, we have to make a cutback because of the state law that says that we shall not exceed revenues. In recent years this has gone as high as 1.2 million dollars. You start out at the beginning of the year and you look like you are in pretty good shape as far as appropriations are concerned, but if your revenues don't match your appropriations, you have no alternative but a cutback.

So whether we are talking about any one of the subprograms all the way from fisheries, Great Lakes fisheries, deer management, or whatever, we do lack a lot of control and we specifically lack flexibility.

In times when dollars are short, I am sure that one thing every administrator would like to have would be maximum flexibility. He would like, and I assure you I would like, to be able to make more internal decisions as to how whatever limited dollars we might have, might be distributed, and I frankly have to wonder a little bit about how a system employs high salary program administrators (I don't know who put that high salary in there), and then deprives them of control over the budget process. That has to be your principle administrative tool and if you are denied that tool, you are denied a lot of your projects and your departmental control. Nevertheless, this is the system that has evolved legislatively in Michigan and we have lived with it so far and I see no alternative but to continue to live with it in the future.

Incidentally, I am sure you have all heard of the so-called "program budgeting." We have heard of it here in Michigan; we have gone through all of the exercises, we have gone to school and studied about program budgeting, and it is designed, as I understand it, to provide greater administrative flexibility. I have to say that from my vast perspective of some six months now, that this has not really made any difference. If anything I have to believe that our budgeting is getting more rigid rather than more flexible. Our Governor calls in department heads and says, "Well you have heard the old song I have some good news and some bad news, only today I don't have any good news." So then he goes on to make his cut in the budget and then he says, "But I am going to give you additional administrative flexibility. You all tell me that you could save at least a million dollars if you had this flexibility so we are going to give it to you." He is Republican and the Legislature is Democratic and they don't happen to agree. So I believe that we have not benefited by program budgeting; in fact, I think the Legislature has taken counter measures to insure retaining budget control which they view as their historical and constitutional prerogative, and I guess, perhaps, they are right, at least from their point of view. Anyway, that is the way it works out.

Now, to touch briefly on inflation. Long before the current economic recession or whatever we choose to code it with, we had already begun cutting at least five years back, but through the pressures of escalating

inflation. In fact, I would have to say that within restricted funds framework, inflation has been a more serious problem, and that in an inflated economy, there is no way that a restricted fund such as licensing revenues are going to keep pace with rising costs--not at the rate of inflation that we have been enjoying.

The result is inevitable. We are operating fish and wildlife programs with fewer people in 1975 than we had in 1970; well over a hundred jobs in these specific areas have either been eliminated or have been allowed to remain vacant. This trend toward reduction has occurred despite the fact that, in some other ways, we really have been quite lucky. Our fishing and hunting has improved steadily.

Now I always like to be at the right place at the right time. I would like to have said that hunting and fishing improved after I got here, but I missed it by apparently about 12 months. There is not any reasonable question that Michigan hunters and fishermen, Michigan waters and forests, produced the best hunting and the best fishing that we have enjoyed in at least a decade and perhaps in many decades. I only hope that we can sustain them a little longer so that it does not all fall on my head. Last year, for example, 1974, we enjoyed the best deer season that we have had in a long time--just about every species of sport fish and game did hit, for one reason or another, a peak level of abundance.

This happy state of affairs seemed to take the marginal hunters and the marginal fisherman, tear them away from the boob tube and away from the bottle, away from the bed perhaps, and entice them to go out and buy hunting and fishing licenses. This was particularly noticeable among hunters. Deer license sales were up more than 50,000; they were up more than 50,000 over our estimates. We are now, Dave Jenkins check me on this, we are now just under 600,000 license sales for deer hunters. Small game licenses were up more than 30,000 and fishing license sales were up substantially. So where budgeting is concerned, these things were all important to us.

Another item which I have to bring in here is oil and gas revenues. Environmentally, we have had probably more problems and will continue to have more problems in the processes of extraction of minerals which we are responsible for, at the same time protecting the surface values of forest and water and habitat of fisheries and wildlife, than almost any other single item in the department. But nevertheless, this is also a source of income to us; this is perhaps one of the reasons we get criticized. They say, well naturally you are going to go for the oil and gas, the iron, or whatever it is because you are making money off it. Sometimes, I think it is a two-edged sword--that we get more trouble out of than we gain--but in fact it is bringing us some additional income. We have the makings of a substantial oil and gas boom, we have the resurgence of iron ore extraction and iron ore beneficiation in the Upper Peninsula and these do mean additional monies coming into, of all places, the Game

and Fish Protection Fund. The reason it comes there is because so many of the state lands that we administrate, and we now have somewhere around 4 million acres of state land, any of these lands that were purchased with fisheries or particularly wildlife monies, we get any mineral revenues from those lands and it goes to our game and fish protection fund. So in spite of some of our economic difficulties statewide we have done, I won't say well, but we have stayed afloat in times that are particularly difficult.

I guess what I have to point out is that there is no way that we can project these things continuing. For example, we have had three mild winters in a row. We can't take credit for that nor can we count on it continuing, but that has got to have done as much as anything we could possibly do towards increasing the deer herd and thereby increasing the number of dollars from license sales.

Well, I believe all that is background and what I think I was supposed to talk to you about was the financing or the managing of the financing for fish and wildlife programs. I have tried to filibuster and use up most of my time so that when I get down to what I was supposed to say, I don't have to say too much.

But it comes down to those things that are obvious. If you have a pinch in your budget, and you project additional pinches in the budget, you have about two choices--sometimes you can go both ways but you either have to have more income or less outgo. That is not very complicated.

Let's talk about how those may or may not be done. The first item is increased license fees. I don't think this is ever easy to do; it's not easy to do in difficult economic times and it's certainly not easy to do just prior to an election which we are getting closer and closer to. Nevertheless, we have again in the legislative process, a fishing license bill increase. By the way, we are well within your 1:4, 1:5 ratio whatever you are talking about. We currently propose to take the resident license from $3 to $5 and the non-resident license from $6 to $10. That is the season-long license. There are some other kinds of licenses and you can buy one tomorrow for a buck if you only want to fish one day and so on.

We have been trying to do this for three years. I think we'll have some chance of doing it this time; I am a neophite so I am not going to make any very strong projections, but I did stay down yesterday to stay with this bill in the Senate through yesterday evening and it passed the Senate with essentially no dissent. We had some filibustering and some amendments proposed which may or may not stand the test of time but at least it was passed through the Senate on the third reading with little dissent. One of the amendments was to raise the fishing license sale age from 17 to 18 years of age. I suggested most respectfully that we as a state already have more exemptions than probably any other state or province. We exempt spouses, we have a senior citizens license, we have a

disability license, and 17 is already a very high age for requiring a fishing license. The only reason given to going to 18 was that that's the time that they can buy beer, and I really could not see the connection. But nevertheless that amendment was on it when I left it last night.

The truth of the matter is, you, myself, all of us, have failed to sell the idea on fishing licenses or hunting licenses to the sportsman what a small part of his cost this really is. Why we have failed to sell this I am not sure. It is obvious you can get something very specific like a reel or a gun or ammunition or a bottle of booze or something else and you have got something tangible for your money. Perhaps he cannot make the connection between that piece of paper which we issue him and the tangible benefits. At least we always get a lot of static when we try to sell a license increase and I suggest that our best information and education brains should put some more work on this one and I think we can, I think we must do better if we try.

Item #2 is to charge special fees for special programs. I am not going to say an awfully lot about that. We have a put-take pheasant program. In digression, I have to look down at Pete and think about put-take pheasants and some of the problems of the clientele that he is encountering and I could go back and just change a few words around and see all the same problems in a put-take fishing program. I would say this about any put-take program--that in terms of priorities, you have to do one of two things to it. You either have to finance it on a user pay basis or you have to put it below what I would term resource programs. If you are talking about long range better hunting or long range better fishing you have to put any put-take program down as a very low priority. It's recreation, pure and simple, has no lasting impact, and those who enjoy it ought to pay for it. That's where I come out. If people that do enjoy it are willing to pay for it, fine. It should be a part of our program. This year we asked for a special $10 fee for hunters who enjoy put-take pheasant hunting. All appearances are that we will have this.

In addition to the put-take pheasant hunting, we also now have a muzzle loader deer season--a special deer season after the regular season for those who would like to do it with a muzzle loader. Personally this means something to me. I have watched bow and arrow hunters and all of their foibles--how they shoot arrows into trees and everything else--and I have decided that a deer would be perfectly safe if I was in the woods with a bow and arrow or a hand full of rocks as far as that is concerned. I have never participated in bow and arrow hunting, but my grandfather left an old muzzle loader leaning behind the door in the corner and I'm having the muzzle loader repaired. This makes two assumptions--one, that the bill would pass, and two, that I would fail to kill a deer during the regular season. I think probably both assumptions are valid so maybe in December I'll have an opportunity to try the muzzle loader.

Certainly if the deer managers of the department can't do any better with my deer hunting than the brook trout managers have been doing with my brook trout fishing I'll be hunting deer across the road from my house with a muzzle loader in December.

These special programs which are calling for special use costs do require special effort from any department involved. I think I will just sum that up and say that we are capable of managing those programs, and I suspect that all of you are--as adjuncts to your regular programs and without a great dislocation of regular programs. So except for coming down very hard, we should never offer those special programs and say they are free; we should always put them on a user pay basis. Other than that one stipulation, I see nothing wrong with them and I would encourage them.

Another alternative is to obtain more general fund support. State Representative Russell Hellman, who I understand some of you have met, is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee and works on our department budget. Our budget originates in the House and he is the subcommittee chairman. He is much more knowledgeable on this subject than I am. I am sure he would be pleased to hear me say that. We won't always agree but I have to confess that he works hard at it and he is knowledgeable. He will speak to you this afternoon and you will hear about that particular subject from him probably much better than I can tell you.

But let me generalize and say that, historically, fish and wildlife programs in Michigan have faired poorly in competition for general fund appropriations, with such needs as welfare, education, and health. In spite of the obvious bias of this group, and I assume you are biased in the same direction that I am biased, I guess that I would have to agree with those ordering of priorities, that if you had to list us, from top priority to lower priority, we would have to come somewhere behind welfare, education, and health. So I see really no optimistic reason or reason to be optimistic about a change in that direction. In fact, I am not so sure that I want it to change.

I think that when you talk of the problems of anti-hunting, probably the single most effective argument that the hunter has been able to put forward so far is that he pays for the program, and I think that is an important argument. While he may be short of dollars sometime, there is no getting around the fact that money talks, and until some of those people who might disagree with the hunter come forward with some element of financing which is substantial, I think that you will always be able to cut much of the ground out from under their arguments. I sincerely hope so. I guess I would sum that up by saying that a sportsman would do well to insist upon retaining the historic funding role in these areas. And they are right to pay higher license fees and special taxes.

Now, people who do not hunt and fish have had a growing voice in what they think about hunting and fishing and what they think about wildlife and fisheries resources. There are some good people in those areas, please don't mistake me. They provide us some very substantial support in certain kinds of areas, in legislative process for one. But they have yet to put their money where their mouth is and until they do, they are not going to be as effective as I would like to see them, and yet again, it's sort of a two-edged sword--I think that the hunter is well served as long as they are poorly financed.

Now I am aware that some of the states, probably some represented, have made an effort to acquire special sources of income from non-game wildlife and non-game fish opportunities for people to contribute. We have just kicked off ours, called Michigan's Living Resources; we are trying to raise a very nominal amount of money from the sale of personal items--decals, pins, shoulder patches, etc. I see that is on your program for later so I won't dwell on that. We don't have enough experience to tell you how that is going to work but initially our aspirations are only $25,000 so you can see, it is not likely to soon be a big source of income.

To digress again a moment, one of my more interesting tasks in the last couple of months has been to come into contention with the tanks of the National Guard of three states over about ten or twelve pounds of Kirkland warblers. Backed up ably by the Endangered Species Act at the federal level, I can report to you that the warblers defeated the tanks and I don't know what that tells you about national defense, but it does give you some ordering of priorities about the endangered species.

One other thing, perhaps not characteristic to all states, is the payment of the administration and policing and management of our commercial fishery. Our commercial fishery in no way pays its own way; we get only a token income from the commercial fishery and our sport fisherman must support that burden with their licenses. However, again, I am not sure that I would prefer an independently financed commercial fishery. If it were financed that way, I suspect it might end up under the Department of Agriculture, and I really don't want to face that problem.

The other thing that I mentioned earlier is cuts, and I have stumped around the three regions of Michigan, talking to department employees at all levels, on this one. I don't want to spend a lot of time on it but I think that the manner in which we make cuts--and we are going to make cuts--is the most important one. The perspective that has been given to me is that we have continually, for the last five years and maybe even longer, tried to do more and more tasks with less and less resources. The result is inevitable--that things are less well done. So as we make cuts in the future, as they begin to appear quite substantially, we have to do it on a priority basis and whole segments of programs have simply got to be identified as our lowest priorities and they have to drop out of the picture. I see no other way of going through that difficult task.

Just to give you a perspective of where we are, in our department we are just now going through an exercise demanded by the Governor's office for the developing of budget requests for 1976-77, and we have two levels. One is 97 percent of last fiscal year and the other is 92 percent of last fiscal year. An awfully lot of trauma went into that. We finished it but there are puddles of sweat mixed with blood standing around all over the place. Those levels of 97 percent and 92 percent are based on many, many estimates by many, many people using all sorts of prorating and everything that you could think of to try to figure out where Michigan's income is going to come out, where our costs are going to go, what inflation is going to do, and what have you. So even though we have gone through all the effort of 97 and 92 percent budgeting, we have very little assurance that that is where we are going to come out.

Now, in closing. If you were expecting a panacea or a miracle from me, you have got to be disappointed. I don't know of any; I hope that you do and I am ordering all of those people from the Michigan department as of this instant, to report to me immediately if anyone else comes up with either a panacea or a miracle. I am sure that we can use them.

I think it is most appropriate that you have selected financing as your theme. I am confident the present economic difficulties will pass. Problems will always be with the fish and wildlife programs; they will never be at what we would think of as adequate levels. And a time of trouble is undoubtedly the best time to look for solutions.

I think most people will understand; most people have experienced financial difficulty. I don't think you can get to them with logic, but you can get to them with the fact that when there are only so many dollars, you have to make some cuts.

This isn't the delightful, optimistic, smiling presentation that I would like to make to you but this is not the kind of subject that you gave me so I gave you what I had to offer.

I have enjoyed being with you; I hope I can enjoy being with you in the boat or on the bus tomorrow, and this evening wherever you are.

Thank you and good luck and come back.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Howard. Our next speaker is from the state of Indiana, and is a former president of this organization. I think many of you know Bill Barnes. Bill was in the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife for 28 years. Since 1968 he has been serving as Director of the Division of Nature Preserves in the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. Welcome back to the Association, Bill. At this time I present to you Bill Barnes who will speak to you regarding the nature preserve system in Indiana. Bill.

THE NATURE PRESERVE SYSTEM IN INDIANA

By

William B. Barnes, Chief

Division of Nature Preserves

Thank you Chuck. There is one thing I didn't tell you about my pedigree and that was the date of my birth.

As you pointed out, I was with the Division of Fish and Game for 28 years. In 1968, our Legislature passed a law which created the Division of Nature Preserves, so I figured this was a good time to get off the hot seat and more or less take a few years in apparent seclusion so to speak. I am not troubled with a lot of employees or anything like that. I am not troubled with a big budget. In fact, our budget to begin with was $26,000 a year, and since then it has been increased to about $57,000, so I don't have too many people working for me.

I know that some of the things I will probably discuss this morning will bring up questions concerning the way that fish and wildlife management actually fits into the management of a nature preserve. These problems probably will come more into focus in the future.

In 1968 this Division of Nature Preserves was created by our Legislature. This was following a survey that had been made by Purdue University through a $35,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. An ecologist from Purdue took sabbatical leave for two years and examined all of the reported natural areas left in the state. He examined about 300 areas, and his final conclusion was that there were about 152 that merited consideration as natural areas with either unique flora or fauna or geological features. Now all of these areas represented about 16,000 acres in the state of Indiana. We concluded that approximately less than 1/10 of one percent of Indiana remains as it was when the Indians were here, so you can see that we are not blessed with many wooded areas and areas that you might have in some of the lake states.

Now, nature preserves actually have been given consideration by several of the states within your region here. Wisconsin was probably the earliest state to recognize what they call the scientific areas and they have a council in Wisconsin that meets, as I understand it, with the department. The department has one person who acts as secretary to the Scientific Areas Commission and they also have an ecologist, two or three ecologists employed within the Department of Natural Resources for examining areas.

In Illinois, they have a different setup in that they have a Nature Preserve Commission that is not affiliated directly with the Department of Conservation there. However, they do meet with the Department of Conservation and the Department of Conservation also has a section devoted to the examination of natural areas in that state. I think their program is about five years older than ours.

In the case of Indiana, our division is directly under the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. We do not work through another outside commission. In other words, we are a division of our department and I feel that this probably gives us a little better contact as far as operation of this division is concerned. It is possible for me to go directly to our Natural Resources Commission, that of course governs our department, and I can make recommendations directly to them. Ohio has a very similar project to this and I think it does have some advantages over a separate independent commission that might be operating that way.

Now, this survey conducted by Dr. Lindsay from Purdue resulted in the Publication of a book known as Natural Areas in Indiana and Their Preservation. This is available, if any of you are interested, through the Midland Naturalist at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana and in this publication, he divided these 152 areas into four different priorities. These priorities range from about 26 with Number One priority--the highest priority for preservation--on down to 40-50 in second priority and since this time we have added a number of areas to this original list so that we have 179 areas that are recognized with about 18,000 acres in the state at the present time.

A natural area is not a nature preserve until it has been dedicated by our commission. We now have 36 nature preserves that have been dedicated involving 6,200 acres. These are primarily described under what we call Articles of Dedication and Master Plan for each area.

In these documents, once they have been approved by the commission, it says what you can do and what you cannot do in a nature preserve. Primarily the activities involve walking and observing, and these Articles of Dedication and Master Plan are actually recorded in the county where the particular area is located.

If, in the future, there should be a higher public necessity arise, which could mean an interstate or a power line or some other public necessity--a private necessity does not in any way take priority over a nature preserve--then it is necessary for our commission to hold a meeting in the county where this area is located. It is open to the public; the public can come and object to it. If they find a higher public necessity, then the Governor has to approve of this higher public necessity. To date we have not lost that first area. And to date, I have not had the commission turn down any areas that we have recommended for dedication.

Sooner or later, I know we probably will have some problems and probably one of the questions that is arising in your mind is about this walking and observing only and what about hunting and fishing.

Actually we do not have restrictions against fishing and in some cases, on areas that are operated by our division of fish and wildlife and where they were purchased with federal aid funds, we actually permit hunting on these areas. We have two on which we permit hunting and one that has always been a refuge on which things are protected.

Now we have another way that we can also recognize any uniqueness and that is a registration which is not dedication but which recognizes unique flora or fauna or geological features and simply recognizes it as such without any rules or regulations on what you can do. So we can go this way if we have any particular problems. We feel that we do have a pretty good latitude.

Actually in this original survey it was found that about 40 percent of the natural areas in Indiana were on public land and about 60 percent were on private land so with my past association with the department, I thought it was best for me to try to actually give priority to consideration of areas that were under the operation of the Department of Natural Resources which we have.

At the present time we have 23 nature preserves in public ownership. Most of those are on IDNR land and two are operated by county park and recreation boards, so we are going into the public sector in that way. This total will make us 25 and we have 11 that have been dedicated by private organizations such as the Nature Conservancy and Acres Incorporated which is a private organization in Fort Wayne, Indiana, primarily interested in the northeastern part of the state.

We can dedicate a private area under private ownership but I do not favor this because I feel that if I had an area that I would like to dedicate, this means dedication into perpetuity. I might be interested in actually dedicating it during my lifetime, but the heirs after that would have to continue paying taxes and not be able to use the areas, so that does not seem to be a very feasible way to approach this. Actually when people with private holdings come to us and say they would like to have those dedicated, I suggest that they either give it to the state or that they give it to one of these other private organizations. We have had areas in Indiana with the prices as high as a quarter of a million dollars that have been given to us.

So we feel, again, that we are primarily connected with that sector brought up by Dr. Tanner--non-hunters. Sometimes, I go to the meeting with my wife and she starts talking about me going duck hunting and sometimes I say well I'm going hunting but that isn't probably a good thing to bring up here. I probably have seceded from this hunting but I really like to do it.

We do have these considerations and whether you like it or not I think it is probably going to increase. We are going to be concerned with endangered species, non-game species; fauna are just one of our interests. In other words, we are interested in an area that might have outstanding flora, it might have an outstanding geological feature such as a falls, or it might have the Indiana bat.

Now the Indiana bat is one of the recognized endangered species. I yet haven't gotten up enough nerve to go to the Legislature and say I want enough money to preserve the Indiana bat, but I think these things are coming and I think they are not only going to involve the vertebrates but they are probably going to involve the invertebrates and the flora and the fauna and so forth.

Now as far as the Endangered Species Act is concerned, I think that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been giving, in the past, primary attention to animals. But the act also includes the preservation of plants. The Smithsonian Institute, of course, has endeavored to make a nationwide survey of endangered plant species. Some of the states have already come up with a list and I understand that the Fish and Wildlife Service now has some taxonomists employed in Washington to actually investigate this particular facet of the present movement.

This more or less explains our activities and I think possibly I might just show some of the slides to show you actually what we are doing in Indiana.

(Slides shown at this time.)

PRES. HARRIS: The next speaker on our program is a long-time associate of the members of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources. For years, we have had what we refer to as MUCC, Michigan United Conservation Clubs. It is one of the largest--if not the largest--organization of citizens, primarily hunters and fishermen, but other interests as well. I am astounded at the interest that still continues and the dynamic programs that they carry. I think it relates pretty much to the organization itself and the fact that over the years they have been able to select dynamic executive directors and we have their present executive director. He is no less dynamic than any of his predecessors and at this time it gives me great pleasure to present to you Tom Washington who will speak to you about "The Sportsman's Organizations Role in Financing New Fish and Wildlife Programs." Tom.

THE SPORTSMAN'S ORGANIZATIONS ROLE IN FINANCING NEW FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

By

Thomas L. Washington, Executive Director
Michigan United Conservation Clubs

Thank you, Chuck, and gentlemen, I truly am pleased to be here with you. I think you can hear me OK without this.

Chuck touched just a little bit on our organization, and just to put us in the proper perspective, let me say that we have about 375 affiliated clubs of one kind or another throughout the State of Michigan with a couple

in Ontario and one down on the Indiana border. These clubs hold a membership slightly in excess of 100,000, all of which pay dues to the Michigan United Conservation Clubs which is the state affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation. So that kind of should set the scene for you.

We do have here in our state a facility in Lansing, a building situated on five acres in the city which houses our staff which presently numbers 22 full-time paid employees.

Chuck, I am going to digress just a little bit from what that topic says, what does it say here, I haven't looked at it for a few days, sportsman's role in financing or helping to finance fish and wildlife programs.

On the way up here--I left at six o'clock this morning--from Lansing, and I caught the news just as I left the driveway. The first news report carried within it a topic about the FBI crime reports which were issued yesterday. Attorney General Levy said that crime in the first quarter has gone up 18 percent again. And then at 7:00, as I was going through Mt. Pleasant, I caught the news again, and this was on it again, and at 8:00 it was on again, of course, and at 9:00 once more. Included in that statement that the Attorney General made yesterday was this and I quote him: "It's a way of life."

Crime has become a way of life and something that evidently the vast majority of the American people are content and willing to live with because we know also, according to what he said yesterday, that two-thirds of these persons are repeaters. Now what has been the answer that our politicians and our legislative leaders and other leaders, civic leaders and what have you, have had for this rising incidence of crime and this rising incidence of repeaters out on the street? It's simple--firearms control or firearms confiscation.

And so before I get into what I had written up here I just want to say that there won't be any sportsmen's groups in this state or in this nation if we don't start looking at something other than firearms confiscation and firearms registration which are very, very real threats to the future of a great percentage--over half--of the wildlife management funds which are available to the several states. I think that those of you who are--many of you I am sure are probably paid with the funds directly or indirectly derived from the private possession of firearms--should recognize that the threat is real and that is why I wanted to digress for just a minute to try and emphasize just exactly how real that threat is.

You know, a lot of people say they are only interested in handguns and so forth, but let me call to your memory 1968 and the late Senator Dodds hearings in Washington when he said all he wanted to do was register the firearms, just let us know where they are. We are not interested in confiscation, we will never take away your guns; all we want to do is get

those serial numbers down. Seven short years later no one talks about registration; the only thing you hear is confiscation and there are numerous bills, 113 I believe at present reading in the Congress, which would confiscate some kind of firearm or make it illegal to possess some other kind of firearm.

Along with that, just this last six months we had the notorious effort by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to ban bullets, including 22 rimfire ammunition which of course is one of the most commonly used calibers.

And just a couple of weeks ago, I had the fortune or misfortune--I don't know where you might put it--to testify before Congressman Conyers and some other Congressmen on the subject of firearms control and what can be done. Congressman Conyers was in Detroit holding some committee meetings, his subcommittee on crime, with the House judiciary, and Representative McClory who is a congressman from Illinois came back at me pretty hard about handgun confiscation. And then he kind of turned his head thinking perhaps that we did not catch what he said and said to one of the committee lawyers sitting next to him that they weren't interested in long gun registration or confiscation--yet.

So gentlemen, just keep this in mind, and I repeat, that at least the way we are presently funded, or at least a lot of our funds, come from private firearms ownership as a result of private firearms ownership and unless we are dedicated to holding onto that freedom, we are not going to have that source of funds and we are going to be forced to look for them somewhere else.

One final thought on that. To those of you, and we find this in our state and I think it is applicable in talking to persons from other states, to those of you who come from less populated areas, don't think for one minute that the laws that are being made down in Washington regarding firearms ownership will only apply to the city of Detroit or to New York State or to Pennsylvania or to the megalopolis of the East. I assure you that those laws will apply to the Dakotas, and to Nebraska and to the Far West and so forth. There is no question about it; in fact they will be easier to enforce there--fewer people to get to.

Now, I will get off my soap box and get down to what we are talking about. But I think it is important to recognize that that is our primary source, at least in wildlife and fisheries, and we should protect it.

Now we were asked to come here to speak to you about the sportsman's role in financing new fish and wildlife programs and I suppose we could wrap this up in one or two sentences by just saying that the organized sportsman can and should act as a public relations arm of the department in spreading the word about the benefits of these new programs and the necessity for the additional fees to finance them. I guess you could say that we have a captive audience so that should be a relatively easy task. However, it is not always that easy and we will discuss that a little bit

further on. This has been the traditional way that sportsman have helped, at least in Michigan this has been the traditional way for most of the last 38 years that we have been organized. But I don't believe that it should be or has to be the only way that we involve ourselves or that we should help out.

Here in the last few years Michigan sportsmen have, or are in the process of, initiating legislation which is designed to raise new money for specific kinds of programs--some of them new but related to fisheries and wildlife programming. Ideally, I suppose every source of revenue should funnel into the general fund and be apportioned out on a need basis to the several state agencies. Dr. Tanner spoke a little bit about that and Representative Hellman is going to speak to you this afternoon about it but realistically this just isn't possible; at least it isn't here. Especially with the Legislature which is constantly under pressure of lobbyists and lobbying groups as well as varied other special interests among which, I might add, sportsmen's groups should play a major role. As a matter of fact, as Dr. Tanner pointed out, our funds come out of the game and fish protection fund or our financing for fish and wildlife programs come out of that fund, and in the last two years there have been several bills in our Legislature which, if they had been successful, would have eliminated our fish and game protection fund and all the other special funds that we have for the purposes of natural resource management in the state. It seems reasonable to us to assume that funds generated in specific areas should revert to those areas. That is sometimes the case, but not always as we will see a little later on.

Now in the time that I have we want to suggest some other approaches to fish and wildlife program financing aside from traditional license sales and related sporting equipment taxes. There is presently in the form of legislation, or will shortly be introduced in our state, a couple of ideas which may be new to some of you and to some others they may not be. I am not completely familiar with what is going on in every state and so some of these may even be implemented in other states.

We operate here, or we try to operate here, on the theory that the user pays and the Governor has espoused this idea as well as the organized sportsman. The fish and wildlife programs are funded almost exclusively by user fees of one kind or another. This year, as it was previously stated, our two year old put-take pheasant program will go on a ten dollar user fee and ironically enough when that particular fee was being set forth in a bill before the Michigan Legislature the whole program almost went under the table and twice it was defeated in our Senate after an overwhelming passage in the House and had to go to Conference Committee and just barely squeaked through because of opposition to the thought of raising pheasants and releasing them and general anti-hunting sentiment which reared its head on our Senate floor. It is very much evident, as I am sure you are aware, right in the Legislature.

Let's consider a program first of all that we have got started here, not really a new program in concept, but it's new in the way we want to put it together in Michigan, and we are hopeful to get it passed. That's a program whereby anyone who hunts, and in Michigan it is going to be in our southern region, would be required to have a public access stamp, with the monies derived from the sale of the stamp specifically earmarked for public hunting land purchase or lease. Now we are looking at a land lease program. By placing these earmarked funds, and the legislation that we have reads that everyone would be required to have a $1.00 public access stamp, in a revolving escrow account and using only the annual interest accrued therefrom along with a portion of the annual input after a given fund goal is established, we can begin a program, we believe, that will insure some measure of perpetuity by holding that escrow fund at a given level. Selling the program is predicated on the fact that more hunters are entering the field, as you heard earlier, and there is less hunting land becoming available to us annually. Also, here in Michigan and primarily in the southern part of the state, trespass has become an astronomical problem and there are bills once again introduced in our Legislature which would require some pretty stringent restrictions on the part of hunters. In fact, they are directed at hunters and exclude everyone else, to require written permission and so forth and so on to get on another's land.

We recognize this problem; we got together with some representatives of our department and we sat down with the Michigan Farm Bureau which represents the primary agricultural interests in the state and came up with this kind of a concept. And then we sold it to our membership and picked a legislator to introduce it. As of this writing, I am not sure we picked the right legislator but I guess only time will tell that. He hasn't gotten the bill with a number on it, but he has got it drafted and ready to go. Anyway, I think this program has great promise because once again it approaches a specific user and it addresses itself to this problem of access to land and trespass. We are hoping to create here an atmosphere where hunters--once again by paying a little bit more out of their pockets to use this land--will have a little more feeling about the land they are using because they are going to have to go through a procedure in order to make themselves accessible to the land and that they will become sort of a self-policing agent in their use of the land and cut down the trespass problem.

Now another program that has already been introduced in our Legislature and is coming along very nicely--it is kind of along the same line--is the Wetlands Stamp Bill which would require all waterfowl hunters to purchase a special waterfowl stamp with the income from that being used exclusively for wetlands acquisition. This is a program that the sportsmen of this state, the duck hunters primarily, asked for and are behind 100 percent. We did a little ditty on television just the other night on a Grand Rapids station. I watched it in the evening and the announcer, when he came on, said with some amazement in his tone and in his approach that hunters weren't objecting to or opposing this payment of an extra $2.00 for this waterfowl stamp. I guess he is probably not a hunter and does not understand how we feel about that particular program.

Now these two programs of course require the hunter to pay and are similar to the other traditional forms of wildlife and fisheries fund raising, namely license sales. And in Michigan we have license sales for every kind of thing imaginable and every year there are four or five new kinds of licenses suggested.

This year low and behold they had a bill in that would have exempted people unemployed. Now you can see where that would have left us when you heard the earlier statistics if all the unemployed people did not have to buy a license. And the handicapped, of course. And the Veterans had a bill in to exempt all the Viet Nam veterans from buying a hunting license. And so forth and so on. I guess I qualify for almost all of those--even the Senior Citizens one; I am getting some gray on the sides.

But none of these license fees which direct themselves at hunters and fishermen, which people consider to be the primary users--I am not so sure they always are--don't get at a source of a vast amount of revenue that should be tapped from other kinds of user groups. Taking to the out-of-doors has become one of the most popular things for a great many reasons other than hunting and fishing; there are hikers, campers, bicyclists, snowmobilers, ORV groups, canoeists, bird watchers, photographers, mushroom pickers, nut gatherers of one kind or another, artists, nature lovers, horseback riders and anyone else--I'm not going to mention them all--who requires open space to pursue his hobby or his recreation should be required to pay something for the enjoyment and management of that recreational opportunity. And that is where we get onto that two-edged sword that Director Tanner spoke about, I guess, but I still think it might not be a bad idea to get them to pay something. Now how we go about that will be a subject of great debate, I am sure.

We are getting some revenue from some of these sources, particularly the motor boat people and the ORV people and snowmobilers and so on, but boy it is doggone hard to take any of that particular revenue that is coming in and pinning it right down to a fisheries or wildlife benefit. In fact, I question whether it can be done, at least here. And I think that it should be done, and I think that it should--at least some of it--apply because certainly there is a correlation there.

Oftentimes, we recognize that the pressure from some of these groups other than hunters and fishermen can even be a greater burden on the resource; I think that ORV's and snowmobilers and so forth are, in fact, the greater burden, and I have heard some of our fellows talk about the bird watchers in this Kirtland Warbler's program as maybe being a greater detriment to the bird than anything else--that they all want to get in there and see the birds and photograph the birdie and part the bushes and so on and so forth and I hope that they will be content to look at the Kirtland Warbler on the front page of Michigan Out-of-Doors magazine next month and stay out of that area during these critical times.

We believe that legislation is necessary requiring all the foregoing user groups to pay something and to be in possession of some kind of public access or use permit. It is not enough to say that their contribution comes from the general fund because if that were so, the hunter and fisherman could plead that kind of relief also.

We believe that they would be willing and ready to accept the user pay concept if we had developed an educational program to get to them and to suggest to them how the money would be used--tell them how it would be used to their benefit. I think that if we start to talk to them like we've talked to sportsmen for the last fifty years or seventy five years or whatever it may be about such things as increased law enforcement, more land acquisition, better land the water management, and so forth and so on, that we might find some acceptance there.

And I think that while we are thinking along these lines, we should caution our sportsmen groups, and we are trying to do this more and more often as we go out and talk to our people, about taking a little bit of care in beating their breasts too hard and boasting about their great monetary contributions to wildlife management. To be sure, they are there, but I think we want to be careful about how we emphasize that contribution. I think they should take a sound rational approach definitely and think about the audience that they are talking to nowadays because more often than not, it's a pretty sophisticated audience, and I think that they can understand when they are told that sportsmen have, in fact, paid their way, are paying their way to the benefit of not only the hunter and the fisherman but also to the benefit of the rest of the public, and with the right kind of educational approach perhaps we can get some support from them.

Hopefully we will someday have the kind of comprehensive land use management plan which will allow for the proper assessment and distribution of monies for natural resource management and outdoor recreation programs. The trouble is, when you mention that word, we have about half the population of this state that thinks you are pinko and they look under the bed every night for a Communist and somebody is going to steal their land from them and that is the concept we have when we start talking about land use and land use management.

I wish that it was as easy to sell that program as it is to sell some of these others. But we have a couple of ideas that we would just like to throw out.

You may think we are a little scatterbrained but what is wrong with the idea of persons utilizing resort type property, particularly waterfront property, but resort type property, for recreational purposes only, being assessed some kind of a tax or millage, however slight it might be, to cofer the additional burden placed upon a resource by a permanent or semi-permanent presence in our recreation areas? How much more work and expenditure is required by the department on a lake surrounded by cottages and primarily used by recreation or vacation transients as opposed to one in a more pristine state?

Another thing that has been talked about here, and our fisheries department has talked about it, is the idea of the contract fishery and hopefully we are going to be able to have that kind of thing someday and to gain some revenue back from it. I believe in just feeling out our sportsmen groups and starting to get them prepared for this kind of concept, we are finding some receptiveness to the idea of alloting the fish of the state or the Natural Resources Department and particularly the Fisheries Division and Wildlife Divisions getting some revenue back from this great surplus that we are experiencing in the Great Lakes now.

Also I don't know what hope there is for this in our state, and I don't know how it is handled in all of yours, although I think probably the same or nearly the same, and that is the idea of fish and game violation fines going into the state library fund. Now in some states, they go into the general fund. If there has ever been a program that calls for general fund appropriations channeled through the agency of the Department of Public Education, it's the libraries. I don't even know how that cockamammy idea ever came up, that all this money from fish and game should go into a state library fund, but nevertheless it does and we are going to try and find someone who is interested in introducing that kind of legislation and getting that thing hopefully straightened around someday.

Convincing sportsmen's groups of the necessity for new programs, higher license fees, or new funding sources is not always the easy job it may seem. It is definitely not an easy job for our department personnel, and even though you might think it's an easier job for me, it isn't. I get in just as many arguments and debates and so forth with our own people about these programs as the department people do. But I think it is incumbent upon the representatives, particularly the fish and wildlife divisions, but also the Natural Resources Department as a whole, to seek out and to establish some rapport with the local sportsman groups.

Now we have been pretty successful with that in Michigan. Budgetary problems in the last couple of years have tended to complicate the amount of travel and contact which our department has had with sportsman groups, but by and large, I think if we have any measure of success that some other areas of the country do not have, it's as a result of the efforts made by the many individuals within the Department of Natural Resources to get out and to make contact with citizen groups, sportsmen groups in this instance, and to get to know them and to sell those programs to those sportsmen groups on a grassroots basis--right in their clubhouse, in their home, in their hunting camp, and so forth. And sadly we just don't have the appropriations to expend for this purpose. Thank God that we have had, in our department anyway, a large number of men who are dedicated enough to the cause of fisheries and wildlife management to do it on their own. And we have guys who I know have spent thousands of dollars of their own money and many many hours of their own time in getting out and doing these kinds of things. But that is what it takes to get the sportsman enthused enough and knowledgeable enough to assist you in selling

the program; because you know, a lot of times--more often than not--sportsmen groups are going to be the major opposition to some of your fisheries and wildlife type programs, and it generally is because they just don't know what the program is all about. They are not scientists, they don't think scientifically for the most part. In fact they don't even understand 90 percent of the terms that a lot of you guys use. They just don't grab it all. Most of them like to think of themselves as self-taught biologists, and frankly they know a hell of a lot more than some paid biologists do. One of the arguments we always use when talking to them is why don't we get rid of them--why don't we get rid of the Todys and the Petoskeys and so forth. If we are not going to listen to them, we sure don't need them. And I think that you get in there, and pitch, and make these people aware and you are going to get a lot further with those programs.

I wonder too though, in that area of cooperation, what has happened--particularly here I can speak from some measure of knowledge--about our state in the last few years to the cooperative effort of sportsmen and Department of Natural Resources agencies in pulling off different kinds of programs. I can't think of very many. We have a few minor things where we might have helped clean up some fish or worked with some walleyes or something like that, but lots of times sportsmen's groups are discouraged from getting involved and the red tape, and the bureaucracy, and so forth and so on has become so complicated that, in some instances at least, they don't feel they are needed or wanted or that the program they might be interested in getting involved with is too important. I think that you might look for some areas to get them involved on the local level whether it be raising walleyes, cutting deer habitat, riprapping a stream or whatever it might be.

Seek them out, get to know them and they might be interested in helping you on those, and then you can get into the more subtle issues as you get to know them better of helping you finance a license increase or some other kind of project that you want to use to raise funds for particular fisheries or wildlife programs.

Finally I want to say that, and by no means of least importance of what I want to say to you today, is the responsibility of sportsmen's groups to insure that all these earmarked monies and special funds are spent for the purposes intended. It's one thing to raise all this money and get it all into a fund, and quite another to save it and make doggone sure that it is spent in the proper areas. All too often fisheries and wildlife related funds are spent on projects and on services which are questionable in their relationship to fish and wildlife.

Now we recognize that supportive agencies need and are involved in some aspects of fisheries and wildlife management but sometimes we question to what extent and to what extent they should receive the funding. I guess what I am saying in plain simple language is that, at

least here in our state, we think that fishermen and hunters are paying for a lot more than they are getting back. If there was ever a source of funds, let's make doggone sure we are getting back all that we are putting in first before we go to them for more; and the only way we can do this, as sportsmen's groups, is to be on top of those legislators, and to make sure that programs and bills that have been initiated that would do away with that or would siphon off those funds are held back and are stopped and prevented.

Sportsman's groups then can finally act as a buffer between the Legislature which is always looking for money from different sources and the pressure groups which would siphon off the funds under the guise of wildlife programs of one kind or another.

And Chuck, with that, I think it is right just about on the money, and I'll close it up.

PRES. HARRIS: Sometimes it has been accused that we are in MUCC's pocket, or they are in our pocket, or we are in bed together, but let me assure you that is not the case. Although MUCC has been a strong supporter of most of our programs, when they have disagreed with us, they have been honest and very honest in their disagreements. They have not fought us with half truths like some organizations do; when they oppose us, they oppose us with the total truth, and it has always been a great deal of pleasure to work with Tom and his many members in MUCC.

As a little sidelight, I never attended an organizational meeting like MUCC where they spend about 90 percent of their entire annual meeting on resolutions. Almost every day, all day long, it's resolutions. They have a few outstanding speakers, but the membership really devotes their time to resolutions, and they invite our people to participate. Our people, at their request, provide technical information on resolutions. Although we may not agree with the resolution, if the membership still agrees, the resolution is passed. We are only there to provide technical information to help them in their decision regarding that resolution. It's the only organization I know that devotes that kind of time to resolutions.

And I want to thank you too Bill. I was outside for a minute when you finished your talk, but I would like to mention that we appreciate it, and I am glad to have you back with the membership, at least for this meeting. Hope you can come again.

We are about through. I would like to delay it a little bit this afternoon but I fear to do that because the mayor is scheduled to address us at 1:00 and she does have a busy schedule. I said she because it is a woman who is mayor of Traverse City, and she will be here at 1:00, but for just a couple of minutes more, I think we have some door prize drawings.

* * * * * * * * *

Reconvened Tuesday p.m. session

PRES. HARRIS: The afternoon session will come to order. In introducing the Michigan department people to you this morning, I skipped one very important person who is doing the recording for us. He is on loan to us from our Geological Survey Division--Red Crothers. At this time I will call on Gary Boushelle for some announcements.

BOUSHELLE: We don't have very much more to add from what we had earlier today, but I would like to repeat that if anyone needs any secretarial help, resolutions to be typed up, or what have you, that they are available.

PRES. HARRIS: Mrs. Gilbo, the mayor, was here but she was committed to be another place at 1:30 and realizing that service is rather slow in the dining room and most of you were still eating, she consented to come back at 4:00. So we can get right into the program as on schedule for 1:30. At this time, following the program, I'd like to introduce to you Representative Russell Hellman. Mr. Hellman serves five counties in our northwestern part of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan--Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keewenaw, Ontonagon and part of Baraga. That's the northwest part of Michigan. He has had fifteen years in the Michigan Legislature. He is a ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee and most important to us in DNR, he is chairman of the subcommittee on the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Agriculture's appropriations. He is also chairman of the Joint House Capital Outlay Committee which is also a very vitally important committee to our program. It handles all funding for construction of new state buildings, including state universities. And I would like to add to this that we never of course receive an appropriation all that we think we should, but Rep. Hellman gives us our day in court. Every division appears before his committee at least once; they start with a zero budget and from there go on and justify what their needs are. He really devotes and works hard at making our appropriations and then following it through the House and also discussing it with the Senate when it gets over in their branch. With no more than that, I'd like to introduce to you Rep. Russell Hellman.

GENERAL FUND SUPPORT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

By

Honorable Russell Hellman, Chairman
Sub-committee on Appropriation
Michigan House of Representatives
Joint House of Representatives and Senate Capital Outlay Committee

Thank you very much, Chuck. It goes without saying that I am glad to be here. We worked this morning until 3 a.m. in the Michigan Legislature passing a bill that was promoted by common cause and it is called something like Truth and Political Financing; if that ever comes about, there will be no need for the Lord because all of us will go straight to heaven.

Chuck gave me a nice send-off and I don't know whether I should tell this story but I'll try to clean it up a little bit; and it is the truth. As you know, the DNR are arrogant, egotistical, self-centered, miserable, dictatorial people and those who work for the Law Division in the UP are no exception. The other day one of them decided that because the Fourth of July was up and he had a kind of a nice sorrel horse, that he was going to take it downtown and ride up and down the streets. He was galloping back and forth up and down one of our little streets and decided to go into the bar and have a drink. So he drank more than his share, of course, in the bar and while he was in the bar someone painted the rear end of his horse yellow. Of course he, with a half a pot on, came out of the bar and went out there and saw what had happened to his horse; he came in the bar and said "who did that?" A big Finlander at the side of the bar got up and said "I did that." He said "I just want you to know the first coat is dry." So I think that makes the personal drive.

I was told that I should come here and address you people; that I should talk about other means of financing fish and wildlife programs. Then I learned that Dr. Tanner was going to be here ahead of me and talk about the same issue and because there weren't any answers to that, he said "I don't know a damn thing about it, and Rusty will give you all the answers." So it kind of left me in an embarassing situation. However, I do have a good speech and I am very confident in giving it because Mrs. Mitchell, my secretary, wrote it. So with that I am going to give it to you. By the way, Mrs. Mitchell's husband works for the DNR. It goes something like this.

Michigan fish and wildlife programs, like many states, have traditionally been financed under the user pay concept. In Michigan, as far back as the 1920s when the Game and Fish Protection Fund was established, this concept has prevailed. In 1941, legislation was passed to simplify accounting procedures of the state, at which time certain restricted funds were discontinued while others were merged with the General Fund of the state. The Game and Fish Protection Fund, because it was solvent, was retained as a restricted fund. It was used strictly for the support of the fish and wildlife programs, and as of today this is still the concept in Michigan.

Funding of Michigan's fisheries and wildlife programs in 1975-76 as passed by the House of Representatives, and I might say that I have been chairman of the DNR budget for eleven years, this is the fourth consecutive year that the DNR budget bill for the time I wrote it passed the subcommittee on appropriations, passed the whole committee on appropriations, passed the House of Representatives, it was passed into the Senate without changing a nickel on it. That's four consecutive years that the budget as I wrote it on my desk passed into the Senate without dotting an i or changing a nickel in the budget. And in fact this year I did not even get up and speak on the bill. The speaker, when they called for the bill, looked at me and I sit in the front just about where you are and I smiled at him and

he motioned this is you bill. I said "yes, I know it" and he said "well explain it" and I said "up your nose." And it passed. However, I did put out a good sheet of explanation of what was in the bill, what I did about a week before we voted on it and I did have some inquiries but apparently everyone was satisfied and the bill is now in the Senate and it has my blessings, of course.

In wildlife we have a budget of $5,200,000 of which the game and fish fund is $3,200,000. That is the general fund of game and fish; we have earmarked funds--we passed a deer hunting license increase which was earmarked for deer habitat and that has $900,000 and that's in it and the federal funds of Pittman-Robertson of $1,100,000. That makes up the wildlife.

Fisheries' gross budget is $6,700,000--Game and Fish Fund is $4,300,000 and Dingell-Johnson fund of $900,000 and we have general fund $1,500,000. The general fund money is a one shot deal. As you know, since Wayne Tody started to manage our fish in our beautiful Great Lakes and inland lakes our production has gone down, down, down, down and we then have to eliminate the commercial fisherman and we have done pretty well. I don't think we have more than about 80 of those left out of some 6 or 7 or 8 hundred that were in Michigan when I first got into the Legislature. And because we have restricted the gill net fishing, we have rendered a lot of fishing equipment worthless. We have put out of business people who are in second and third generation of fishing and we had decided that we should buy their gear and the DNR estimated that this would cost about $1,500,000 and even though it was to protect the sport fisherman we knew that they would not stand still for $1,500,000 taken out of the restricted fund so we agreed that we would take the $1,500,000 out of the general fund, buy the gear of those fishermen--gill net fishermen who we are putting out of business--to help those that are going to go into the trap net fishing. This is the second year we have passed this $1,500,000 in the appropriations bill to pay for it. Last year we didn't spend it because along with that has to pass the bill to determine who will get the money and how it shall be paid off. And of course that bill did not pass; it was hassled out because of personal vendettas and so forth. We are going to try the route again this time and see whether or not we can pass the bill to accompany the appropriation and pay these people off. In the meantime, however, if we could procrastinate and put it off one more year, we won't need it. The fishermen themselves will have just vanished into thin air. But that is what the $1,500,000 general fund in fishing is.

Even the 1.8 million of federal funds is excise taxes on hunting and fishing equipment, and that, of course, comes under the user pay concept. The federal Pittman-Robertson Enabling Act was passed by Congress in 1939. In 1951, the federal Dingell-Johnson Enabling Act was passed.

Alternate methods of financing have been proposed in the past. In Michigan, for example, a move to credit all hunting and fishing license fees to the state general fund was proposed last year, in 1974. The basis of

the recommendation was that fish and wildlife programs would then compete for a share of the state's general fund on the same basis as health, education, welfare and such programs. This was vigorously opposed by the sportsmen of the state and by the DNR. Arguments were that fish and wildlife programs could not compete successfully with social program budget needs during revenue shortages. And the possibility exists--hunting and fishing revenues could end up financing other than hunting and fishing programs. And because of the low entrance fees into the world of hunting and fishing, there is still increased interest in the concept of earmarked revenue for special taxes or user fees to assure a steady flow of funds for desired projects.

Now many of you and I have heard it many times say Hell, hunting and fishing licenses are too high, and this is ridiculously unjust and unfair. When you consider the amount of facilities that must be used and time and effort and money that must be spent to provide one hour of hunting or one hour of fishing for a sportsman and you compare that to a $2.50 admission fee to a go-go show or a movie or a buck fifty for a cocktail or a ten dollar bill that you will spend if you go to the racetracks before you put down your first bet or the $20.00 that it costs you to go to a football game and you compare a seven or eight dollar annual license fee to fish and the number of hours that are available to you to fish in comparison to the two hours you spend in the movie or the three hours at a football game or what. The resistance from the sportsman is not the fee itself but most sportsmen feel that the natural resources are a God-given gift to him and they are his right to use as he pleases. That concept does prevail, and he objects to any fee because he feels he is being taken. Now it isn't the amount of the fee, it's the fee itself that is irritating. If you as DNR people begin a public relations program to tell them that that is gone, then I think we will have much, much less problems in getting a better fee.

Michigan, for example, recently passed legislation providing for an annual fee on pheasant put-take programs and I think that fee was $10. It got kicked around and ended up at $10.00, but even that is too low. They promised when we put in the pheasant program, Bob Burke was there and Pete Petoskey was there and so forth. They promised me faithfully and I was with the joint capital outlay and DNR budget that we would raise pheasants for about $1.50 a piece. No problem. Pheasant cost now is about $3.85 to $4.00 p piece. And it costs $10.00 to go into put and take. By the time you have your third bird, you already owe the state $2.00. So really the cost of put-take is not a high cost. It is well within the poor man's purse or the low man's purse and this is the way you should go. But House Bill 4060 which would require possession of a special stamp for hunting waterfowl was passed by the House on June 9 and is now in the Senate Conservation Committee. And Senate Bill 573 which would provide for an increase in the fishing license in Michigan is on third reading in the Senate at this moment.

Fiscal people however object to this concept as do appropriation bodies and they argue that the only way for legislators to maintain intact their constitutional powers over the public purse is for all revenues to flow into the treasury without any note as to its source or ultimate use. Thus, subject to appropriation priorities to meet the needs of the people whether they be social needs or hunting and fishing programs, hunting and fishing administrators often present the argument that the license fees that support their program benefit the non-hunter and fisherman either by a user fee or through general tax revenues. Although this is true to some extent, there are programs that are supported by general tax revenues that indirectly benefit hunting and fishing programs. In Michigan, for example, Michigan's water and air pollution programs. They are financed by general tax revenues as well as by industrial surveillance fees and federal funds and of course the surveillance fees is a user tax on industry. Therefore the general public and the industry are indirectly supporting hunting and fishing programs in their effort to conserve and improve water quality, wildlife habitat of the state, and to protect the air resources.

Commercial forestry certainly benefits all hunting, fishing, and wildlife. In fact, commercial forestry's priority is often fish and wildlife habitat. I am much interested in the forestry business of this state, coming from the UP, and many, many gatherings where I go with a commercial forester his prime interest is what does the public think about wildlife habitat and fish habitat of our commercial forest programs. Not how much do we grow, what is the cost of stuff, what are our taxes, but they are most interested in this issue here and they certainly benefit the hunting and fishing programs.

One alternative suggestion has been general fund support in addition to restricted funds. The major source of general funds revenues is taxes. Taxes are levied to support governmental expenditures that generally benefit all of the people. Based on a 1970 national survey of fishing and hunting, 15 percent of the people in Michigan on the average hunt and fish--9 percent hunt and 21 percent fish. Therefore when the use of state general funds is proposed the argument is that 100 percent ofthe tax paying public is paying the cost that benefits only 15 percent of the populace. There appears to be no other viable alternate for financing hunting and fishing programs other than the current user pay system leaving but one other alternate, and that is program adjustment and economy.

And you as DNR people, of course, don't see that but we in the Legislature certainly know that the only viable alternative you have is program adjustment and economy. The program administrators have to continually evaluate existing programs to determine their efficiency and effectiveness and adjust program priorities accordingly. All too often, after programs are initiated, they tend to be forgotten and emphasis placed on program expansion and not on results, priorities, or on trade offs. What may have been a good priority yesterday does not necessarily mean it is of a good priority today. Concentration on hunter and fisherman success must be

relegated to the back seat. Concentration on hunter and fisherman success, the bag limit, that has to be relegated to the back seat. Greater attention must be given to allow more people to participate. Greater and more efficient use must be made of the facilities we already have. The one on one use of our facilities can no longer be afforded.

Our problem is not how do we get more financing and more facilities; our problem is how do we make better use of what we now have. The days of privacy and singular enjoyment of a man alone in complete solitude are gone. We must alter our programs accordingly. Even with these changes we will be hard pressed to finance our lust for the great outdoors while earning our livelihood within darkened air conditioned rooms. A substitute ingredient for money must be found and that substitute has to be ingenuity, imagination, foresight, economy and drive. There is no alternate way of financing fish and wildlife programs.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Rusty. Is Arlow Boyce in the audience? Will you see that transportation is available to take Rep. Hellman to the airport when he is ready to go? Good.

The next item on our agenda for this afternoon is the Trends Toward Unions of State Employees. Particularly I think this relates to collective bargaining. We had hoped that Glen Nelson from Wisconsin could be here because they are in a collective bargaining program in that state. We have not reached that point yet in Michigan. But evidently they are doing some bargaining in Wisconsin so Glenn could not appear.

We are very fortunate that we could have a gentleman here who is the Director of Membership Services Division of the Michigan State Employees Association. He is a lifetime resident of Michigan, graduated from Michigan State University, and this association of which he is membership director is in excess of 20,000 members. It includes about 1,400 employees of our Department of Natural Resources. Also he serves as secretary to the Central Regional Assembly of Governmental Employees representing in excess of 700,000 members of independent employee organizations. At this time we will hear from Fred Lipinski. Fred.

TRENDS TOWARD UNIONS OF STATE EMPLOYEES

By

Fred Lipinski, Director, Membership Services Division
Michigan State Employees Association

It is a pleasure being here. I want all of you to know that this was indeed a last second assignment. As a matter of fact, the way it was broached was "How would you like to go to Traverse City next week?" And of course I am always willing to go to Traverse City or anywhere in northern Michigan so I said sure, and then I called Mr. Boyce and I found out why. You may not believe this but a lot of this presentation was written between

catches of one of my favorite fish--it's bullheads. You don't have to concentrate too hard when you are fishing for those and so a lot of it got written then.

The question that came to my mind as I was thinking about this presentation is "Will I be objective?" You have to understand that I come in from an employee organization point of view instead of management. There could be a little bit of difference there but I can assure you that I'll make every effort to be objective--as a matter of fact I'll even mention our competition.

The subject that you have chosen--Trend Toward Public Employee Unions Within State Service--is a subject that could very easily take up a week long seminar if you considered all the peripheral issues that are involved. But understanding the time limitations, I am going to give you kind of a thumbnail sketch of what the subject matter is and that is the trend toward unionization of state employees--what it amounts to.

Before I do, I'm sure the mayor of Traverse City has extended a welcome to all of those who have come to the state of Michigan and I'll, in as much as she isn't here right now, I'll give my own little welcome. I'd like to welcome all of you to the state which I think has probably the three greatest wonders of the world. Of course, the first is the Great Lakes, the second is the Upper Peninsula, and the third is Michigan State University with its football team. And I was very pleased to notice that the gentleman from Ohio is here with a green blazer and a white shirt today. That made my day.

The trend toward unionism among state employees is a subject to which I can relate with a certain amount of familiarity. As all of us are aware, private employment unionism has been around for a long time and probably will continue to be around for a much longer period of time, although at present, employee membership in private employee unions is on a slight decline.

The field of unionism among public employees, which of course would include state employees, is one that has seen growth in not only internationally affiliated public employee unions but also independent employee associations. The roots for this movement can be traced back to Executive Order 10988 issued by President Kennedy giving certain collective bargaining rights to federal employees excluding the FBI, CIA and certain security branches of the federal government. With the President of the United States acting in this fashion and as a result of strong state house lobbying, the field of public employee unionism and the resulting collective bargaining was seen to be a rather lucrative and untapped resource for international organizations. The largest such organization is of course the American Federation of State, County and Municipal employees, an affiliate of the AFL-CIO which has grown from 99,000 members in 1955 to approximately 700,000 members in 1974.

It is worthwhile to note that most of the membership of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal employees is within the city and municipality and county structure as opposed to state employees. There is, of course, a reason for this phenomenon and that is the historical involvement of state employees in independent associations. Many of the independents have been around the public sector for a long period of time and they are large and powerful organizations within their state. As an example, the California State Employees Association represents approximately 113,000 employees. The New York Association, another independent, represents in excess of 210,000 employees. Other organizations that are not as large have been around for nearly as long and are fairly stable, sophisticated and able to withstand pressures from international unions to disband or affiliate with these internationals. Ohio represents approximately 35,000 members, while the Michigan State Employees Association is seeing its greatest growth surge in a number of years and is currently slightly above the 20,000 member mark.

On the state scene, state administrators are more than likely to be confronted by an independent association as opposed to an international union. The reasons for this are many and varied. To begin with, the states employ a much more diversified spectrum of employees than do the smaller cities and counties. In a state setting, a psychiatrist is as likely to be a state employee as a laborer working for the Highway Department. There appears to be a great deal of emphasis among state employees on the professional nature of their employment. There will be those, of course, that will debate where professionalism begins and ends, but according to the overall picture, and that which has happened up to this point in time, state employees are typically wary of stigmas which may be attached to industrial unions moving into the public sector. For this reason, the associations were born, nurtured, and in many instances are now flourishing by representing a broad spectrum of employees from the laborer level to the true professional level.

This fact is reinforced by a quick check of the types of employees that are most likely to join an international union such as ASCME. On the nationwide scene attendants working in state institutions, laborers and equipment operators in highway departments and correctional officers tend to drift toward the international unions. Other employees within the respective states lean more toward independent associations. It is interesting to note that the traditional representative of public employees that belong to international unions has been the American Federation of State County and Municipal employees.

However, that scene is beginning to change in a fashion not too surprising in view of the number of public employees and the current trend in the area of private employee unions. What we are seeing is the involvement of such organizations as the United Auto Workers and the Teamsters in the public sector. As an example, the Teamsters have been somewhat active in the area of law enforcement while just recently the United Auto Workers

defeated ASCME in representation of the elections at the University of Michigan among the clerical employees. It would appear that we are on the verge of a scramble for membership and one has to wonder what is becoming of the traditional AFL-CIO no-rate clause. That seems to have gone by the wayside.

The question now becomes what is the trend toward unionism of state employees going to mean to the individual states and the administration of their affairs. Twenty-two states, including Michigan, do, at the present time, have formal procedures for dealing with state employee organizations. Of the industrial states, only Ohio is lacking in some type of formal recognition procedure although the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, considering its size and the fact that it has payroll deduction and can enter into certain agreements, does seem to be doing pretty well in that state.

The trend toward unionization of state employees continues to grow and as an example, I recently attended a meeting in the southern United States at which representatives from five newly formed independent state associations were present.

The development of labor organizations among state employees in southern states has been slow primarily because of the lack of sympathy toward unions in general where unions have not had a strong foothold as they have had in the northern industrialized states. In any event, once a union or association becomes a reality in a state, the next step is a formal method of representing its membership. The current trend is toward some type of collective bargaining. At the present time the states of Michigan, Florida, Nevada, and Oklahoma provide collective bargaining rights for local employees while denying such rights or the same rights to state employees.

Collective bargaining, where it is non-existent in certain states, is replaced by the need and confer process which experience has shown to be less effective than the employee organizations might desire. On the other hand, collective bargaining, even in those states providing for such a system, is not on a parallel basis with industrial type collective bargaining in that in nearly all instances the tool of the strike is prohibited. Notice I said prohibited and not impossible. Therefore other means of dispute resolvement are being turned to and of course these include mediation, fact finding and arbitration. It is interesting to note that on pay and fringe matters even though the contract is agreed upon by the principles involved it does not become effective until such time as the Legislature appropriates the money to honor the terms of the contract. Therefore while both parties can bargain in good faith it is not necessarily incumbent upon the state Legislature to honor any agreements reached by the bargaining teams.

To summarize this point it is safe to assume that if your state is not already involved, it soon will be in the collective bargaining arena either by statute at the state level or the federal level.

The question now becomes what impact will this have on the state. To begin with, employees will be placed into units for election and representation purposes. There are several means of accomplishing this and among available choices are statewide occupational units, units restricted to certain classifications within a given department or departmental units. There are many other different methods or guidelines to be used in determining an appropriate unit and community of interest and historical representation can play a big role. At the present time, seven states provide for statewide occupational units and they are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Kansas, Alaska, and Hawaii. Fifteen other states have units composed of work classifications within a single department or department-wide units.

There has been a move among some states, notably New York, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Hawaii, to place a limit on the number of units that can be recognized and in general the use of statewide groupings was intended to restrict the number of units in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Large units, limited in number, do provide for a smoother operation in the area of representation. Additionally, management does not have to become involved on a full time basis with the fact that contracts may be expiring every day of the year and organizations representing the employees are able to spend more time in membership dues money providing representation and grievance matters and improving conditions of employment if they are freed from the task of constantly battling rival organizations for representation rights.

One advantage to state administrators as well as employees as far as representation and collective bargaining are concerned stems from the fact that the state does actually become involved as the employer. While all states have numerous state agencies to conduct the affairs of the state, the ultimate employer does still remain the state. This means that while employees similarly situated but not necessarily within the same agency may have been treated differently with respect to salaries, fringe benefits and conditions of employment in the past, they will be moved under one roof so to speak when the bargaining begins. Not only will this provide for more efficient utilization of state resources and monies, but it will also provide for equity among employees.

One thing that I have not touched on that I feel is rather important is the role of a collective bargaining system in a state utilizing merit principles. I am making a very clear distinction between merit principles and merit systems. Merit principles, once established, are there in writing for everyone to see. However, merit systems are only as good as the individuals and commissions operating the merit systems. A merit system can be a model employment apparatus or on the other hand it can border on the

spoils system. It is my view that collective bargaining can exist within a merit principles framework. An example of what I am talking about can best be obtained by using the state of Michigan.

Michigan, in the event you don't know, has its Civil Service law built into its constitution. It is the only state, of all 50 states, that actually has a constitutional provision for civil service. Many states have statutes, but statutes can be readily amended, replaced, or changed and constitutions are a little more difficult to deal with. The Civil Service Commission of the state of Michigan is unique among all other such bodies in the United States in that it has exclusive authority over the regulation of conditions of employment and the hiring practice for all classified state employees. It provides pay increases for civil service employees which can only be overturned by a two-thirds vote of the members elected to and serving in both the House and the Senate. But even with this strong constitutional system, the state of Michigan is at the present time considering a collective bargaining proposal which will ensure its employees the right of being represented by the organization of their choice, and the right to participate in the pay setting process by actually bargaining salary and of course bargaining fringe benefits and conditions of employment. The merit principle in Michigan even if this proposal is adopted will remain intact in that classifications and testing will not be subject to bargaining and will be protected by the Civil Service Commission.

In closing, let me summarize my feelings by pointing out that the labor movement in public employment is running a parallel course with the labor movement among private employers and industry. The big difference that must be recognized is that the employer in the case of public employees is not free to raise prices or increase production output to compensate for demands made upon it by labor organizations. Therefore one of the major concerns all of us must have is a fair and impartial method of maintaining harmony and productivity among the work force while at the same time making certain that public employees are not placed in a position of being second class citizens. Public employees should not be expected to be a buffer between the demand for public services and the lack of public tax money. They are workers entitled to respect, dignity and the fair ways the same as any employee at General Motors. Those states that do not have a means of recognizing state employees are going to be forced into the position of providing this recognition by virtue of the fact that employees themselves could look around them in any factory or school district and realize that they are being considered somewhat apart from other workers.

The trend is toward organization of state employees and the number of independent associations that are in existence today is adequate testimony to the success of the effort where it has occurred. The Assembly of Governmental Employees, a body consisting of independent associations throughout the United States, at the present time represents as many employees as does the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal

Employees. With growth activity such as I have seen in the past two years, it is only a matter of time before state employees in your state are organized and presenting a solid front for improved salaries, fringe benefits, and conditions of employment.

Thank you.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Fred. We are running a little bit ahead of schedule. I wonder if anybody has any questions that they would like to ask Fred or make any comments relative to the subject which he addressed us. Yes, Larry.

GALE, MISSOURI: I would like to inquire, in your Michigan set-up what level personnel are included in your association or is it all inclusive?

LIPINSKI: Well the way Michigan is constituted right now, it is all inclusive. Michigan has a pay scale, steps from 01 through 21, 01 being the highest and we represent people from the 01 through the 21. As a matter of fact, we have 162 chapters right now and we have one chapter devoted strictly to psychiatrists. So we have quite a broad spectrum of involvement.

Now they are proposing to change that under the collective bargaining proposal they are talking about. This is a pretty interesting issue because one of the things that could happen--they could separate true managers from other employees and tell those people they cannot belong to any kind of an organization. What they are thinking of right now is separating everybody above first-line supervisor. Now for those of you who are familiar with state employment, it is pretty hard sometimes to distinguish who is a supervisor and who is not a supervisor in a typical setting. An individual may be a supervisor for the purposes of marking down when someone is late or approving annual leave or sick leave; that individual may not be the same individual that would issue a less than satisfactory service rating or a counseling memorandum. So it is perplexing to us how anybody could ever really draw such a fine line and why they would want to draw it.

GALE: What I was wondering was if you had a possible conflict of interests. For example, Director as head of the agency has certain responsibilities that would not apply to people farther down the line. He might see the issue one way and the other employee has a different view.

LIPINSKI: Now conflict of interest. I'm not sure I followed your exact question but I can talk about conflict of interest for a moment. That has a lot to do with how you are set up internally. Under most systems you have managerial employees excluded, you have confidential employees excluded; in other words what you have excluded are those people who are responsible for establishing and creating policy and then you have those people who are responsible for sitting across the bargaining table from the employee organization. That's the type of person you have excluded.

Now the question becomes, looking at it from our point of view, why should a park manager in the state of Michigan be excluded from representation. I know a lot of park managers that have troubles that need representation. If you look at the structure and figure out where the park manager fits into the total operating system within the state, you have a district, a region and an office down in Lansing, and he may be a manager of sorts--within his own framework he is responsible for the operation of that park--but he is not really responsible for the goals and objectives of the agency that are created or established by managerial policy-making people at our state capital. There are a lot of arguments on both sides.

PRES. HARRIS: I might come in on that a little bit too, Larry. At one time, I was a member of the Michigan State Employees Association. Then when I got in a position where in grievance procedures we had hearings with an employee that was represented by the association and I was a member of our personnel committee hearing the grievance I felt that I would no longer actively participate as a member of the association having that kind of a responsibility. So when it gets into personnel policy matters and personnel policy decisions at least I felt that I could not very well continue as a member, so I resigned. And I know others in the same kind of category as that that have done the same thing. Or they have retained their membership but been inactive as far as the chapter is concerned. But there is no set line now as to who belongs and who doesn't. Anyone can join.

GALE, MISSOURI: Isn't it inevitable, Chuck, that anybody who is a supervisor is going to be involved in a grievance procedure?

PRES. HARRIS: And the grieved employee could very well be represented by the association or union to which he is a member. But there is not a civil service rule yet that says who can belong and who can't, so it is pretty well left up to the individual and his own choice. Jack, did you have a comment?

HEMPHILL, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE: In terms of industry, when the union makes demands, the industry has a choice of doing several things. It can accept, close down or move to someplace that has a better labor relationship. But in terms of a municipality or government that is not so. Where do you place the level of responsibility such as setting down the amount per year for garbage truck operators in New York City and San Francisco. In one of our installations, we pay a mechanic, a so-called blue collar worker, about $100/year less than we pay the project manager because he falls under a different wage scale than does the civil service worker. Where does the level of responsibility here that unions too have the responsibility to the people. They represent the workers but somebody also represents the people who are hostage to pay this thing because the government doesn't have the opportunity to move or to make choices as does industry.

LIPINSKI: That is a very good point. I would like to say one thing right at the outset. That is, not many people realize how much labor peace is actually kept by unions and associations. The problem that you have mentioned, one of salaries, has been handled somewhat in the state of Michigan. The civil service commission determines, although they might deny this but in actuality they determine in advance, pretty much what percentile they want their employees to fall within compared to other people doing similar work. And then the state conducts very extensive surveys and there is a lot of participation through our compensation board, on which we have membership, in an effort to determine what is a fair and just wage. Now one of the big criticisms that the state of Michigan had a few years ago but has been taken care of somewhat is the nature of the survey. The state was surveying people that we weren't really interested in finding out how much they were making. They were surveying a lot of the non-industrialized states. In Michigan we are a fairly industrialized state and if a worker is going to leave a state hospital, the worker is probably--in better days--going to walk down the street to the nearest Ford Plant and go to work. The turnover in our metropolitan area is 24-25-26 percent so the state did have to do something to compensate for this and they made an attempt to increase salaries to make state employment a little more lucrative; they provided other things--fringe benefits, time and a half, on-call pay, recall pay, shift differential--this type of atmosphere in an effort to keep the employees.

Now last year we conducted an independent survey of our membership. We polled enough people--I forget what the exact number was--but about the same number of people that commercial pollsters use to determine who is going to win the gubernatorial election--we took this out of our members and out of our non-members and we found in that poll (very surprising) the one single area of concern for state employees, the thing they felt the strongest about, the thing that they wanted the most done about, was not salaries, not fringe benefits, it was working conditions. They were happy with the salaries, they were happy with the fringe benefits, but by God, they didn't like that plaster falling on their heads.

So a lot of the things that people assume are of primary concern to employees are not necessarily so. Of course, you have a difficult situation; I mean, if you are paying a truck driver $18,000 a year, I think perhaps that maybe this has gotten out of hand. I tell you, an awful lot depends on the responsibility and the integrity of the organization that the state is dealing with, whether it is an independent association or whether it is an internationally affiliated union.

One of the benefits that we have, at least in our organization by representing a broad spectrum of employees, is that we have members who will talk to one another about what is fair and what is reasonable. You could have an individual who absolutely thinks he has to have a 20 percent pay increase. You have another member who may be in a different set of circumstances working for the state who is going to say that might be nice

but it still isn't going to help you with this problem over here. So there does appear to be some balancing off, at least for us, within our own organization. I can't speak for other organizations. I know they have problems.

One gentleman over here had a question about grievances, I think. Or you made a statement, I guess about belonging to an organization and participating in the grievance procedure.

NOREN, MISSOURI: I think it was in relation to the supervisory level. It seemed to me that the supervisors at the very lowest levels are going to be involved in the grievance procedure as I understand the grievance procedure; they have to involve themselves in the judgments and then tether, I think, following the logic of Mr. Gale's question, a conflict.

LIPINSKI: No there is not. I'll tell you why. To begin with, most grievance procedures at the lower level, at the immediate supervisor level, oftentimes were up against our own member representing the department against us so to speak. But we have meetings throughout the state and the state has meetings too; the state is no dummy. And it is made pretty clear that these people have a job to do and if they are going to hold onto that job, they better do that job in an objective fashion. Now we have never had any problem with anybody selling the farm so to speak because they happen to be a member of our organization. Where we have had problems sometimes, although they have been somehow limited, is where an employee who is not a member of our organization files a grievance against a supervisor who is a member of our organization and that member wants representation from the association against perhaps the union or maybe an unaffiliated employee. Now we have a standard answer for that; we tell them that we are not providing representation. You are being represented by the state of Michigan, the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Corrections, Social Services, whatever it might be. If when the whole thing is said and done, you get into trouble as a result of something you did during the grievance procedure or prior to the grievance procedure--maybe something that caused the grievance--then we will represent you because you have got a grievance. So at the lower levels of procedure and there is even a federal, I think it is in a recently issued Executive Order, one of the executive orders that amended 10988, where it indicates that there is no conflict of interest with lower level supervisors representing the department in lower level grievance procedures and at the same time being a member of the organization. Of course, that can be debated as most of this subject matter can. But we've not had any problems nor do I know of any other states that have had problems.

PRES. HARRIS: Well, thanks ever so much. We appreciate your coming and filling in for us on such a very short notice. We might want to stand up a moment while the next two speakers come forward. We are about a half hour ahead of schedule. We will probably break during your presentations to have coffee but Dale Haney and Bob Evans, will you come forward. And

before we get on with the rest of the afternoon's program if anybody sees John Popowski tell him I would like to see him. Before we start, we will have some more drawings. Are you ready, Henry?

We will add an item to the program. When the one that is now scheduled is concluded, Pete Warsen from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife I think has some slides on PCB's. Is that right? We will add that to the program and put him on after we are finished with the present program.

The next item is a two panel discussion relative to special revenue financing to fish and wildlife programs. Not a new member to our association but a man who is in a new position--Dale Haney--who is now Chief of the Division of Wildlife with the state of Ohio. Recently promoted to that job in Ohio that includes fisheries, wildlife and law enforcement with the retirement of our old friend Dan who was with us for so many years. Dan got married and I guess he wanted to devote more time to his married life than he did to his work with the department so he retired. And Dale has stepped into his shoes and Dale will be the first speaker and that will be followed by Bob Evans who is assistant director of management with the Division of Wildlife in Colorado. And I'll give you more on Bob when your time comes, Bob. Dale.

Panel on SPECIAL REVENUE FINANCING FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

By

Dale Haney, Chief, Division of Wildlife
Ohio Department of Natural Resources

And

Robert L. Evans, Assistant Director, Management
Division of Wildlife
Colorado Department of Natural Resources

HANEY, OHIO: Thank you, Chuck. I'll try to quickly give you a rundown on Ohio's wildlife stamp program.

Ohio was the first state to offer a wildlife stamp for sale. Research indicated that other states had considered the idea but none had instituted such a program.

There were two basic reasons for considering such a program. First we thought it would be a method to permit non-licensed buyers who used wildlife lands and facilities and expressed a desire to help wildlife to voluntarily contribute to the wildlife fund.

For example, a survey conducted during a three day summer holiday revealed 200,000 people visited our 84 wildlife areas. One half or more of these were non-licensed buyers composed of hikers, campers, picnickers, photographers, naturalists, sightseers, and bird watchers. Their presence is not objectionable but does increase maintenance costs on these areas.

Second, frequently during the past decade and more often within the past few years we have had persons and organizations who wanted to donate money to the wildlife fund for various reasons. We accepted it but did not recognize the donor. It was felt the wildlife stamp would serve this purpose.

Legislative action first had to be obtained to authorize the sale of such a stamp. Since the proposal would not be mandatory but only permissive, legislation was needed. It was not difficult to find sponsors for the bill. Final action resulted in Senate Bill 303; it authorized the Chief of the Division of Wildlife to issue wildlife conservation stamps for a fee of $5.00.

The enabling legislation provided no privileges to the purchaser but merely recognized such a person as voluntarily contributing to the management, protection, and perpetuation of the wildlife resources of the state. It also provided such monies received from the sale of the wildlife stamps be paid into a special fund for use by the division as mentioned above for the management of all forms of wildlife for its ecological and non-consumptive recreational values.

The design for the first stamp was selected: a pair of cardinals--Ohio's designated state bird. Our staff artist painted the original. Forty eight thousand stamps were printed and the plates destroyed. A potential income of $240,000. Ten thousand colored brochures were printed to explain the program objective and to be given to each person who purchased a stamp. In addition, 125 colored photographs of the stamps were produced for display and advertisement purposes. The total cost was $5,977.

The stamp was placed on sale June 7, 1972. All methods of advertising were used to inform the public of the new wildlife stamp--news releases, newsletters to all outdoor-oriented groups in the state, photographs and feature articles in Sunday newspapers, radio, television, the Ohio Outdoor Writers, national sportsmen's magazines, stamp collectors, magazines, special Christmas cards, gifts, and of course word of mouth.

The stamps were available from 72 state park offices, 10 wildlife administrative offices, and from our 120 uniformed officers. They were also offered during special events such as boat shows, sportsmen's shows, state and county fairs, and during wildlife-sponsored field days. Two other sales outlets were investigated--the U.S. Post Office and a statewide chain store. Both wanted a piece of the action from 25¢ to 45¢ each for handling the stamps. We did not get involved in such an arrangement.

Now a little more than three years later, we have sold a sum total of 2,257 stamps and almost 75 percent of these were purchased by the already contributing buyers. Our original intent was to print and sell a new issue each year. As you can see from the sales record to date, this would not be an economically sound venture.

We have had inquiries about the program and success from about two-thirds of the states. In evaluating the program, we have concluded the ecology groups, the environmentalists, special interest wildlife groups and the general public who use our wildlife areas and who profess to be concerned about various forms of wildlife are not concerned enough to purchase the stamp. As always the sportsman will continue to support wildlife and pay for beneficial wildlife programs.

Looking ahead, we anticipate amending the present legislation to expand the chief's authority to permit a charge for additional wildlife oriented items. This possibility would include colored posters of endangered species in Ohio, unusual photographs of wild animals, copies of original wildlife paintings, life history publications on specific wildlife species. Perhaps one or all of these will meet the public's whim and result in more wildlife dollars.

Thank you.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Dale. We will leave our questions until the other speaker has presented the Colorado story and Bob Evans will do this. Bob was born in the state of Missouri but he was raised in Oregon. He went to California and now he is in Colorado and he considers himself a native Coloradoan. He attended Colorado State University and received a B.S. degree with a major in game management. He got his masters degree from the same institution a time later. In fact, it was the first masters degree in fish management that was granted by Colorado State University. With that we will hear from Bob and he will tell us about the program in Colorado.

EVANS, COLORADO: Thank you Chuck. I kind of like the introduction Howard Tanner started out with. Howard Tanner, as you probably know, and I have had some experiences together. I just can't imagine how he could remember way back when on that pheasant deal. In fact, I asked him for some of the details because I forgot. Heck, it was fifteen years ago or better, wasn't it Howard? And he reminded me that it was the time that I had my black lab out, Gorgeous George we called him, and he put up a rooster. I took three shots and missed, and Howard took one shot and got it so I guess that's called wax in the eye. Wife in the eye, I guess that's the terminology. Of course, I could tell some stories on Howard, but to show my respect for him as a person and for his new position, I won't go into some of the stories one of which had to do with hunting pheasants and others had to do with floating the Green and Yampa Rivers.

But gentlemen, anytime wildlife people get together of course the discussion eventually gets around to problems of financing conservation activities and programs and so the theme of this conference is certainly appropriate to the occasion.

Of course the fact of the matter is inflation compounded by increasing demands of the public on wildlife is leading to one inevitable inescapable conclusion and that is that conventional and historic sources of revenue to finance wildlife management are no longer sufficient to foot the bill. So we have to look at sources of funding other than those traditionally used in the past. It has to be unearthed and implemented and it is these other sources of financing that I would like to explore here today while touching lightly on those of more of a historic nature.

First, by way of explanation as to what is to come, let me say that most of the research and exploration into sources of funds was prepared by Dick Denney. I think most of you know that Dick Denney was with us at one time as a game biologist and went to Africa. He came back and is now one of our non-game biologists and doing a fine job by the way. But I will be departing from the text to a considerable extent. I did bring some extra copies back here if any of you are interested in the review of literature which he really went into. You can pick up a copy.

In order that we may all interpret two words which will be used extensively in this paper in the same manner, let me give two definitions. Wildlife as used herein means non-domesticated species or sub-species of the animal kingdom and conservation means any action the goal of which is to maintain wildlife populations at the optimum carrying capacity of their habitat. This will include variations from total production to control taking.

The consciousness and consideration of ecological principles in natural resource management is really no longer the lonely domain of wildlife managers for within the past ten years a social concern and awareness of environmental quality has surfaced. For state conservation agencies, this has pointed out the need for more comprehensive wildlife programs geared not only to the sporting public which has traditionally paid the bulk of the bills but also to the non-consumptive public.

Current projections indicate that all 50 states may be investing over $235 million currently in their wildlife programs. This information, by the way, was from the recent report of the Wildlife Management Institute. Their survey covered 36 states spending some $176 million in wildlife programs. The point is, of course, it is big business and yet because of inflationary trends more is required just to maintain existing services and projects.

A case in point is Colorado. The last general license fee increase was in 1967 and since then we have experienced a 52 percent increase in inflation. Maintenance budget requirements alone indicate that we will need something like 3-4 million dollars in addition just for our maintenance programs.

So the question is where can additional funds be derived. There are a number of sources of potential income though of course all of them may not be available or possible in each state. It must also be pointed out that one source may not necessarily be a panacea but the sufficient income for expanded programs may have to be in the sake of income from several sources. Howard, you touched on that.

Income sources are of two general types--long term and short term. Long term sources must be dependable and predictable. Short term sources are usually less reliable with smaller potential and dedicated to special interests or projects. Under long term of course we have our long established licensing system.

We just went through the Legislature and recommended license increases in Colorado. It was just signed last week by the Governor. The fees proposed by the division and approved by the Commission fit in with the 5:1 hunting and 3:1 fishing non-resident to resident ratio as recommended by the Western Association of Game and Fish Commissioners and as reported by the Wildlife Management Institute's study of 1971. But those approved by the Legislature were not within the suggested range. I won't go over them, I do have the full listing, but just to hit a few of them. On resident fishing an increase from $6.00. We proposed $8.00, passed by the Legislature was $7.50. Non-resident fishing increased from $10.00 at present, will go to $25.00, a little over a 3 1/2:1 ratio. Resident deer increased from $10.00 to $13.00 and non-resident deer from $50.00 to $90.00--a 7:1 ratio. I am not going to elaborate on this, needless to say. Resident elk from $12.50 to $16.00 and non-resident elk increased from $75.00 to $135.00--better than an 8:1 ratio. Non-resident mountain lion from $50.00 to $200.00; non-resident antelope from $50.00 to $100.00. So as I said, I just picked out a few of them and I'm not going to expand on them. Needless to say, our projected income from the recommended legislative license fees will be somewhat reduced from the reduction in the number of especially non-resident hunters.

Requiring licenses for additional outdoor-oriented activities if it becomes feasible in view of the public demand and increasing responsibilities in the sphere of environmental protection for wildlife, this then opens new fields of expanded income. You mentioned here today about your $10.00 stamp on the put-take pheasant. Dick Kline recommended years ago a trout stamp be put on our license so that it would help pay for our put-take trout fishery program.

By the way, Howard, we are making some progress there since you left. I didn't mean it that way. Well, you said your timing was always perfect. But our commission has looked at our stocking creel census techniques and our outgo stocking of catchable trout and recently took action that we are not going to be stocking catchables on top of good wild fish populations. I knew you would be interested in that.

Schneider (1971) observed that license revenue funds had been known to be diverted to funding of services that result in less than the total gross receipts being returned to the game and fish agency. He felt that militant protection and recovery of diverted funds offer an opportunity for improved financing.

Then we have user fees or use permits. The user fees, of course, have come into scrutiny too and implemented in the form of parks and special hunting area facility, boat, snowmobile and off-the-road vehicle fees and permits.

A good many of these are directly aimed at the non-consumptive users of the public resource illustrated by the Savoy Wildlife Area in Oregon where a use fee is assessed those not possessing a hunting or fishing license. A similar concept was suggested for overnight camping fees on state owned or management hunting areas and fishing areas in Colorado by our fish manager, Tom Lynch, but we have not gone to this. Both of these approaches represent a potential for significant income if applied on a broad spectrum of conservation agency lands. User fees, in the form of permits for boats, snowmobiles and off-road vehicles, are an important incremental fund resource. Colorado sold last year some 41,000 boat permits which brought in nearly $150,000 which went to the general fund. These are handled by parks and recreation. In 1974, some nearly 12,000 snowmobile permits which brought in $43,000 to the Division of Wildlife and some 7,500 off-road vehicle permits brought in nearly $40,000 to the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation. So this is a source of funding.

Of course the federal grants-in-aids are long established in state conservation activities in the form of the Pittman-Robertson Act, the Dingell-Johnson Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Anadromous Fisheries Act, and more recently, the Dingell-Hart Act, the Marine Mammals Protection Act, Endangered Species Act, and pending Components Bill. Congress as you know has not appropriated any money for the cost sharing on the Endangered Species Act but I have it from a good source, is Kirk Hamet here, well he said he would duck out, I had it from a good source that this is a very good possibility next year. So anyway these federal programs are becoming increasingly more important in relation to stretching the agency dollar for qualified projects.

Of course we have taxes--sales tax, excise tax, severance tax, and real estate. The sales tax is the form of tax most readily used by states and their governmental subdivisions. In 1970 five states levied taxes on soft drinks--Louisiana, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee and West Virginia. Recently in Missouri, the Citizens Committee for Conservation voted to initiate a new constitutional amendment to impose a 1/8 of one percent general sales tax to be earmarked for the Department of Conservation. In Minnesota, a bill was passed in 1963 which imposed a tax ranging from 4-8 mills for cigarettes to be paid by the distributors and the tax as I understand it brought in about $18 million bienially. Massachusetts has

proposed 1975 legislation authorizing a 3 percent tax to be levied on the cost of each pound of bird seed purchased from a wholesale dealer and this money is to be used for the inland fisheries and game fund, primarily a non-game program, and will yield an estimated $300,000 annually.

Of course, there are excise taxes. I won't go into these except that these normally are levied at the federal level and according to the recent Wildlife Management Report which is entitled Current Investments and Projected Needs and Potential New Sources of Income for Non-Game Fish and Wildlife Programs in the United States, their report shows that with excise taxes of 10 percent if imposed on such recreational items as camping equipment, snow skiing equipment, and skin diving items would yield in the neighborhood of $30 million annually and these above items plus a 1 percent excise tax on off-road motorized vehicles and mobile temporary living quarters, a 5 percent excise tax on photographic equipment and photo finishing and a 10 percent excise tax on binoculars all at the manufacturers level indicate a total potential yield of almost $150 million.

Then on severance taxes of course and Howard mentioned this. According to the University of Missouri, over half the states currently levy some type of severance tax which generated some $618 million; of course this is a pretty old figure, in 1968. Some of this revenue of course should be made available for natural resource management.

Of course there are real estate taxes, I won't hit those; I would kind of like to get to some of our specialized projects in Colorado but one other voluntary fund and I would like to touch on this--the personalized license plates. Dick Denney did a survey on this and found that 38 states authorized the issuance of personalized automobile license plates of which eight used the revenue for environmentally oriented programs such as parks, tourism, highway beautification, litter clean-up and wildlife. So we thought we would maybe get on the bandwagon also and introduced a bill in this past Legislature. We wanted the money earmarked for non-game programs but the bill foundered on a constitutional interpretation and the Attorney General ruled that the money from the sale of license plates must go into the Highway Users Fund.

Other sources of revenue of course are bonds--general obligation bonds and revenue bonds. Then some of the short term sources--the first one you think of or one of them you think of are general funds. They have the potential of becoming long term but they really do not fit the criteria established earlier, particularly in respect to predictability and reliability. The Wildlife Management Institute has recommended that general fund appropriations support state wildlife agencies on the order of 25 percent.

Our non-game program in Colorado is supported by general funds. The first year we asked for these funds, 1973-74, we did not receive any. Then, in 1974-75, we received an appropriation of $76,000 and this year, $136,000.

So state agencies should not despair of general fund appropriations because I think in time the voters, with proper orientation and information, will demand general support for the non-consumptive facets of our program.

Then we have voluntary fees and sales. These are based on the philosophy that the buyers receive something of value or interest in return for their contributions. Conservation stamps--Dale has commented, of course, on Ohio. We were authorized to use the conservation stamp in Colorado starting in 1973. The 1974 issue depicted the black-footed parrot. We sold 828 at a cost of $5.00 each. Income was around $4,100. Our costs were not quite as high as Ohio's--a cost of $1,100. We cleared about $3,000. We printed 5,000 of these stamps. We were going to cut off the sale at the end of the year but we have decided that we would go ahead and sell them. They might be of value to stamp collectors and so we are selling these stamps of the black-footed parrot along with the 1975 issue of the white pelican. We are trying to put out a little more publicity on these and in addition to the stamp a paper decal to be applied to the car window is given with each stamp.

To our knowledge, the conservation stamps are not yet authorized in other states. It is obvious that the potential of significant funding from this source is not great but we feel that the program still has some redeeming value in public awareness and the opportunity for non-consumptive user to, Howard used this statement, to put his money where his mouth is. The trouble with being the last speaker is that everything has been said.

But anyway, then there are specialty sales. These include prints of paintings, photographs, posters, decanters, jewelry. Pennsylvania has four sets of posters or charts of birds or mammals which have been selling for several years from $2 to $2.25 each. Tennessee has been marketing signed and numbered prints of commission paintings for around $35 plus tax and mailing. Utah sells Bronson reprints on a limited addition based on 1,000 numbered prints. In Colorado, we are considering colored photographs of wildlife on a limited number and signed basis. We are also considering a wildlife calendar featuring wildlife drawings by Don Mallek. Now I talked to a magazine editor, Charlie Geldy, and we may give these calendars to subscribers to Colorado Outdoors to promote the magazine. Of course, he was quick to add that we would probably raise the price of the magazine too. Then we would sell the calendars to non-subscribers for anywhere from $1.00 to $2.00 each.

On special projects, grants for specific projects and contributions can be of significant but limited importance. California began accepting donations on May 30, 1975 from individuals and organizations who wished to support their non-game species management, and individuals donating at least $5.00 receive a sea otter decal and any organizations get a sea otter certificate.

In 1974, the Southlands Corporation, operators of over 5,100 7-11 stores across the country, raised more than $200,000 through a joint project with the National Wildlife Federation by selling wildlife cups. This money was applied toward the purchase of the first permanent refuge for the American Bald eagle. This theme, Save a Living Thing Project, continued on into Colorado in May of 1975 between the 7-11 and our division to finance the introduction of the river otter into Colorado. The 7-11 stores have guaranteed at least $2,500 towards this project and they were enlisting the aid of children through the sale of 25¢ bicycle decals. Of course, 7-11 also sell our conservation stamps. But just before I left, we had already received $3,300 from them on just the decals where youngsters wanted to feel that they were helping to contribute to an important program. And from this standpoint I think it is very valuable even though the income is small.

The Safari Club International has expressed an interest in funding a follow-up on monitoring the success of the transparent river otter in Colorado. We have another special project. This is one of our sportsmen's organizations--Metropolitan Wildlife Federation. They hope to raise $3,000 to help preserve the white pelican by selling decanters in the form of native wildlife. They have selected some 12 species. They will be limited. They will be more valuable if limited editions--1,000 of each species--and they will sell for $12 for the miniature and $35 for a full size. I understand if you put in an extra $5, the large decanter will be filled with a good brand of bourbon. The public relations value of these special projects is immeasurable and the specific accomplishment of a given project is of benefit not only to the state agency itself but to the general public and the natural resource.

To summarize then, some of the long term sources--increased license fees, new licensing, species stamps or permits, non-diversion of funds, use permits, federal aid, special taxes, voluntary funds, and bonds; and short term sources--general fund appropriations, voluntary fees, specialty sales, and special projects. It would seem, in conclusion, that there is a diversified spectrum of fund raising possibilities open to state agencies if we but have the imagination and ingenuity to take advantage of them.

Thank you.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Bob. We will entertain questions now, comments from the floor, or others that may have similar programs and what your success has been with them.

I might start it off. We have just started, Dale, a program similar to what you had or do have in Ohio. We are offering a shoulder patch, windshield decal, or picture of the Kirkland Warbler in an attempt to raise funds to help finance our rare and endangered species program. It has been predicted by Tom Washington, who was on the program this morning, that probably 90 percent of these sales will be to hunters and fishermen

of his organization rather than to members of Audubon groups and most kinds who are not hunters and fishermen. We recognize that many Audubon people are actually hunters and some of them fish also but the non-hunting group. It is his feeling that the purchase by those people in the non-hunting fraternity will be quite small. That was your experience?

HANEY, OHIO: Yes, very much. The bill that was drafted in Ohio was real limited. The only thing it authorized was the stamps. If I were rewriting it, I would make it as broad as possible so that there were several avenues that you could try.

PETOSKEY, U.S. FOREST SERVICE: You mentioned, Bob, that revenues from snowmobilers, and ATV people and so on--you did not mean that in a non-game sense?

EVANS, COLORADO: No.

PETOSKEY: What do you do with the dough you get from those people now?

EVANS: The off-roads vehicles income goes to the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation and the snowmobile money goes into the general fund. So some of it is still coming in and you have to have appropriations for it. I didn't really go into detail on that, but the snowmobile does come to the division and we do handle that and the boating is handled by Parks and Outdoor Recreation.

PETOSKEY: What do you do with it though?

EVANS: This has to be reappropriated, right Steve? Steve is my expert on some of these details. It is an income.

STEVE: The only reason he calls me an expert is because I am in Michigan instead of Colorado. Part of what we do is plow it back into the wildlife cash fund to administer because this is not a money making proposition as you well know. It costs us a little bit to administer a program such as this--registration implies law enforcement so if we break even we are happy.

PRES. HARRIS: Any more questions or comments? If not, we will break for fifteen minutes. We will come back and set the slide projector up for Keith Larson.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Reconvened Tuesday p.m. session

STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Thanks, Chuck. This is a personal privilege so to speak. Last winter our state Legislature passed a law putting some restrictions on non-resident hunting in the state. I should qualify that--non-resident hunting of waterfowl. First, they require that we sell a waterfowl stamp which will cost the non-resident $5.00 in addition to the regular non-resident hunting license. The second consideration was that they will be restricted to ten consecutive days of hunting. They can name the dates. However, the joker in that is that they will have to apply and receive the license through the department because it is the only way we can have it. In other words, heretofore every county and every sportsman's or sporting goods store, hardware store, handled non-resident licenses. This is a thing of the past in North Dakota; they will have to apply and receive them through the department.

If you get requests from some of your constituents, tell them that they can start applying for these permits on August 15 of this year which is not too far in the future and what we are concerned about is that there are people coming and we do get them from the 47 states, primarily to hunt waterfowl, that will come into North Dakota expecting to go to a particular area, primarily for goose hunting and find out that all these permits have been issued. It's on a first come, first served basis. We have eight zones--well, we have nine zones--the ninth zone covers about the western two-thirds of the state and they will be able to get licenses from the department to hunt waterfowl in that area. Now I will warn you that the goose hunting is very spotty in this area--tremendous duck hunting--but goose hunting is very spotty in this western 2/3 of the state. So if you do get inquiries from any of your people, tell them about that, and if need be they can phone and we will send the application blanks to them and process them almost immediately.

Now we have made the quotas very liberal in these zones and if they apply, we'll say, anytime during August, very likely they will be successful in getting a permit to hunt in the zone they so desire. We are giving them a first and second choice and then the third one is if they will accept any choice, of course they will be able to hunt in North Dakota.

Now as I say this is a legislative act. We were not fully in sympathy with it but there has been a lot of dissatisfaction from our own goose hunters primarily because, and unfortunately, we do get a tremendous number of Minnesota hunters coming in, and it is aimed primarily at them although they never said that during the discussion. We do not think it is going to be as restrictive as the non-resident first thought and if you can get that word out, I would appreciate it because we do not want to have someone spending several hundred dollars coming into the state and find out that he will not be able to hunt where he has perhaps hunted in years past.

Packets have gone out to the 47 state directors with a few of the applications in there. We could not send enough out to take care of the demand by any means but at least it will give you an idea in the office and if somebody calls up and your secretary answers it, she can give them this information off the applications. So I would appreciate if you would pass the word.

PRES. HARRIS: Thanks, Russ. Does anyone have any questions on that?

One of the things that some of you who are going fishing tomorrow inquired was whether you can take beer on board. You can take beer with you but don't take so much that you fall overboard. That water is pretty darn cold out there. You will sober up real fast. Also if it is sunshiny, you may want some suntan lotion. Also something to wear on your head. Beer is welcome. No restrictions on that or even hard liquor. You can be your own judge.

One other thing. Some of you inquired about purchasing a lug of cherries or two lugs of cherries to take home with you when you leave Thursday. I'll leave a slip of paper up here and you can put your name down if you are interested. Tell us whether you want sweet cherries or tart cherries and we will have somebody pick those up for you on Thursday afternoon--or Thursday morning--so they will be fresh when you leave Thursday noon or Thursday afternoon.

One other thing while we are waiting. As you all know, I think, Pete Petoskey is on leave from our department with the Forest Service and I think he is going to have something to do with wildlife management in the national forests. I thought you just might be interested in hearing from Pete on what his assignment is and what he is expecting from the job. So, Pete.

PETOSKEY, U.S. FOREST SERVICE: Charles is groping for filler material. I do appreciate the opportunity though. I went to the Forest Service from the department effective the first of July on a temporary assignment of one or two years depending on the situation there and the situation here and so on. This is under the inter-governmental exchange act. I was quite flattered to be offered this opportunity and it appears that the Forest Service could stand a little more representation at a meeting like this. The Fish and Wildlife Service seems to be quite adequately represented and I am the only one here from the Forest Service. At the Western Association, I met with them last week, the situation was both agencies were quite well represented including the BLM and the Corps of Engineers.

I don't know very much about the Forest Service as yet. I have spent the last two weeks trying to get acquainted and apparently it is going to take a little bit more than two weeks. I haven't even gotten through the Procedures Manual yet which is about seven feet thick and this is no lie. The wildlife portion is about that thick. They have a procedure for about

everything that goes on in a federal agency. I found out though that they have 187 million acres of land that is administered by the Forest Service in 40 states and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The reason that I was asked to go down there was to strengthen the wildlife program on these 187 million acres and hopefully to tool up to do a better job of wildlife management than has been done in the past. The program, as you would assume, on Forest Service land, is habitat oriented and the game, the wildlife, non-game and game, are the responsibility of the states and as far as I am concerned, they will stay the responsibility of the states. I think that our job or our task is to expand something like we have here in Michigan on some of our state owned lands and currently have completed plans for on Forest Service land, to the rest of these states that do have these federal lands in them.

The current program is about $11 million and we hopefully will get another $5 million for the next fiscal year 1976. They were talking this morning about having a 13 month fiscal year in the state. They have a 15 month fiscal year in the federal government which is kind of unusual. It is something you have to get used to, I guess. We want to expand the program from 11 million to somewhere in the neighborhood of 30-40 million dollars. Hopefully, the coming fiscal year will be approved at around $16-17 million. This is going to require a lot of cooperation between the foresters and the biologists with the service and the biologists of the states.

The second responsibility I have is to maintain or strengthen relationships between the states and the Forest Service and I am a strong states rights man and I will do the best I can to maintain the strengthen these relationships. I know most of you people pretty well in the room and quite a few of you have Forest Service lands in your state. All is not as good in wildlife on those lands as it might be, and I'd appreciate any ideas or any help that you can give us in making a better program for wildlife on those lands in your state either by word of mouth, phone call or letter because hopefully in the next couple of years, we'll develop a much broader and deeper wildlife program for both game and non-game species, and frankly I am a hunter and I want to make sure that hunting is a strong recreational activity on those 187,000,000 acres. So with that Chuck, I will sit down.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pete, maybe through the Wildlife Management Newsletter or the Federation Newsletter would you get your address and phone number in there so that all the states are aware of this and can get in touch with you?

PETOSKEY: Yes, I will be happy to do that. In fact, I have to look up my home phone number yet. I can't remember it.

PRES. HARRIS: First, I would like to apologize to the next speaker. Because of our morning session and the time it took for lunch this noon, we couldn't get back on schedule at 1:00 so she graciously agreed to

return. She was here at 1:00 and had other commitments after that so she graciously agreed to return at this time to welcome you to the city of Traverse City.

And that is the mayor, Diane Gilbo, who was appointed to the City Commission in 1972. She was elected to fill a two year unexpired term in 1973, was elected to a four year term in 1975. At the organizational committee meeting of the City Commission held in April of this year, she was elected mayor and thus received the distinct honor of being the first woman mayor in the city's 128 year history. And I am particularly pleased that she is coming. My boy is a resident of Traverse City. I mentioned to him that the mayor was going to address the group and he said he would be disappointed if she didn't. So with that, I would like to call on Mrs. Gilbo.

WELCOME
By
Diane Gilbo, Mayor of Traverse City

Thank you. And a very sincere and official welcome to Traverse City. I am interested in seeing there are apparently no women delegates to the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commission meeting. I see you know a lot more about me than I know about you. Unfortunately, there was some goof-up. I never received the program I was promised and so looking at your letterhead I am assuming that I can welcome you here not only from other states but also from provinces, is that correct? How many from Canada do we have here today? Way back there. Welcome to the United States as well as to Michigan and Traverse City.

I am also interested in seeing what better picture of Traverse City than cherry pits around. That means you have been enjoying our prime product. As you know, we had a distinguished visitor this year during the Cherry Festival and I keep telling the mayor protem who will perhaps be mayor next year that it is kind of a hard act to follow. When you are mayor, who are you going to get?

Our Cherry Festival has just passed and we are all just kind of breathing a sigh of relief but we have lots of summer left and I hope that you will have some time to enjoy the area. How many of you are from out-of-state? Most of you. How many have the pleasure of their first visit to Traverse City? Well you have a whole world ahead of you. I hope you will be able to visit some of the really fine spots that we have, not only within the city of Traverse City but also outside. We have Interlochen Music Camp which is nationally known. We will soon have national lakeshore which is now being developed. There is some work that has been done on it. Sometimes the nicest time to visit these places is before they are totally developed. If you get over to the Sleeping Bear Dunes area, there is a lot to see over there and it is really quite lovely. All Leelanau County

is very picturesque and the city of Leland is--I'm sure it would be most interesting to those of you who are interested in fish and wildlife. Judging from the people outside picketing this morning I think you have a problem. It's a problem that I hope that we recognize here and that we are trying to deal with in the courts as well as just on a one to one basis. It's something that's not going to go away I am afraid and I hope--I am not exactly sure what your role in this is, but whatever it is I wish you luck in working it out to the best of everybody's advantage. And with that, I think I will go on to my next duty.

As a mayor, I became eligible to perform marriages and so that is my next duty. For some reason, it is a big deal for people to be married by the woman mayor in Traverse City. I am not offering my services to anybody. Anyway I do hope that you will have a really fine stay in Traverse City and a very profitable meeting.

Thank you.

PRES. HARRIS: The meeting is adjourned for today and I think we convene tomorrow morning at 8:30.

* * * * * * * *

Second General Session - Wednesday, July 23, 1975

PRES. HARRIS: I guess there are a few not ready to crawl out yet, but rather than wait for them, I think we will get started. We have a man out checking on cherries this morning, and he will be back sometime soon. He will announce where cherries are available, in what quantities you can buy them, and what the prices are. It's rather doubtful that the tart cherries are yet available. They are just in the process of picking, but he is going to find that out too, and he will be back. I think Gary has a couple of announcements to make.

BOUSHELLE: We are putting a list together for the charter boat tour this afternoon. I think during the coffee break here, we'll announce who will be on what boat and the further arrangements for that. There will be a $1.25 fishing fee for the one day license, and I think what we will do is set up a place back here and sell licenses. For those who are going on the bus tour, we'll leave from the front of the hotel at 1:00 or thereabouts, and I have a list of everybody that signed up on that. You are supposed to have a pretty good day; little chance of rain I understand. When we get our boat list put together and we have room for anymore, we'll try to fit you in but it looks like we have a full boat. I think there are about 40 signed up for fishing. One other thing--if you haven't had the opportunity to visit the Steelhead it will be there all day today.

PRES. HARRIS: You know the Steelhead is our experimental Great Lakes boat.

Regarding the charter boat, the charter boat fishermen are donating this half day to us. It means usually anywhere from $100.00 to $150.00 to them if they had a paid charter, so we are really appreciative of the charter boat fishermen providing this kind of service to the conference. I'm sure you will express your appreciation to them when you get through fishing and what not. As I mentioned yesterday, beer is welcome on board and they will furnish all the gear--they will have the tackle and everything that you need.

So we will get right into the program this morning on committee reports. The first committee report is the Pro-Hunt Committee by Chairman Carl Noren of Missouri. Carl.

NOREN, MISSOURI: By way of background, I think some of you will remember that the Pro-Hunt Committee a couple of years ago, in searching for ways to attack this question of the anti-hunting sentiment and the question of what to do to promote the interests of the hunter, decided that it might be well first to send out a questionnaire to see what the feelings were in the fifty states on this question of hunting sentiment and anti-hunting sentiment. I think the results were certainly surprising and not what we expected. Everybody, I think, thought that the anti-hunting people were a real problem but to the question of were they a problem in their

state they said no or a very minor one. This was the general answer except in two states where they regarded it as severe. So this is a sort of anomaly which I'll leave you to explain and I'll not try to do that.

This year the committee, consisting of myself, Fred Priewart of Iowa, and Milo Casey of Minnesota, was charged with soliciting articles from the various states--their magazines and other conservation publications--and selecting those that were considered to be the best at combatting the anti-hunting sentiment and to make them available for other agencies. This we have done, with the assistance and help from the AACI in the persons of Jim Keefe, who heads our information program in Missouri, as well as Larry Davis of Iowa, and Chuck Wechsler of Minnesota.

To accomplish this, we asked each state to describe its situation with respect to the anti-hunting movement and suggest articles that it had prepared or knew of that they considered to be especially good. We were pleasantly surprised with the fine response received from almost everyone asked. But as might be expected, the situation with respect to anti-hunting varied a great deal from place to place and the ways of combatting anti-hunting varied a great deal from place to place too.

We soon concluded that our original request, to select three best articles or publications for possible reprint or publication by other agencies, really was too limiting. Articles or publications are only one aspect of the persuasion process and several states used different media to combat anti-hunting sentiment. We decided to broaden our search and include other examples as well.

After looking at a great deal of materials submitted by member agencies we have some general observations regarding the problem as best expressed by Larry Davis from Iowa.

Let me divert for a minute to say that, in all fairness, the people who did the work, were the three men of this subcommittee rather than the main committee. Fred Priewart, Milo Casey and I delegated this work and it was really these people who have done the work that is responsible for this report and the material that I have with me today.

These thoughts which Larry Davis expressed follow:

(1) We should play down the "hunting as a management tool" aspect. It is not a total defense nor even one that can stand too close scrutiny. This may require some explanation. I don't know that it does. Certainly it is something I agree with.

(2) It is extremely difficult to explain <u>why</u> hunters hunt. The best defense is that hunting does not damage or endanger the resource and that hunting is the only recreation form that directly contributes to habitat development and protection for all wildlife--game or non-game.

(3) Our efforts should not be directed at anti-hunters but at non-hunters, and we should concentrate on facts, not raw emotion or sentiment (though they have their place). To aim arguments at anti-hunters will only amplify the battle.

(4) Our approach should be geared to show that we are conservation agencies concerned with the use of the wildlife resource.

(5) The anti-hunting problem should be a regular feature of AACI and other wildlife related professional conferences, to air problems, to share various attempts at solutions.

The following are some items that we thought were "the best," and that's in quotes here in this report, of materials sent to our committee by the states or from even more recent sources that have reached us. It is really almost impossible to define what is truly the best. Xerox copies are attached to the report (where possible) and copies that other agencies may duplicate are available from my office. I'll put out somewhere on this table examples of this material and our thought is that rather than try to duplicate--there was such a volume of material everything for everybody--that we would put out these examples of some of the best material and those of you who are interested might look at it and either contact me or the agency that published the material originally and get it for your use in that fashion.

Best Speech (these are not necessarily limited to one in these categories)--"The Hunting Controversy, A Question for the Southeast" by Bob Campbell, Information Specialist for South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department. "Of Rights and Resources" by Robert Herbst, Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

Best Fact Sheet--New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and "Massachusetts Furbearers and Trapping," Massachusetts Fisheries and Game.

Best News Article--"Wildlife Afield" by Jim Dean, North Carolina.

Best Sign Program--"Hunting with Permission," Ohio Department of Natural Resources. Colorado Sign Program, Colorado Division of Wildlife.

Best Magazine Articles--"What to Do About This Anti-Hunting Thing" by John Madson, Winchester-Western in the Minnesota Volunteer, July and August, 1973. "Let's Send the Hunter Back to School" by Roger Schoenecker, Minnesota Volunteer, July and August, 1973. "Why I Am a Hunter" by Jim Keefe, The Conservationist, Missouri, December 1973.

Best Film--"A Question of Hunting," Remington Arms Company.

Best Newspaper Editorial--"The Plus of Hunting" by Mel Ellis in the Milwaukee Journal.

Best Background Article--"Man Would As Soon Flee As Fight" by Erich Fromm in Psychology Today, August 1973.

It should be pointed out that the order in which this is reported to you is not the ranking of the material. It is just as it came to mind. Maybe other agencies have material equally as good, but we can only report on what we have been given to date. And again, the volume of response was large and gratifying.

Thank you.

PRES. HARRIS: Are there any questions of Carl or any comments anyone wishes to make regarding pro-hunting programs in their particular area? Being no questions, Carl, thank you for your report.

I am going to skip the Water Resources Report. Dick Wettersten was chairman of that and Dick, at the last minute, couldn't come. Later Carl will report for Dick relative to the National Coordinating Committee of which Dick is our representative to that committee. But right now, I will call on Willard Barbee to give us a report on the liaison with the Pheasant Council. Willard.

BARBEE, NEBRASKA: Thank you, Chuck. You will recall that the Pheasant Council is a creature of the Midwest Association. It was created back in 1957 as a technical committee to look into the pheasants, and the role of the pheasants in the Midwest, and the demise in numbers. The functions performed by the Midwest Pheasant Council include serving as a technical advisory group for the association, to coordinate research, and to provide a forum for an exchange of research material and management information. They were to carry out assignments as directed by the Association, to conduct cooperative studies in population, distribution, densities, harvest, physiology and ecology of the pheasant. There was some concern among the directors in the Midwest Association as to the direction that the Pheasant Council was going and some consideration about perhaps disbanding the council.

You will recall in Fred Priewert's report on the council this last year in Duluth; Fred worked with the council and gave a rather good report on the work and the function of the council. We directed the council to restructure their memberships somewhat so that it would include management as well as research people. So at their meeting this last spring in North Platte, Nebraska the management people were also included in those participating in the conference which was held in early April. I so well remember that meeting, Dr. Fred, that was where I got the word of the outbreak of foul cholera some 100 or 150 miles off to the southeast of North Platte where we were meeting.

At their meeting last year, in addition to bringing management into their discussions, they devoted a day to a workshop with the central theme, and their concern was one of making the pheasant council more responsive to the needs of the states making up the association. In the course of their deliberations at North Platte, they decided that this current year they would initiate two studies and both studies were directed toward factors that have significant impacts on pheasants and other forms of wildlife.

One of the special studies that they launched into was to look into the annual report of the Soil Conservation Service--this is the annual report put out each year by the Soil Conservation Service listing the conservation treatments on the land, the acres of land that come under treatment. There is some reason to maybe suspect, I guess you would say, some of the statistics as were recorded there. You may recall that over the past few years there has been federal legislation directed toward making the Forest Service and their management program a little more responsive to the needs of the nation as far as natural resources are concerned, and with the thought that looking ahead to the program of the Soil Conservation Service and legislation that would look into their program and make it more responsive.

The pheasant council, and Keith Harmon working with the pheasant council, surveyed the states. We had an indication of participation in this study from all of the states except one making up the council. They are in the process of conducting a pilot survey in four states looking to these statistics of this annual report and checking it with the idea of determining how then next year to approach the problem to investigate the essential areas of investigation, to work with the sample sizes and the manpower required to carry out the study modeled somewhat over the studies that were conducted by the council a few years ago with the ASCS program and the land treatment practices that were being paid for by that program when it was operative.

The second project that they are attacking is one of looking to the plant breeders--going to plant breeders and asking them to develop, design, breed, select, what have you, agricultural crops that will be more adapted to the needs of wildlife. I think if we look back that the plant breeders are College of Agriculture and USDA plant breeding programs. Many of the things that have been done in developing grain crops and forages have been designed to work to the somewhat disadvantage of particularly farm game and in the western part of this association I think wheat is a good example.

We have been breeding and selecting wheat to get it to mature and harvest as soon as possible, perhaps at a sacrifice in yield and certainly at a sacrifice in some areas of the pheasant nests that are about ready to come off in the wheat fields.

Alfalfa is another example. The selection has been for fine stemmed, leafy alfalfa to be cut early. The first cuttings coming off early all of which are detrimental to pheasant nests. And there are many others.

You can recall how Fred Priewert says that you plot the decline of the oat crop in Iowa and you can superimpose the decline in pheasant numbers upon that curve. The pheasant council men are going to the plant breeders, discussing with them the possibility of developing a higher protein oat so that oats will come back into the crop rotation systems in the corn belt states.

So these were some approaches that they are looking into, that the plant breeders are carrying germ plasma in their seed banks that possess characteristics that look like it offers some promise and they plant something like this. Then through the efforts of the Pheasant Council, we felt it might be possible to subsidize the increase of strains. An approach such as this would be directed at the cause of some of our problems rather than at the symptoms of our management problems and that might put us out in front for once in the area of agricultural crops as it relates to game production.

The Pheasant Council every four years update their range density maps, and this current year is the year that they are working on that. The updating of this map is useful in tracing the trend and population changes as it relates to land use. The council was most appreciative of the interest that this association has placed in their deliberations the last couple of years and they ask that I submit the following proposal for the Association's consideration:

That the Council continue to exist as a technical advisory group to this Association. That they be authorized to continue to have annual meetings, meeting next year to be held in Wisconsin. The theme for their next year's meeting is Predictive Modeling--The Use of the Computer in the Importance of Parameters such as Land Use Change and Weather Upon the Pheasant Numbers. They are looking into another area that personally I think offers a great deal of opportunity for us, and that is one of looking into the economics of crop rotation, now that we are faced with higher priced nitrogen. We will never see cheap nitrogen again in the corn belt and you can think perhaps a few years back when cheap nitrogen came on the market. It was a very common practice all across the corn belt to abandon crop rotation, to buy nitrogen, to go to a monoculture of corn, corn, corn, to apply more fertilizers, more insecticides, all of which was working very much to the disadvantage of the pheasant. With the passing of cheap nitrogen, there is a great deal of evidence to subject that the pure economics of farming is going to dictate that on certain lands the farmers go back to its crop rotation, that he grow his nitrogen and we all know the role of the value of sweet clover in pheasant production. To go through sweet clover that means oats, and to go through oats that means some improvement of the pheasant habitat at a critical time of the year.

In the state of Nebraska we have had some brown bag sessions with the director of the experiment station and other members of the staff at the experiment station. The result of the series of these meetings and some other work that has been going on in the state where farmers have launched into what is frequently referred to as organic farming, but it is nothing more than crop rotation, that the University has launched into a rather detailed and complex research program of crop rotation measuring the economics of the thing and seeing if there isn't perhaps a place for getting back to the kind of agriculture that we knew a few years ago before the coming of the cheap nitrogen. So the Pheasant Council members are quite excited about the possibility that this holds for the future. They have asked that the association liaison committee and the director of the whole state participate as time permits in their annual meetings, and they are asking the association for suggestions that will make their work more responsive to the state director's needs.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is the report of the Pheasant Council of this association.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Willard. Do you think we ought to accept your report by motion or motion to approve the recommendations, what do you think?

BARBEE: I so move.

PRES. HARRIS: Could I have a second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

PRES. HARRIS: It has been moved by Mr. Barbee that we accept and approve the report of the liaison with the Pheasant Council. Are there any questions?

JOHN: Willard, I have heard some comments from, I guess maybe, some of our representatives on the council and I suspect that some administrators are feeling this too but in earlier years we used to get quite a bit of printed material from the council. It seemed that they were pretty industrious in getting status reports and so forth out and it seems to me that during the last few years, this has kind of fallen off. Is there a need for this type of material in the various states and if so can we ask the council to provide additional technical summaries from time to time?

BARBEE: I think the council went through a period of time when they floundered, and I can recall some Midwest meetings, one in particular when we met in Chicago, when they were there. They had a report--their representative was there to report--and we had too busy a meeting to even call for a report from the Pheasant Council. They were somewhat discouraged. I believe that they are sincerely interested in asking for

direction, and they would respond to any direction that would come from this association. I really believe that. It was rather interesting I think that the research people were amazed to find what a contribution it was when management was also invited. You can recall there was a time, John, when--you were born into the Pheasant Council--it was a pretty starchy group when they first started out but I think they have turned the corner, and I think they are looking for direction from the association.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would it be appropriate for the association to suggest that member states be provided with status reports from time to time, printed, I don't mean any formal presentation?

PRES. HARRIS: Certainly they are a branch of this organization and I think we can make any such request. We could include that as part of the motion that we so request this from the council. What are your views?

BARBEE: I think that would be most appropriate. I would convey to them to continue to serve as liaison with them through the rest of this year until the next committee is appointed and ask them to provide us with, for example, an update of their range maps.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think you are approached in a negative or critical manner. I think it should be an expression of interest from the association.

PRES. HARRIS: You will do that.

BARBEE: I will.

PRES. HARRIS: Any other comments or questions regarding the motion regarding the report that Willard has just given? Will the primary delegates from each of the states and provinces signify their approval to the commission report by saying I.

NAMES: I.

PRES. HARRIS: Opposed? Report is accepted.

We have another substitute this morning. Late in the game, Jack Grieb from Colorado called me and said he would be unable to attend the meeting and make the report of the Legislative Committee. Knowing that Larry Gale is chairman of the Legislative Committee for the International, I assumed that he was up on all the latest legislation, at least at the federal level, so I did call Larry to ask if he would pinch-hit, substitute for Jack. He did agree and so Larry is here and I will call on Larry to give the Legislative Committee report. Larry.

GALE, MISSOURI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you take some liberties to imply in any way that I am fully informed on all federal legislation. I don't know that anybody is but certainly I am not. Our Midwest Legislative Committee has functioned during the year mainly through cooperation with the International's Legislative Committee, and I really think this is the way it should be because I think its the way we can be most effective.

Those who attended the North American probably realize that the International's committee set out on a new type of legislative effort this year and this was approved by the International in its business meeting at Pittsburgh. What we are trying to do is to strengthen the influence of the states over national legislation through a system of establishing a closer relationship between each governmental member and its state delegation to Congress.

At that time we asked each state to designate a congressional liaison officer who would establish contact with, not only the Senators and Representatives of his state, but particularly with the staff members who do most of the actual work, particularly those who are involved in handling conservation and environmental matters. To date, about 41 state agencies have designated a congressional liaison officer. I believe there is only one state in this association that has not yet done that and we really feel the response has been very good. I might say at this point that we have sent most of this material to the Canadian provinces. For obvious reasons, they do not feel that they should become involved in efforts to influence legislation in the United States, but we are trying to keep them informed of what we are doing even though they do not wish to take an active part in this legislative program.

We also asked the states to put their congressional delegation on their mailing list for any publications that would be of interest, particularly their magazines and news releases, and most of them have indicated that they have done this and we think this is important too.

As an aide in working with the appropriate committees, John Gottschalk, in his April newsletter for the International, listed the members of congressional committees that deal with wildlife and environmental matters. We recommend that each state file this newsletter if they don't have some other reference to these committee members.

Our Washington staff, particularly John Gottschalk and Paul Lenzini has been active in keeping the association informed of the progress of legislation during the year, and also in arranging for testimony and written statements at the hearings. In mid-May we expressed approval of HR 5608 which would extend the Wetland Loan Fund Act and also HR 5511 which would require that the Deputy Director and Regional Directors of the Fish and Wildlife Service be qualified by professional training and experience. We also testified in favor of HR 5512 which would require that wildlife

refuges and other units of the refuge system be administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service. I am sure most of you realize that there wasn't an order from the secretary to put some of the game ranges under the Bureau of Land Management for administration. We are, of course, opposed to this.

On June 17, John Gottschalk testified at a subcommittee hearing on HR 1319 dealing with a tax on component parts of ammunition. John's testimony favored the bill, but pointed out certain problems relating to the mandatory requirement that 50 percent of the revenue be devoted to hunter safety training and shooting ranges; he also questioned the formula for apportioning funds on the basis of the state's population.

I might interject here that our Legislative Committee had mixed feelings about this bill as it is written; however, we were informed that the principal sponsors in the House would not accept the bill without this 50 percent mandatory split of revenue. There was even some feeling that we might be better off without the bill at all than to have to accept this mandatory 50 percent split. The main problem is that this formula would apply not only to the component parts but also to handguns and handgun ammunition and archery equipment which have not been under this in the past. They have been under 25 percent formula. So many states feel that this will introduce some real problems in the effective use of this money.

At this same hearing Captain Harry Shaver of West Virginia, who is in charge of the hunter safety training in that state, also testified for the bill on behalf of the hunter safety coordinators. As you know, they have a separate association. The subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee that same day. We had agreed earlier that we would support the bill as written in the House while expressing these reservations, but that we would try to offer an amendment in the Senate to make some change regarding this mandatory use of revenue. Our Legislative Committee of the International right now is trying to come to some agreement as to what sort of amendment might be appropriate. Paul Lenzini has suggested that perhaps a provision that this mandatory 50 percent division would terminate after a five year period would be the best approach. That way, at the end of five years, we could determine what the problems are and make a judgment as to whether it should be continued at the same level or whether this would be phased out entirely at this time the way Paul has suggested. Whether we can get this through the Senate and then through the Joint Committees is another question. But we do think something has to be done and would appreciate any suggestions that any of the members may have for dealing with this particular problem.

On June 24 a hearing was held on HJR 154 which would establish a Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge. John Gottschalk testified that we don't believe there is a need for such a refuge because the state of California has an adequate management program for these animals.

For the remainder of the year, the main function of the Legislative Committee will be to attempt to coordinate testimony on bills of major importance. We urge those states that have not done so to designate a congressional liaison officer immediately and to respond promptly when asked to contact their congressional delegation either in support of or opposition to specific legislation and legislative matters. We will try to keep you informed of those that seem to be moving.

As you know, there is a tremendous backlog of legislation, and most of it is not in a position where it is going anyplace this year. We are going to try to key in on those matters that do have some chance of passage.

Paul Lenzini has a couple of interns who are working now on a summary of the major bills that have been introduced this year and will work up a status report on those that have received active consideration or are in a position to be acted on this year. After this summary has been prepared, it will be reviewed by the Legislative Committee, and we will attempt to recommend an official position for the International Association for consideration and action at the September meeting. Earlier we had thought we might be able to get this out the very first part of August, but Paul told me last week that it will probably be about the middle of August, so we may have to revise our procedure and send a report out almost immediately as soon as I can get it duplicated. Then our committee will meet prior to the business meeting of the International and be in position to recommend positions for the association at the time of the business meeting. In any event we would hope to get this report to you about the middle of August, so you will have plenty of time to study it and determine your own views with regard to these matters.

At this meeting, the Legislative Committee has met with the Resolutions Committee, and we have had input into those resolutions that relate to legislative matters, so we feel that this has been well coordinated, and we do support the Resolution Committee's recommendations as they affect legislation. The other members of the committee were Jack Bails of Michigan, Bob Herbst and Dave Vesall of Minnesota, Pete Barrows of Colorado, and Les Voigt of Wisconsin. This constitutes the report, Mr. Chairman.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Larry. Are there any questions of Larry?

I think we got a letter back from some of our congressional delegations that HR 5512, no it was 5608, the Wetlands Bill, passed the House with, I think, one dissenting vote. That was last week. That is how the states, I think, in responding to that legislation, I think that the International's effort was most effective. I don't believe we have arranged for coffee this morning. I will wait for Pete to come back. If it is not why then I am going to call on you Ken and then we will get into resolutions. Well let's go on with the program then.

Let's do this, Carl. Why don't we have your National Coordinating Committee report and maybe the coffee will be here by that time and then we can take our break for coffee and then come back with Ken's presentation.

Again this is a substitute. Dick Wettersten is our representative on the National Coordinating Committee and as Dick could not come, Carl is familiar with the committee's activities through the International, so Carl has condescended to report for Dick.

NOREN, MISSOURI: This is going to be a mighty sloppy report. Your president told me Monday evening that Dick wasn't going to be here and asked if I could make this report. I had no preparation at all. I did, yesterday, call my office in Jefferson City and asked them to look into the records of the last meeting of the National Coordinating Committee. I have been chairman of that committee the last couple of years, but I am not any longer, and I have the unfortunate facility to disremember everything just as long as I am no longer responsible. This is the situation, so I called my office, and my writing is so horrible that the notes I took will probably be illegible and unreadable but let me have a try at it. This is a kind of combination report of the Water Resources Committee and the National Coordinating Committee, because I think it touches on a couple of things that are not part of the National Coordinating Committee function exactly.

Dick Wettersten represents the Midwest on the National Coordinating Committee as the chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the Midwest. Last meeting of the National Coordinating Committee was held in West Virginia at which time Harvey Bray was elected chairman. I tried to get him elected before the meeting so I wouldn't chair it, but I wasn't successful in that device. He is now chairman of the National Coordinating Committee and I am through with these functions. I have been on the steering committee since 1970, and there is a rotation system set up to move other people into this effort. I think this is an important part of it so that the various states have an opportunity to express themselves as well as participate in the effort.

There were 17 people present at the National Coordinating Committee meeting in West Virginia--5 states, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Water Resources Council, the National Marine Fisheries, the Isaac Walton League, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, and the Sport Fishing Institute were all represented.

One of the things we discussed there and had a report on was the habitat evaluation system, a system for measuring the effects on the habitat of water resource projects. This was reported on by Gary Hickman of the Water Resources Council. I think most of you have had some contact with this through the various field hearings that have been held throughout the United States now except for one or two that are still to be held on

contend arose from harvesting crops and sharecropping procedures and some of us are going to be caught with a sizeable bill. The Coordination Act, as now written, provides only for the use of these crops directly to feed wildlife and the Corps' thinking is more or less dumping it out of a truck kind of thought of food development for wildlife. We would like to see a broader base for the monies collected to be put back to use in wildlife management in general on the areas and the new Senate Bill has language which would do a better job of that. I think it is something that the Midwest might devote itself a little more to. Perhaps the Fish and Wildlife Service talking about the areas in which they might work more assiduously would be, I think, in getting some separate legislation in; if we don't get moving on the Coordination Act perhaps getting some separate legislation which would broaden the authority of the states in the use of this crop land.

The members of the Water Resources Committee are Dick Wettersten, Willard Barbee, Tony Dean and myself. As I say this is a pretty sloppy report but it was the best I could do under the circumstances.

PRES. HARRIS: Thanks, Carl. I didn't think it was sloppy at all. I commend you for doing such an excellent job on such short notice. Are there any questions from Carl?

BARNES, INDIANA: We met one time with the Corps on this cropland issue and at that time we asked the question of why do we have to return the money every five years, (the profit). They came up with the statement that they have had meetings and they are working out procedures where we can keep the money if we put it back on that particular property for wildlife management and that includes wetlands and better roads. But there is a hooker that you have to look out for. They say they will do this on leased land but if you have a license, fish and wildlife license, there is a lease and this money still has to revert back to the Corps of Engineers. So if you are looking at this you have to be awfully careful. It's not as nice as it sounds. There is that hooker.

PRES. HARRIS: Any further questions or comments?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Also that most lands are licensed rather than leased.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know of any leased lands. Perhaps there are some but--you have some. The thing that concerns me is there may be a number of states--I think we are in this bind a little bit--that have gotten in deeper than we realize over some of the language in these licenses that varied from earlier licenses. I know I for one assigned a license which I should have realized put us in a box a little bit and I think this is a very serious consideration that everybody needs to be

aware of. We are hearing the same routine that they are looking into it. We get a good response from the district office and then it goes to the division office and as you know it thins out and when it gets into Washington we are not getting anywhere as far as any clear response. What I am afraid of is that after five years we are going to get whanged with a $50,000 bill or something like that.

PRES. HARRIS: Any further . . .? Yes, Russ.

STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: This has been a serious thing. I have been concerned about it for a long time, Carl. As a matter of fact, going back about five years ago when Harold Copeland was director in Oklahoma, we took it upon ourselves to try to get this changed. Actually it is a Corps policy; it isn't law. Because we have a license--25 year license--on a major reservoir; we have, oh, 50,000 acres at least under license from the Corps and we have been sharecropping this because this is good game management to produce some crops and wildlife along with it. We lay out the program and have been getting revenues with the value of the crops but nevertheless 50-75,000 bucks a year. And the only provision is that we have to plow these additional monies back in further development. And we have. We have done a tremendous job on it. OK, we have another reservoir and this one on a main stem of the Missouri where, built at a later time, when the license came up for my signature, low and behold, a provision in there that says any monies accruing off this project land has to be turned back into the Corps. In the first place we maintain that we took a tremendous wildlife loss when these projects were constructed and all this land inundated. And then to expect the agency to provide all the O and M money is absolutely ridiculous. I don't think the Midwest is the place to do it, but I think this is something that we should reactivate again at the International and try to get this. Now as I say, this is strictly a Chief of Engineers policy changed about ten years ago and if the Chief at that time could change the policy I see no reason why the Chief of 1975 can't go back to this original format which we were using.

PRES. HARRIS: Right. Anything more? Could I have a motion then to accept the reports of the Pro-Hunt Committee, the Legislative Committee's report, and the report of the National Coordinating Committee? It is moved by John Keenor of Wisconsin. Could I have a second? Seconded by John Popowski of South Dakota. Any further discussions? All those in favor of accepting the reports, signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

PRES. HARRIS: Opposed. The motion is carried.

Do you have some reports to make on the availability of cherries? Some of you inquired yesterday about the possibility of purchasing cherries to take home with you. Gary and the boys went out this morning. Dave

Dilts has been out scouting around and I think he has all the information on what size quantities? Dave.

Thanks a lot. We are going to try to break early this morning so that those who are going on the bus tour and those who are going fishing will have ample time to change their clothes into the right kind of gear, and then have your lunch so that you'll not be rushed to do that.

So at this time we will get back to the program and we'll call on our good neighbor, Ken Irizawa. Ken has had a varied experience in Canada. He was born in British Columbia. He did receive a non-paid free vacation for about four years with the Canadian government during World War II but he liked the government so well, he gave his services after graduating from school and receiving a bachelors degree in biology with honors. He worked during the summertime for four years while he was in school at the South Bay Fisheries Research Station. He has had various experiences with the government in Ontario as a game manager and as a district forester. He was also manager of outdoor recreation program and at the present time he is Executive Director of Fish and Wildlife Division for the Province of Ontario. It is a lot of pleasure Ken to call on you and Ken is going to speak to us regarding Financing Fish and Wildlife Programs in the Canadian Provinces. Ken.

FINANCING FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS IN THE CANADIAN PROVINCES

By

Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario

Thank you very much, Chuck. That isn't the title of my speel incidentally. I gave it to Arlow Boyce but apparently Arlow couldn't write as fast as I was talking so the real title of the speel is "The Financing of Fish and Wildlife Programs in the Canadian Context with Particular Reference to Ontario." Maybe he got stuck on one of the words, I don't know.

While I am talking about Arlow I should tell you. He is one loyal employee and Howard Tanner should make note of this, or someone should carry the message to him. Arlow said, "Look Ken this is Howard Tanner's debut before the Midwest in his new capacity, so he's going to give a very serious talk now. Just to be on the safe side, and we want his speech to look good, we want you to provide a little comic relief." And I said, "Well, whatever you say, Arlow." So this is what this is going to end up as.

I suppose it is customary to start off with a little bit of a story, maybe. I realize I am going to have a little bit of a communication difficulty with you people and I am reminded of a U.S. Forest Service chap, who addressed the Federal Provincial Wildlife Conference in Victoria last year, just about a year ago. He came up and he had visions of

Canada--you know, the igloos, Eskimos, mounties, and the red uniform bit--and in his opening comment he said something like, "You know as I drove up and crossed over on the ferry I felt right at home. You people speak the same language as us. Even on the billboards you use the same language, you know Kawasaki, Suzuki."

In the same vein I might mention that yesterday Howard Tanner mentioned Chinese bookkeeping. Today you are going to have lesson two in our continuing series on Oriental financing. Now the whole secret to this so-called Oriental financing is the characteristic of being inscrutable. You know what that means. Your point of view depends on whether you are the screwer or the screwee.

My style is a little cramped on the next one with one lady in the audience. But it is written down here so I have to go through with it. Also talking about inscrutable, I am reminded of a Playboy cartoon--some of you who read these high-class magazines may recall that one. Picture the scene--a typical stereotyped Oriental about my size, westcott like Russ Stuart, black-horn rimmed glasses, buck-toothed (you are not buck-toothed, Russ) and he is wearing a happy coat, that's H.A.P.P.I. coat and he is clawing over this big buxom blonde, you see. The caption underneath says, "You know, you're not so inscrutable when you are horny."

Now I'd like to digress for just a moment like Tom Washington and deliver a social note. This is the serious part now. Dr. Doug Clark, whom many of you know, spent two years in Africa and he is back in Ontario; he came back about a year ago. Most of you that know Doug know that you can never keep him down. He is teaching part-time at the University of Guelph and he is really enjoying his retirement. We took a leaf out of Indiana's book and for the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference in Toronto this December ala Bill Barnes we have asked Doug Clark to be honorary advisor for the steering committee and he accepted, Bill. He says he is following a great tradition.

Incidentally in a commercial note, the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference will be in Toronto at the Royal Arch Hotel December 7-10, and we are looking for a good turnout despite austerity and recession and what have you.

Now before I get into the speel I thought I might just explain the Ministry organization, just so you will see where we sit. I'm sorry I don't have a screen, a slide or anything, but fish and wildlife is just one of the many divisions in the Ministry of Natural Resources. In the resources and recreation field, you have the divisions of Forests, Mines, Fish and Wildlife, and Parks, each with the branches, and then you have a unit called the Policy Research Branch or Policy Coordination Secretariat it is called now. These are the eight regions and then here you have the Finance and Administration Division which is what you'd expect--legal services, personnel, finance and management, etc. The Conservation

Authorities Branch which is the River Valley, you know the Watershed Authority, and then the Field Services Division in the lands and water area which is a faster way of saying fire fighting, engineering and such; and finally the Division of Lands with lands administration.

Everyone is talking economy and I just cut something out of a thing in the airplane some time ago and I think maybe it's appropriate. It says here, "The Scotsman and his wife decided to see America so they took an economy trip. After the journey started, his wife said, 'Sandy, do you think we should have started out on this economy trip to America.' 'Shut up,' said Sandy, 'and keep swimming.'"

OK, I have kind of forgotten what the title was now. The Financing of Fish and Wildlife Programs in the Canadian Context with Particular Reference to Ontario. Here goes. And this is pretty dry.

The British Constitutional Concept prevails in Canada at the provincial as well as at the federal level. It means that a constitutional monarch, the Queen, acts on the advice and with the consent of Parliament. In each Canadian province, the monarch is represented by, we call it lastenant governor, you call it lieutenant governor. In Ontario, Parliament is a single house, a single chamber or unit, traditionally called the Legislative Assembly.

Generally speaking, there are no restrictions or limits on the authority of Parliament except those imposed by the British North America Act (BNA Act) of 1867 as amended from time to time. This act established the federal system in Canada and forms the basis of the division of powers between federal Parliament and the legislative assemblies of the ten provinces. For example, foreign affairs and defense, as you would expect, are solely within federal jurisdiction while other items such as education and highways are exclusively under provincial control. In the fish and wildlife area, game, other than migratory birds, are under provincial control whereas fish are a federal responsibility and are regulated by legislation at both levels of government.

Constitutionally, only the government can introduce a money bill, that is a proposal to raise revenue or incur expenditure. In Ontario, the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet is charged with the duties of developing, reviewing, coordinating and advising on policy and priorities relating to overall long-term and short-term goals of governmental activity in relation to the social and economic needs of the province and also the general outline of budgetary and fiscal policy and of levels of taxation and priorities among the expenditure programs in accordance with provincial goals.

Another board, called the Management Board of Cabinet which we formerly knew as the Treasury Board acts on all matters relating to coordination and implementation of programs sanctioned or provided for by

the Legislature; also the preparation and review of forecasts, estimates, and analysis of revenue, expenditures, and commitments, expenditures of public money and other myriad duties.

At the head of a government department in Ontario, for the Ministry of Natural Resources as an example, is a minister, an elected official. Deputy ministers are appointed as the chief administrative officers of each Ministry working under the direction of, or subject to, the approval of the Minister. I should mention that in an organizational sense, the authority to organize or maintain an agency is always conditional on the annual approval of the necessary funds.

The government of Ontario, as do most if not all governments and institutions, operate on a fund accounting principle. Briefly, fund accounting is nothing more than a self balancing group of accounts provided for each accounting entity established by legal, contractual or voluntary actions. In Ontario, it is established by legislative action, more precisely by the Ministry of Treasury, Economics, and Intergovernmental Affairs Act of 1972. The government of Ontario calls the fund in which all public monies are credited the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Whenever I hear that term, Consolidated Revenue Fund, those people who went to see the Seven Year Itch last night recall that big pot that came dropping down from upstairs; I see a pot about ten times that size--Consolidated Revenue Fund. OK, in your terminology, the General Fund I suppose is the comparable term. While the province operates other funds, for example the teachers superannuation fund. For the purposes of this paper and as far as the Ministry of Natural Resources is concerned, we can safely state that all revenues collected by the Ministry, whether for taxes, licenses, or royalties, are deposited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund and all payment of expenditures is made from this fund.

Since the Consolidated Revenue Fund is the vehicle for paying the expenditures of the Ministry, two questions arise naturally. First, how does the Ministry obtain the authority to request payments from the fund? And second, are the expenditures of the Ministry, but specifically those of the Division of Fish and Wildlife, contingent upon the related fish and wildlife revenues?

I will attempt to answer these two questions in reverse order.

While obviously the revenue going into the Consolidated Revenue Fund as a whole must be as much as or exceed the monies paid out, and if it doesn't the government must raise additional funds by borrowing, the amount for any specific program, for example fish and wildlife, is not usually based upon the revenue generated by that program. Let me illustrate this:

The revenue generated by the fish and wildlife program in Ontario, mainly through license sales, for the last three years were $10.1 million, $10.7 million, and $11.1 million, whereas the corresponding direct expenditure, and these do not include administrative overhead, were $10.8 million, $11.7 million and $12.8 million. It is my understanding that the government of Canada as well as most if not all of the provinces operate on the same basis.

Now that we have dispensed with this relatively minor matter, the question then arises, How and where do we get the funds to finance our fish and wildlife programs? The funds come from three sources: mainly from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, in a minor way from the government of Canada and thirdly, donations from non-government associations. The example I can quote here is the Atlantic Flyway Council.

Since the bulk, that is over 95 percent, of our available funds come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund I'll discuss the budgeting process the Ministry goes through in order to receive an appropriation. An appropriation is authority to pay money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Ontario carries out for the lack of a more appropriate name an incremental budgeting process. That is, our existing or ongoing projects from one year are carried over to the following year. Some projects may be or are discontinued and new projects, called new initiatives, are added on. While this seems a rather simple process there are a number of hurdles that must be crossed.

First of all the fish and wildlife program must compete with the other programs within the Ministry, and on a broader scale, the Ministry is in competition with all the other ministries and government boards, commissions and agencies for an equitable share of scarce resources, that is, dollars and manpower.

The government of Ontario has a number of alternatives, or mixes if you will, in providing outdoor recreation opportunities to the people of the province, as well as contributing to the goals and objectives of tourism. Naturally, we in fish and wildlife feel that fish and wildlife is the route to salvation and pays the largest dividends be it measured in opportunities, enjoyable experiences or contribution to conservation. On the other hand, we have our parks people and others who feel the same way about their programs. Our objective therefore is to convince our Ministry of the worth of our program and why the Ministry should invest in it.

After we have convinced our Ministry, we have to now sell our product to the various boards set up by the government to review all government programs. As you can appreciate, the objectives, costs, and benefits of our program must be fully and accurately described and sold to the various levels of government. Failure to do so means sufficient funding will not be provided and the intensity of some aspects of the program could very well be curtailed.

While having cleared the preceding hurdles, it is now necessary to submit our estimates to the Legislature for debate, that is, for review and approval. This legislative approval is the authority for the Ministry to spend funds on the various programs. Such spending must not exceed the amount approved by the Legislature except where additional spending authority is granted by Management Board of Cabinet or the Legislature.

Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on who is viewing the situation, we cannot close the book at this chapter. When we submitted our spending estimates to the Executive and Legislative arms of government, we also had to submit our objectives or targets as well. We are thus required to meet these targets with the funding provided. If, for example, we set a target of planting 5,000,000 fingerlings during the fiscal year, we are required to show that these fish were indeed planted, and that we did not fritter away the funds on some pet project that maybe myself or one of my branch directors may have dreamed up and did not show in the estimates. That is to say, the central control agencies of the government periodically conduct an examination of our spending in conjunction with our output target; that is they carry out, I suppose what you would call, a performance audit, to determine if the objectives were met and how effectively and efficiently they were carried out.

Finally, we come to the scourge of all good executives. That is, when the government in their wisdom and for economic purposes, decides to go on an austerity program halfway through the year. For example, operating funds cut by let's say 5 percent. Since the Legislature approves the funding in the first instance, they of course, have the right and responsibility to restrict spending for the economic benefit of the province or nation as the case may be. I suppose the Biblical proverb here is he that giveth can also taketh away. In addition the government may wish to maximize those programs which have a high labor content during unemployment periods to the detriment of other deserving programs. However, thankfully, this does not happen all that frequently, and it is something we have to learn to live with and provide for.

Now perhaps I might attempt to provide some comparison and contrasts between your system and ours. We do not depend on revenues for expenditures; we do not have what are called restricted funds or dedicated funds or earmarked funds largely. We do not have counterparts to the P-R or the D-J programs. We do have some federal-provincial cost-sharing programs but federal aid is not a significant factor in the fish and wildlife area. In cost-sharing programs the province spends so much as agreed upon by the two levels of government and the usual procedure is to bill the federal government for the recovery of their share of the matching funds, usually at the 50 percent level.

Ken Loftus has suggested to me that some federal programs, for example sea-lamprey control or fish quality inspections, are of direct benefit to our fisheries program. Also, he is the one to talk about this,

but we have engaged in a joint planning exercise called the Strategic Planning of Ontario Fisheries or SPOFF between the federal government and us. This is not just Great Lakes fish but inland waters as well in an attempt to integrate more of their programs with ours.

Despite experiencing similar inflation and recession problems as you folks and general austerity, this year we were very fortunate to obtain 25 new conservation officer positions. These are not just fish and wildlife conservation officers; in Ontario parks and fish and wildlife are combined in what is known as the Outdoor Recreation Program so if I were to just estimate, about eight man-years would be spent on parks enforcement--you know, riot, vandalism, rowdyism, this sort of thing and 17 man-years would be devoted to fish and wildlife. In addition we also got four moose biologist positions for our four northern regions. I think this is particularly significant in the light of a government cutback of 3 percent in staff numbers.

Despite austerity, our fish and wildlife budget has been increased from $12 million or thereabouts to $17 million. In Ontario, again maybe through a stroke of good fortune, the emphasis was shifted from social development and that is the area of welfare, health and education to the resource development area, so the social development people, who had enjoyed their place in the sun previously, had their programs and growth somewhat arrested and we were the beneficiaries of the money so found.

One thing we envy most of you about is we do not have a resident angling license in Ontario which represents we feel a potential minimum of about $5 million but unfortunately government policy precludes reimposition of the resident angling license which we had in existence for a year and a half or so back in the 1969-70 era.

As I mentioned earlier we do get some assistance from the Atlantic Flyway Council to defray duck banding costs. There is a Canadian Migratory Bird Hunting permit but the provinces do not necessarily get any returns in relation to their share and Ontario's share in that is about 50 percent. For example Ontario may contribute the lion's share but the expenditures may be greatest in the prairie provinces for crop depredation payments.

One program you may be interested in hearing about is the Federal Provincial Humane Trapping Committee. Here two federal agencies, the ten provinces, and the two territories--Yukon and Northwest Territories--all contribute dollars and/or services, according to a formula, in the interest of humane trap development and a humane trapping program. Although this program was a direct outcome of public criticism and pressure, it nevertheless illustrates the development of a program where the various members, by pooling their somewhat meager efforts and resources in the line of humane trap development, could mount a more effective program.

The Division of Fish and Wildlife in the Ministry makes a number of annual grants to relevant organizations. For example, we give $5,000 per annum to the Ontario Council of Commercial Fisheries, $3,000 per annum to the Jack Miner Migratory Bird Foundation except for one exceptional year, when they got $33,000 and this was largely to fund public washrooms on the property, and $5,000 per annum to the Ontario Waterfowl Research Foundation. In addition, up to $100,000 per annum in cash and services is dedicated to support what might be termed cooperative research primarily in a sweetheart type of deal with the University of Guelph. I think this is fine though; these are means of meeting our objectives through others.

The catchword in Ontario now is MYP or multi-year planning. This is very much a part of our catechism. Originally conceived as part of an overall forecast of programs, direction and financial requirements covering a five-year period prepared annually by each Ministry, MYP is now on a three year cycle. The MYP provides ministries and screening committees a formal opportunity to examine their programs and prepare recommendations. It provides senior boards of government and the cabinet the opportunity to review the total content and cost of all government programs spread over a projected three year period in conjunction with revenue and taxation alternatives so that objectives being sought in each program can be confirmed or modified. The viability or relevance of existing programs may be examined and decisions made on expansions, reductions or terminations. Programming decisions on the introduction of new policy items can be made. Priorities can be established and direction can be provided to the appropriate organizational units for the basis of their forthcoming estimates and submissions.

Organizationally, the Division of Fish and Wildlife in Ontario includes four branches: commercial fish and fur, fish and wildlife research, sport fisheries, and wildlife, each headed by a director. In the program budgeting context, commercial fish and fur is included in the resource products program along with forest and mines while the other three elements are part of the outdoor recreation program. This anomaly or bifurcation presents minor difficulties but none which is insurmountable. Other arms of the ministry provide services to fish and wildlife in areas such as capital works and accommodations, road construction and maintenance, aircraft, information and education, land acquisition and program analysis to name but just a few examples. Many of these support services are not directly charged to the activity but some operate on a charge-back principle.

Well, Chuck, this has been a rather rambling and disjointed presentation and probably not along the lines that Arlow Boyce had anticipated. If such has been the case, my apologies. If there are any questions, I think between Ken Loftus and I, we'll attempt to answer them. If not, I say thanks for your patience and let's go and eat.

PRES. HARRIS: Thanks, Ken. Are there any questions of Ken?

NOREN, MISSOURI: I would like to explore why you don't have a resident fishing license. You had it and apparently dropped it. I would be interested in knowing what the history behind that is.

IRIZAWA: I am on foreign ground, so I guess I can be daring. I think the reason was largely political. We had it and we saw the need of it as a device to get a handle on the number of anglers we had and so forth, and if not for any other reason, that would have been valuable. When it came out, some of our yo-yo citizens, you know--this is the last free right type of thing--and just like Howard or someone said yesterday, we had all of these exemptions--old people or kids under 19 and women were free and the whole bit. But anyway, a bunch of people, particularly in northern Ontario where the fishing is good, I suppose this is in relation to their normal feeling of alienation from southern Ontario, they really got into a great mail campaign and the powers that be got alarmed and the next thing it was cut off. So as I said in the speel, by government policy. We have an election coming up, maybe September or October of this year. It will be very interesting to see because the government will be looking for more sources of revenue and the crystal ball is kind of clouded but I wouldn't be surprised if maybe we got a $5.00 resident angling license again. We hope.

NOREN: Any talk of federal aid programs?

IRIZAWA: Oh, the feds are just as hard to get along with up there as they are down here. Sorry, Pete.

PRES. HARRIS: Mike Casey.

CASEY, MINNESOTA: Briefly what are you doing about the trapping bit you were talking about:

IRIZAWA: OK, there is a committee set up. Our director of the commercial fish and fur branch is the chairman of it. I think it is very much along the lines of humane trap development sort of thing going on here. You know the International with its committee. Incidentally, I might get on my soap box and say I don't think too much of the International getting in bed with Woodstream. A little bit of compromising there however, we get their books and we supply information to them as well. They are a committee of representative people that federal and provincial has a coordinator appointed, who spearheads the thing, and they are carrying out all sorts of experimentation, Canadian Standard Act, patent stuff and trying to get at a trap which is a perfect one and also to disseminate a fair bit of information--good information--because we have to counter some of that crap that the bleeding hearts provide. They are very effective, let me tell you. So in short, Mike, that is it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe getting in bed with Woodstream has something to do with the fact that we are not inscrutable either.

PRES. HARRIS: Arlow Boyce.

BOYCE, MICHIGAN: Are you having the same type of Indian problems in Ontario that we are having in Michigan and the states?

IRIZAWA: I can tell you that I think our Indians are just as militant as yours; in fact, people with the surnames like Banks and Means have come up and helped to incite the people. We don't need any of that outside assistance either, I might say. But anyway, yea, they have been occupying parks, not just threatening, but they have occupied a park in Kenora. They have been conducting sit-ins in federal Indian Affairs offices, usually in conjunction with post offices. They have even conducted fish-ins and I can explain. They are pretty crafty. They know that we go easy on kids so adults--caravans of cars--come down to a good location like a dam where rainbows are, and they send the kids out with gunny sacks, or whatever you call them, spears and what have you and then they just dare our officers. We haven't fallen into their traps in those instances by producing a show of force; usually the local officer is the only guy in attendance and he observes what is going on and so forth and obviously he hasn't made any charges but they are getting pretty bad. Some of your constituents around the Detroit area who have formerly lived along the banks of the Thames River were apprehended this year and very ironically one of the red power type's vehicles, a truck, was seized and his cousin was driving it so a little bit of satisfaction there maybe but I don't know; they have been fighting. In court cases recently, we have come through with a fair number of convictions so and that despite our policy quote that we will not bother them on or adjacent to their reserves. If they start commercializing, look out.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you have a treaty similar to what we have or what?

IRIZAWA: Our treaty is the same sort of thing, I think. No different. In fact we have some common treaties--I think the Jay Treaty is one which allows your Indians to roam up and down and ours north and south. Yes, each band or area is governed by a treaty--adhesions to treaty and surrenders, and all this.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are these treaties of the Crown?

IRIZAWA: The federal government. And we have an Indian Affairs branch in the federal government. They are not too effective. All they are doing is paying out bucks and guess who is getting the short end. The dirty end. Enforcement or whatever.

PRES. HARRIS: Thanks a lot, Ken. I think we have some more drawings, Henry, don't we? And is John MacGregor or someone here that can tell us exactly where the picnic area is tonight?

* * * * * * * * * * *

Third General Session - Thursday, July 24, 1975

PRES. HARRIS: I will call the meeting to order. Do you have any announcements to make, Gary?

BOUSHELLE: The boys are going to make one more cherry run, so if you are interested we'll sign you up for some more. Also if anybody needs a ride to the airport, if they will get a hold of us, we will make sure you get transportation out there regardless of what time your plane leaves today or whatever. That's it unless anyone has any questions.

PRES. HARRIS: I realize why we are starting late. If everybody feels as slow as I do this morning, I am surprised there are as many here at 8:30 as there are. The weather last night--the Weather Bureau being a federal agency function, there wasn't much we could do about it.

To start off the morning, we will hear from one of the federal boys. I think he has the program we tried to show the other day when the projectors wouldn't function or something or other, so we will have that the first thing this morning followed by the first item on the printed agenda.

(Film shown at this time.)

Does anyone have any questions to ask about the presentation? It was very good. Thanks very much.

The next item on our program is a cooperative program of habitat development in a mining waste disposal area. This has been a cooperative program between the Copper Range Company which we know as the White Pine Operation in Ontonagon County where we have worked together with company representatives in a waterfowl habitat program. With us this morning, and he has been with us most of the week, I'm sure some of you have already met him, is Edward Bingham who is presently Corporate Manager of Environmental Affairs for the Copper Range Company. He has been with the Copper Range Company since 1964. Previously he was with the Kennecut Copper Corporation's Research Facilities in Salt Lake City, Utah. He is now a resident of White Pine, Michigan which is also a company created town where the company's corporate offices are located. He was born in Dansville, Illinois, married, has two teenage children and holds a B.S. in geology from the University of Utah. He is affiliated with a number of wildlife organizations, which I think identifies his interest in our field. He is a member of Ducks Unlimited, National Wildlife Federation, the Isaac Walton League, and he was recipient of the award of merit for the year 1971 presented by the Michigan Soil Conservation Districts, Inc., for activities in the conservation of land and water. We have had a most enjoyable and rewarding cooperative program with him and his company and without further ado I'll call on Ed.

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM, WATERFOWL HABITAT DEVELOPMENT IN A MINING WASTE DISPOSAL AREA

By
Edward R. Bingham
Cooperating Manager, Environmental Affairs
Copper Range Co., White Pine, Michigan

I hope I can read this thing. If I can't see it, maybe I'll get some volunteers up here with matches. Could I get some light please?

White Pine Copper Company operates an integrated, primary copper production facility in Ontonagon County, six miles from Lake Superior and near the Porcupine Mountain State Park boundary. The facility produces about 25,000 tons of ore per day from an underground mine of which approximately 24,200 tons must be disposed of after being milled extremely fine to extract the copper values.

The method used in disposal of this waste material is the construction of large, earth-filled dams to retain the solids and provide stilling capacity so that clarified, treated discharges result. These impoundments require the clearing of large acreages of the second growth mixed hardwoods dominated by aspen present in the area. This clearing involves both the acreage inside the large impoundments and on lands adjacent to the structures. The clearing outside the impoundment areas is to obtain the millions of cubic yards of fill material required to build the berm. At White Pine, three such impoundments have been constructed or are presently under construction. The total area impacted by this waste treatment system is approximately 10,000 acres with about 5,000 located inside the berms.

The cleared borrow areas and resulting borrow pits are plugged and allowed to flood after the usable fill material has been depleted. This has resulted in over 100 ponds, ranging from one to twenty acres in size and up to fifteen feet in depth.

The South Tailings Dam which encloses approximately 800 acres, has been written off as it was found that mining activities beneath the dam created potential stability problems which precludes its use for impounding tailings.

North Dam No. 1, which impounds approximately 1,750 acres had the usable volume filled with solids in November of 1971.

North Dam No. 2, presently under construction, occupies about 2,450 acres and will ultimately be approximately 120 feet high on the downstream berm. Impoundment is necessary on all four sides because of the lay of the land.

North Dam No. 2 construction method involves the use of the coarse fraction of the tailings in the core of the dam with rolled clay fill on the upstream and downstream sides. This practice allows a reduction in the amount of clay fill needed and a resultant decrease in acreage necessary for clearing. However, over 16,135,000 cubic yards of impervious clay fill will be required for completion of North Dam No. 2 in addition to the 10,197,000 cubic yards of sandfill in the core of the dam.

Reclamation

A program of reclamation has been in effect for the 20 years the dams have been under construction slope stabilization and erosion control have been an on-going, integrat part of the construction activities.

As cleared borrow areas were depleted of useful borrow, volunteer vegetation took quickly to the flats surrounding the ponds in spite of the fact that the soil could only be classified as a very heavy, poorly drained subsoil.

Prior to the depletion of the usable impoundment volume in North Dam No. 1, test programs to revegetate the Tailings Flats were instituted. These tests involve the planting of various grasses, legumes, shrubs, and trees with varying amounts of fertilizer and soil conditioning. In the dry borrow pit areas, plantings of spruce and jack pine were attempted, primarily for surface cover and erosion control.

As the years progressed, it became apparent that a natural population of nesting ducks was occupying the ponds in the borrow areas. These observations in 1971, led to discussions with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Division as to the potential for developing the area as waterfowl habitat. Early in the discussions, waterfowl management experts in the DNR indicated they felt the area had the potential for increased production of ducks and, further, showed promise as a Canada Goose nesting and production area. We then entered into an informal, cooperative arrangement whereby the DNR would furnish the expertise required in waterfowl management planning, procedures, and training in techniques. The overall management plan was developed cooperatively with, and approved by the DNR Wildlife Division prior to implementation. Their advice is the focus of all planning and such plans will be implemented by the company to the extent allowed by budgetary and operating conditions. It is understood that the areas involved have to be classified as active mining areas and also as active timber management areas and that, in all cases, operational needs would have to take precedence over any game management proposal or activity. By the nature of the construction, mining and logging activities involved, and by integrating the game management program into our own long-range operational plans, we should be able to avoid invoking any after-the-fact use designations.

The DNR has approved the current plans for waterfowl habitat development on the property. They have advised and trained company personnel in habitat management techniques in the handling of captive geese, predator control, census taking, posting of property and other technical aspects of game management. They have also furnished the services of staff specialists in entomology, bacteriology, pathology, wetland management, and other game management specialists as part of the program. The department, of course, also provides general game law enforcement in the area and advises company personnel in security measures relative to the management program. In addition to the contacts in the spring, summer, and fall with the DNR personnel involved in the program, an annual review of activities is submitted to the department in January of each year.

Planning

Significant land changes brought about by the construction of the large tailings impoundments have already created habitat attractive to certain animal species. Essentially, four zones have been created: (1) wide, grassy flats; (2) groups of small ponds surrounded by heavy forest cover; (3) large open ponds, some interconnected, separated by spoil pile strips; (4) mixed, uneven aged stands of aspen, brush and occasional blocks of northern hardwoods and swamp conifers. The grassy flats have been used for nesting and feeding by sharp tail grouse and for rest and feeding by migrating geese. The wooded, small ponds are used by surface feeding ducks as well as other marsh bird species. The larger ponds are used by nesting ducks and have a significant beaver population. They are used by migrating waterfowl, including diving ducks and as spring and summer range for captive, wing-clipped geese. The brushy sections and the upper forest portion attract deer, ruffed grouse, and the usual suite of fur-bearing animals and predators. The basis for the total program at White Pine is modification and improvement of the existing habitat for selective species propogation.

The breakdown of the management units in the cleared borrow areas is as follows:

(1) Goose pasture and sharptail grouse nesting habitat management.
(2) Duck management.
(3) Goose nesting and summer range management.
(4) Deer, grouse and upland game management.

Some of the management techniques serve in more than one of the zones listed. The overall goose management plan includes: First, the elimination of undesirable woody vegetation either by cutting or bulldozing. The bulk of these activities are in existing openings that require clearing and grading in order to use cultivation equipment for both seeding and mowing. A major portion of the present clearing work is being conducted on the spoil strips between the borrow pit ponds, which tend to be elongated in a north-south direction, with a runout apron on the south end used by the

heavy construction equipment, and with the deeper portion of the pond on the north end. The original trees, stumps, and top soil were pushed to the east and west margins as this material could not be used for fill. Brush, grasses, and trees took readily to these spoil banks and, as can be seen, in 10 to 15 years, have achieved growth of up to 20 feet. In the initial management zone on the south end of the project, it was necessary to level the spoil banks using heavy equipment. The reason for this activity is two-fold. First, to eliminate the tall cover which created an undesirable situation as far as the geese were concerned in that it provided cover for predators and cut off the open vistas preferred by the birds. The east and west edges of the ponds are sheer sided, which makes it difficult for waterfowl to walk ashore. By leveling these spoil banks and pushing the material into the ponds on either side, a flatter slope is attained. Second, this clearing and leveling allowed these margin strips to be seeded with desirable plant species for goose forage.

In the grading work along existing established borrow pits, a maximum slope of three on one is the goal. In clearing and grading the open areas, small pot holes will be preserved to provide nesting habitat for ducks.

The main long range problem that we foresee for this part of the program is the volunteer aspen which tends to establish very quickly in cleared areas even if the soil is of low fertility.

The area on the north end of the management project offers opportunities to develop suitable goose nesting and feeding habitat as an integral part of the construction of North Dam No. 2.

The borrow areas are set up in zones which are 1500 foot strips around the perimeter of the new dam. As these borrow pits are developed, a ditch on the north end is used to drain the casual water from the bottom of the pit. After the usable borrow is depleted, this ditch is plugged and the borrow pit allowed to fill with water to a pre-determined elevation. As a final step, a bulldozer will be used to dress the banks down to 3 or even 5 on 1 around the entire perimeter of the borrow pit. The spoil, instead of being stacked linearally along the east and west sides will be graded out. Debris and spoil will be pushed up at points in the dry pit prior to flooding to the proper elevation to create islands about 2-3 feet above the eventual water level that will be surrounded by water at least 5 feet deep. Based on the surface area of the resulting pond, two or more of these islands will be so constructed. This will provide natural, protected goose and duck nesting sites once the borrow pits' water level is attained and vegetation takes over on the islands.

In that year or the following year, the dressed banks and the intervening space between this borrow pit and the next one to the east or west will be seeded with suitable, low growing forage for both ducks and geese. By proceeding in this fashion, we expect that the costs now experienced

in dressing the intervening areas between the old borrow pits on the south end will be minimized.

The ever present problem of late spring breakup of ice cover will be, in part, resolved by eventually constructing a series of canals to interconnect the ponds and, by routing the discharge from the Tailings Dam sequentially through the developed ponds to accelerate ice removal.

Existing Tailings Flats

The 1,750 acre tailings flat on North Dam No. 1 is presently used by migrating geese in significant numbers for rest and feeding.

The reclamation program for this area and the 2,450 acre North Dam No. 2 flats 20 years from now, will be tailored to fit the waterfowl program.

The original concept was to revegetate these barren flats with any adaptable species. However, we now feel that development of low-growing goose forage is possible, given time and heavy application of seed and fertilizer.

If this is possible, this area could provide excellent food and resting habitat for large numbers of resident or transient geese.

Volunteer red top and sweet clover as well as the test plantings of other species indicates that this is a distinct possibility.

Progress - Goose Management

After the initial contact with the DNR concerning this program in the fall of 1971, visits to the area by both waterfowl and wetlands specialists were conducted and, subsequently, the preliminary, long-range plans for goose and duck habitat development were determined. The main physical accomplishment in 1971 was the intensive use by migrating geese or areas previously seeded for erosion control and slope stability. The areas were mowed in late August (about 2-30 acres) but significant numbers of transient birds used this small area for 1-2 weeks during their southward migration.

One of the problems with the seed mix used for slope stabilization and erosion control is that sweet clover tends to dominate as the areas go rank over the years. While providing good cover for both holding soil and minimizing movement due to winds, the sweet clover grows as high as 3-4 feet in some years. Large fields then were limited by this fact in their use by the geese. Mowing in late August was recommended to improve visibility and open the necessary vistas and to promote greening in early and late September as the transient birds appeared. For the future habitat development, the DNR recommended, based on experience, seed mixes that would provide good forage for the birds, would green late in the year, and minimize the need for mowing.

In 1972, as in previous years, significant number of surface feeding duck broods were produced, based on observation in the spring and on rough counts of the young birds flying late in the summer.

In April, 1973, the DNR furnished 20 giant Canada geese as a starter flock. These birds were brought up from the Mason Game Farm and released in the South Dam area which offered two advantages: First, the ponds inside the dam were already suitable nesting habitat in that they had many islands and also a good crop of forage on the spoilbanks and flats at the south end. The birds were released in April (somewhat late) due to a temporary quarantine imposed on the flock at the Mason Game Farm. These initial, wing-clipped birds took readily to the area, scattering well throughout the 400-500 acres in the original release site. The second factor in the South Dam area was that the main berm and the wings of the dam, in effect, created a barrier to straying of the birds. This did not, in fact, impede the movement of the birds as, very shortly, they were scattered over about 5-6 square miles of area. Some, in fact, found their way to Lake Superior seven miles to the north. Ultimately, however, most of these birds returned to the original release site either on their own volition or by herding. They appeared to settle down in the new area but no nesting success was achieved. Some territorialism and attempts at nesting were observed but no broods were successfully hatched.

The plans were to recapture these birds during the molt and to over-winter the flock to minimize losses due to hunter harvest or to predation. Unfortunately, the flock achieved flight status about one week earlier than was predicted, so efforts to recapture them were unavailing. These birds remained in the area and were observed to isolate themselves from the presence of large numbers of migrating birds later in the fall.

After this experience, it was recommended that a second wing-clipped flock should be scheduled for release in the spring of 1974 following overwintering in the White Pine area. Sixty birds were picked up from the Game Farm in November, 1973, and placed in a pen at the home of a local resident. All birds withstood the rigorous winter weather very well. They were fed a mixture of shelled corn and high protein pellets and were provided with open water for drinking purposes. Heavy snowstorms and temperatures to -30°F were experienced with no apparent ill effects on the flock.

The spring breakup in 1974 was somewhat delayed so that the birds were not released until April 13. More evidence of territorialism was noted than in the previous year, however, only one successful nesting effort was made. This was a brood of six goslings, five of which survived to flight status. While difficult to quantify, we feel that at least six of the previous year's release of 20 birds returned to the area that spring. The successful nesting pair may have been from this population.

With the assistance of personnel from the Mason Game Farm, 38 of the 1974 release of 60 birds were recaptured in July during the molt and defeathered on one wing and clipped about a month later on the opposite wing. The remaining uncaptured birds feathered out and achieved flight status. Attempts to capture the single brood were not successful.

Twenty additional birds were obtained from the Mason Game Farm in the fall of 1974 and a total of 58 was overwintered at the same site as the previous flocks. These 58 adult birds withstood the rigorous winter as had the previous flock.

A different release method was attempted in the spring of 1975--with the birds moved early to the release site where a pen was prepared with a flow of water to open a hole in the inside of the pen. When sufficient open water became generally available in the area, the pen was opened and the birds allowed to scatter. Some escapees from the preceding year also returned to the area. Fifty-eight adults were released, and an additional 19 birds were counted for a total of 77 in residence. Additional adults may have been present in remote, inaccessible parts of the area.

Problems of census and counts are simplified in the South Dam area as the 65 foot berm affords a good vantage point for observing the birds inside the dam. However, there are many thousands of acres in the area that are difficult or impossible to observe so that counts of young and adult birds are necessarily conservative.

This spring, it became apparent that the program to establish a resident nesting population was finally off the ground. With eleven broods hatched with an average of 4.6 goslings, the first real success was realized. Most of these successful nestings were inside the South Dam or in ponds immediately outside the structure.

We learned that the capture of goslings is an entirely different situation than the capture of adults. Even with intensive efforts, only sixteen of the 50 odd goslings were captured for banding.

Our objective was to capture as many goslings as possible for banding and glood testing as well as to overwinter a large number to minimize losses and intensify imprinting. Unfortunately, the geese became quite hostile furing this operation and were very uncooperative.

We are still learning the techniques and, with additional training and advice from the DNR personnel experienced in handling the birds, we should become more successful in these efforts in future years.

Public Support

The entire White Pine complex, including the 25,000-30,000 acres surrounding the 10,000 acre waterfowl project, has traditionally been open to all activities, particularly hunting (except the actual construction and the plant site areas which were closed for safety purposes). On the advice of the waterfowl management personnel in the DNR, an area of about 40,000 acres, which includes a buffer zone around the management area, was closed to all shooting and unauthorized access three years ago. Through a series of announcements, we were successful in gaining public support to the point where no significant problems have developed in terms of harassment or illegal activities on the area. We feel that the local population generally sees the potential long term benefits of this program in that in future years, it should supply excellent shooting in the two-three county area as the resident flock gains sufficient numbers. Any birds from the starter flock that stray from the area--particularly to the north along the lake, are immediately reported by interested citizens.

Enforcement

Enforcement activities relative to all protected species present is, of course, vested in the DNR. The local conservation officers have been very helpful in routinely checking the area out during the shooting season as well as during the off season period. We have the additional enforcement factor of company security personnel who have the power of arrest in trespass situations, and who can also hold game violators for the conservation officer to handle. During the critical migration period, the outside perimeter of the area is patrolled by company security personnel. Other than occasional bear and partridge hunters on the edges of the 40,000 acre closed area, we have had no significant enforcement problems. We feel that this is due to the enforcement activities but also in a large part, to the local public acceptance of the program. (A few of the citizenry tend to be rather carefree where fish and game regulations are concerned.) We already have had reports of small free-flying flocks of geese in areas up to 30-40 miles away during the summer which is, of course, visible evidence which promotes public support of both this program as well as the DNR programs to the east. In observing these birds during periods when they were not normally present in the past, the local residents see them as a harbinger of things to come. This is an attitude, of course, which we are making every effort to foster and promote.

Transient Birds

In the past three years especially, since the area has been closed to shooting, we have found that sizeable flocks of snow and blue geese as well as the dark species have been stopping for 2-3 weeks during the peak of migration, using the mowed areas as well as the areas recently cleared

on the south end of the project and seeded with forage. While our estimating procedures are perhaps not as accurate as professionals would use, we have seen as many as 5,000 birds in restricted areas--say 25-30 acres--which is a very impressive sight. We have noted in the past two falls that the transient birds tend to come and go with flocks of 200-300 departing and equivalent size flocks arriving from the north. The population during these last two years of observation has tended to remain fairly static at around 5,000 up until the time of freeze-up which, in this area, generally occurs in late October or the first week in November. At the time of freeze-up, all of the transient birds depart and only the resident flock remains. We have noted that the local birds tend to remain in the area until forced out by weather particularly snow cover.

1976 Plan

The 48 geese captured during July of 1975, including some mated pairs, as well as the 17 goslings, will be overwintered as before and released in the spring of 1976. If available, additional birds will be furnished this fall by the DNR from the Mason Game Farm and added to this flock being overwintered. The release technique used in the spring of 1975 proved to be successful and this will again be carried out in the spring of 1976, i.e., moving the birds from the overwintering pen in March to a holding pen with free flowing, open water. The birds will be held until open water is available generally and then released.

General Notes

Other than the periods when the birds need to be handled, i.e., release, capture, wing clipping, banding, under DNR direction, our main management technique is to leave the birds strictly alone after release in the spring. In the South Dam area, the vantage point of the 65 foot berm permits accurate observation using spotting scopes as well as binoculars--not approaching closer than 200-300 yards. The birds tolerate this as long as the observers stay on top of the berm or in a blind constructed immediately on top of the berm. No attempts are made to approach the birds when the goose is on the nest or during the period immediately after the goslings hatch. This is in keeping with the recommendation from the DNR which suggests that minimum disturbance is necessary if the birds are to become, in effect, truly wild. Capture efforts late in the spring of 1975 showed that we were more successful in enlivening the wildness in geese than we really cared to be. The mated pairs with goslings, for example, were highly intolerant of activities by company personnel who were setting up pens for their capture. They escaped two capture drives but a third one proved intolerable. Some adult pairs took their goslings and departed on foot for areas as much as four or five miles away. By later observation and brood counts, it is not felt that this overland move caused any losses due either to predation or injury. After two or three days of settling down, the families that moved were observed in the other areas and other than increased wariness, seemed to be intact and content.

Incidental Observations

During the past two years, reports have been received of geese nesting in areas heretofore unproductive. One in the spring of 1974 was sighted in a lake approximately 45 miles to the wouthwest from the release site. Another pair was observed nesting in the spring of 1974 on the stabilization lagoon at Wakefield, Michigan--approximately 30 miles west of the release site. We presume that these birds are most likely from a release either at White Pine or as part of the DNR programs to the east.

The area immediately surrounding the 10,000 acre project area has numerous active and old beaver dams. No attempt has been made to date to observe any activity by the geese in these remote areas.

In addition to the beaver dams, the entire south end of the pond in North Tailings No. 2 is relatively inaccessible. The trees in this area were permitted to stand to provide a wind break for the water impounded inside the dam. In the woods on the back edge of the pond, there are about 4-5 miles of shoreline, some of which passes through small and large clearings in the woods from clearing for borrow or logging operations. While these grassed openings would more likely be used for duck nesting, there is a possibility that some of the geese found their way into this remote area and nested successfully. To include these areas in the observations made during the spring and early summer, additional manpower would be required which is not available either from the DNR or the company.

Banding Returns

Band returns from the 1973 release indicated that one of the birds which evaded capture was harvested in the Ottumwa, Iowa area and three were harvested locally, i.e., within 100 miles from the release site. One of the birds taken by a local hunter approximately 20 miles away from the release site was weighed on a butcher's scale at 15 pounds. This bird was taken at Bass Lake, southwest of the release sight; the other two in the Sturgeon River area. Band returns from the 1974 release show that some of the birds are using the west shore of Lake Michigan as a southward migration route. We are advised that the local population should establish a migration tradition in future years and will become a factor in hunting areas to the south.

Disease Studies

As with other areas in the Upper Peninsula, the leucocytozoon blood parasite is known to be present. DNR studies on this potential problem started early in the program with adult mallards which had been exposed to the black fly in the area. The birds were blood tested weekly to determine the presence of this parasite. These adult geese did, in fact, contract the disease early in the black fly season.

The 1974 and 1975 experience indicated that at least in these years gosling mortality was not excessive due to this disease. It still remains as a possible limiting factor, however, and the department plans to continue the studies.

Predator Control

Two trappers are permitted to take coyotes, skunks, raccoons and fox in the area. Three to four years ago, the area could only be classified as infested with coyotes so it was felt that a limited predator control program was necessary in the beginning years of the starting goose population. In a fairly restricted area, i.e., the south 1,000 acres, thirty-five coyotes have been taken in the past three years. The large number is, most likely, due to the large field mouse population in the hundreds of acres of area seeded for slope stabilization and erosion control. We feel that most of the bold and clumsy coyotes have been taken and only the wise remain. We have had no evidence of predation by coyotes on the resident goose flock--in fact, this spring, when the birds were penned inside a 4 foot snowfence, signs indicated that coyotes observed the penned birds from a vantage point above them but did not approach the pen. This could be due to the fact that human odor was present and the remaining animals are very cautious about entering such areas.

An incident occurred last summer while the birds were penned in the South Dam area of a bear crossing the fence, picking up a sack of corn, and leaving with the corn over his shoulder. From the tracks, no attempt was made to molest the birds.

In future years, the effects of the coyote predation on the resident flock will be determined and the need for localized, limited predator control will be re-examined.

No attempt, of course, is made to control predacious birds which include the marsh hawk which nests in the area as well as a large resident raven population which are protected species. The ducks and geese will then have to learn to cohabit with all protected wildlife.

An increased incidence of snapping turtles in the ponds has been noted in the past year. One animal was observed which was at least 18 inches across the shell. We plan to institute control measures if, in the opinion of the DNR specialists, these animals become a major factor in predation on either the ducks or the geese.

Fall Migration Use

The first migrating flocks (usually small flocks of Canada geese) normally arrive in mid-September. The blues and snows generally arrive

about two weeks later. The peak periods in the stopover are generally in the second, third and, occasionally, fourth week in October. The latest that the resident birds have been observed was November 24.

Accelerated Development

The possibility of purchasing mated pairs of geese was considered as an alternative to the relatively slow, natural process of mating juvenile birds. However, with the success noted in 1975 and, on the advice of the DNR experts, it is now felt that the natural process will be productive and, in the long run, more in tune with the overall objective of establishing a wild, free-flying flock.

Other Recreational Activities

The area has a large resident beaver population. In fact, nearly every pond has a beaver family present. For most of the waterfowl management project, the beaver are beneficial as they provide extra freeboard by damming up the exit ditch from the borrow pits. In the active construction areas, however, where beaver can become a problem, trappers in the late winter are permitted access to take these surplus animals. Two years ago, 150 beaver were taken from the center and north end of the area without visible effect on the total population. The entire south end of the project is closed to beaver trapping for the previously mentioned reason. In future years, as the north end is developed as a duck and goose habitat, the beaver population will be allowed to stabilize itself naturally and access for trapping will be prohibited.

Otter present in the area are few in number so that in the entry permit given to the beaver trappers, the condition is made that no otter sets are to be made and any animals taken accidentally in beaver sets will be reported.

Both the predator control permittees as well as the beaver trappers are required to file reports on animals taken, locality, etc.

The cleared areas support a sizeable deer population during the summer months but lack suitable winter habitat. The signs point to an increase in numbers over the past 2-3 years, which correspondingly have had relatively low snowfall recorded.

Other Management Opportunities

A small but persistent population of sharptail grouse inhabits a portion of the south end of the management area. The goose habitat development plans include provision for sharptail cover in this zone.

Some of the larger ponds on the south end are being evaluated for their potential as a pan fishery. A test stocking of yellow perch was made in one pond, with evidence of successful spawning in subsequent years. Other ponds are being checked for their ability to carry desirable species over the winter.

Personnel

The program with the DNR is administered at White Pine by the environmental supervisor--who has formal training at the graduate level in resources management.

In addition to permanent technical and professional personnel, he has available three summer students who work in both the general reclamation program as well as in the game management program. Other company personnel are available when required for exercises such as herding for capture, pen construction, etc.

Interest in the company is so high that the environmental supervisor has a problem keeping the number of volunteer workers down to a reasonable and workable number.

General

The objectives of the overall reclamation program in the waste disposal area are both ambitious and comprehensive.

In the short term (5 years), we hope to accomplish the following:

(1) The production of significant numbers of ducks and geese through habitat development and improvement.
(2) Revegetation of stripped areas and tailings flats for esthetic reasons.
(3) Increase the numbers and species of animals not common in the area, such as blue heron, songbirds, shore and wading birds and sharptail grouse.

In the long term, only time will tell. No one can predict circumstances that may be present 10-20 years from now. It will suffice to say that our top management enthusiastically supports the program described here and that it is an integral part of our long range operational plan. Opportunities for additional use--such as bird watching, pan fishing, etc., will be evaluated as the program advances.

The large openings created by the construction of this waste treatment system in an area normally covered with second growth mixed hardwoods present both a problem and an opportunity.

We hope that the long range objectives of this waterfowl management program, when achieved, will demonstrate that this area has become a productive, useful entity after its primary purpose of industrial waste treatment is fulfilled.

C. O. Ensign, Jr., president and chief executive officer of Copper Range Company, in thanking the DNR professionals for their assistance in the program said, "I hope that this program will become representative of an approach which is all too uncommon in this day of extreme pressures for quick resolution of all environmental problems--that of an industry working in concert with a public agency, drawing on the latter's expertise and experience in developing programs that will ultimately benefit both the environment and the public."

PRES. HARRIS: Are there any questions to ask of Ed before we go for our coffee break?

BINGHAM: If any of you would care to have them, there are copies of the nonedited remarks.

PRES. HARRIS: Thanks very much, Ed. You've got a company that is concerned about and willing to do something to improve the situation and help out and regenerate the areas that are disturbed from the mining operation. We have others, of course, in Michigan over near the Marquette range--several large iron ore mining operations which offer similar opportunities. It's only through the graciousness of Ed's company that we've had this kind of program and it's been very rewarding and enjoyable with them.

We'll break now for coffee and let's be back at 10:00 so we can wind up the session by noon.

* * * * * * * * *

Reconvened Thursday a.m. session

PRES. HARRIS: I would like to introduce our girls at this time. The first one is Pat Wagner who was Pete Petoskey's secretary and is now serving Dave Jenkins who is the Chief of Wildlife in the Wildlife Division in Lansing. The second one is Vicki Robinson and Vicki is from our Region III office in Lansing. She has been working on this conference for nearly a year with Gary who has been serving as our secretary, and I am sure that much of the success that Gary has shown in this conference is owed to Vicki, and we certainly appreciate her help. And last but not least is Sherri Hoag and Sherri is from our local office here in Traverse City. We have a field station here, and she is the secretary there.

Now we have the last of the drawings and I'll turn that over to Henry.

Who is going to make the Audit Report? Ken Loftus.

LOFTUS, ONTARIO: Ladies and gentlemen, your audit committee met yesterday morning under the chairmanship of Harry Harrison who, last night when my tummy was full of several things, suggested that he wanted to go home early today, and feeling magnanimous at the time, I said sure Harry I'll present the report.

Fred Warders, the treasurer, was present and had provided me the advance copy of his books which incidentally are very neat and tidy in comparison to my own. Dave Vesall, John Popowski, myself and perhaps one or two others were there and went over them, and we find the books in good order. When we added up the numbers and subtracted, we got the same answers as did your treasurer. I'm not sure what other things an audit committee is supposed to do over and above indicating that the bookkeeping is in order and the balance shown is correct! If that is it, then that is the gist of my report.

However there was some other committee work that went on during the year as the result of a fairly close look at the financial situation of this association, and the committee that did look in detail at the state of the finances included Larry Gale, Pete Petoskey, Don Johnston, and Dave Vesall. I rather suspect that the details of the financial situation would be included in the report of your treasurer, Mr. Chairman, and so with those few remarks I'll leave it there. We have some numbers here that were given to me, and they may be useful during the discussion of the financial situation.

PRES. HARRIS: Thank you, Ken. Any questions of Ken? Now we will call on our good friend, Fred, to come forward and give the treasurer's report.

WARDERS, KANSAS: President, I understand that Dave Vesall's committee on financial status will be discussed in conjunction with this report so I'll be brief with this. The books may be in order as the audit committee so stated; however, our financial condition is not particularly healthy at this time. The status of the association's funds at the close of business for the calendar year 1974 realizes total assets of $2,639.13. Total receipts for 1974 was $737.13. Total expenditures for the Duluth conference--the one held in Minnesota last year--was $839.28. So you can see that even though the expenditures were minor in Duluth, it still exceeded our income. We do have a certificate of deposit in the amount of $1,200.00 which was renewed with the First National Bank, Pratt, Kansas, at 6% interest. The balance of the 1974 cash account forwarded to this year for use by the state of Minnesota amounted to $599.85. Internal Revenue Service income tax exemption form 990 was prepared and submitted.

Now into 1975. The status at this time, as of this particular date today, realizes total assets of $2,254.85 which includes 75 dues from 13 states and 3 provinces. No expenditure claims have been made on the 1975 cash balance.

The official ledger showing receipts and expenditures has been made available to the audit committee, and they have made their report. That completes the report. I have copies of this I would like to give to the recording secretary for submission into the proceedings. I have extra copies for anybody who wishes them.

PRES. HARRIS: We had a committee this year working on our financial situation as it relates to our By-Laws and I think Dave Vesall, who is chairman of that committee, is here. He was appointed during last year's meeting by our former president, and they continued to work through this year's sessions. So is Dave here and Dave, will you give your report. I think all the states and the provinces received the proposed amendments to the By-Laws well in advance of the time required by the By-Laws, so that we can vote on whether or not to amend them at this session.

VESALL, MINNESOTA: The ad hoc committee to review the fiscal status of the association was actually purported by Russ Stuart, and as president Chuck Harris said, he asked that we continue. The committ was composed of Pete Petoskey, Larry Gale, Don Johnston, and myself as chairman. We have met once at the North American Wildlife Conference in March, and the committee has had correspondence. Fred Warders is also on the committee, and he has done a good job of furnishing us fiscal information and a fiscal analysis of the organization.

In the order of June 3 memo from Chuck Harris to members of this association, there was set forth a need for--I think this was from the By-Laws Committee actually which I am also chairman of this year--the fiscal status of the organization. As it points out in this memo, the maximum annual income available to the association is $702.00. Last year at Minnesota the cost of printing the proceedings was $839.00. The indications are that we are going backwards a little bit each year financially.

Now we were fortunate in North Dakota. For instance, at Bismarck, Russ Stuart I guess was very cautious and conservative and he spent only $241.00. The amount of funds that various states and provinces can spend for different expenses will probably vary by state and also by their administrative procedures, rules and regulations. But the expenses that could possibly be charged to the association are printing and binding of the proceedings, printing the program, hotel costs, letter and stationery, duplicating machine rental, recording costs, mailing costs, cost of award plaques, contributions, and miscellaneous.

Now the various states of course are able to absorb and have absorbed some of these costs to varying degrees but in talking to representatives of some of the states who will be holding the conferences in the future, they question to what extent they will be able to absorb these costs which I have listed here. So therefore in view of the cost of printing proceedings, inflationary costs of putting on meetings, it is the recommendation of our committee--fiscal ad hoc committee--and also of the By-Laws Committee that the annual dues be raised to $100.00 per member state and province payable in advance at or before each annual meeting.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President if there are any questions as to any of the details of the fiscal standings in the organization, treasurer Fred Warders would be very happy to fill in.

PRES. HARRIS: I think it would be well if the persons representing the several states would come forward and take their places at these tables as we have done in the past for voting purposes. I entertain a motion to approve the amendment to the By-Laws as proposed in the letter that was sent to all members of the association dated June 3, 1975. Can I have such a motion? Then we can get it on the table and discuss it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So moved.

PRES. HARRIS: Have a second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

PRES. HARRIS: It has been moved and seconded; now it is open for discussion. I wonder if the member representatives would come up to the tables and sit down if you think it is necessary. It is the way we have done it in the past. Are there any questions regarding the motion or do you need any further clarification?

I might add that for this conference we were able to cover all of our expenses with the registration fee. Our Director was generous in letting us permit a number of our employees to attend and we asked them to make advance registrations which they did and this gave us some capital to work with prior to the conference. We were able to print the program, purchase the name tags and also print a new supply of stationary this year. We were able to run through this on our own budgeting, so that was not an expense of the association. The registration of $15.00 covered the buses, the dinner last night, the cocktail party Monday night, and all of our additional expenses. We also had to get some name tags made for the award plates. I think with the little bit we have left over, we can pay for those, so the only expense I see at this time to the association will be the printing of the proceedings of the meeting. That is the only thing we will have to tap the treasury for, but even there, I would expect that our printing costs would be at least comparable to what yours were last year in Minnesota. I don't see how it is possible to do it for anything

less. So expecting that our printing costs of the proceedings would be equal to those in Minnesota it would still be more than what our annual income is from dues.

Are there any questions or comments anyone wishes to make regarding this motion? If not, I think this is an important enough item that Mr. Secretary, would you call the roll and all those in favor please signify by saying I.

COLORADO: I.
ILLINOIS:
INDIANA: I.
IOWA: I.
KANSAS: I.
KENTUCKY: I.
MANITOBA:
MICHIGAN: I.
MINNESOTA: I.
MISSOURI: I.
NEBRASKA: I.
OHIO:
OKLAHOMA:
ONTARIO: I.
SASKATCHEWAN:
SOUTH DAKOTA: I.
WISCONSIN: I.

PRES. HARRIS: Motion is carried. The next item on the agenda. I will call for a report of the Awards Committee and that will be by our Vice-President, John Popowski.

POPOWSKI, SOUTH DAKOTA: Thank you, Mr. President. First I would like to acknowledge the assistance of the other members of the Awards Committee, Mike Casey from Minnesota and Izaak Standefer from Oklahoma. The committee and I appreciate also the replies that I had in requests or comments on awards from members of the association.

We have first of all a special award this year that I think is well deserved. It is for an individual that any of you that have spent any time at all around this association are well aware of. I am talking about Walter Scott of Wisconsin. As I think most of you know, Walter recently retired from the Wisconsin Department. Walt is not here this year, and I am not going to go into any great detail on his background. I think you are aware that he put in in the vicinity of 39 years of service with the Wisconsin Department starting in 1934, taking some time out during the war. He served in a wide variety of capacities from conservation officer up through assistant to the director and later to the secretary. I wonder if John Keener would come up and accept this. I would like you John and Les Voigt to present this to Walt at some appropriate time and to express

to him our appreciation for the many years of very dedicated service that Walt put in for both this association and conservation in general. In fact, let me read what it says:

> Walter E. Scott, for his many years of service to the Midwest Association and to conservation in general, July, 1975.

and express our thanks to Walter.

KEENER, WISCONSIN: I am very happy to do this. I'm sure that Walter will appreciate it. John indicated his many years here working with the association. Walter has received many individual awards since his retirement and just prior to his retirement. I'm sure this is one that he will appreciate. Thank you.

POPOWSKI: Thank you, John. We have another award. This is the past president's award which is given to the president that finished his ten year at the end of the last calendar year. Dave, I wonder if you'd come up and accept this award from the association to Bob Herbst of Minnesota, who was president of our association last year, and again I hope that you will find an appropriate time in Minnesota to give that to Bob.

VESALL, MINNESOTA: Thank you very much and I'm sure that Commissioner Bob Herbst will appreciate receiving this award. It's a fine plaque.

POPOWSKI: OK. Hang close and I will give you another one. I have here a certificate of appreciation to Jerome H. Keene who acted last year as Bob Herbst's secretary. Most of you were at Duluth and thoroughly enjoyed that conference and I wish that, Dave, you would present this to Jerry again for the association.

VESALL: John, thanks very much and I'm sure that Jerry Keene, who was one of the workhorses in our department, will very much appreciate receiving this, especially at this time as he is recuperating from open heart surgery. Thank you very much.

POPOWSKI: Now I'll let you lay those down, Dave, and then come on back up. This also is a certificate of appreciation suggested by several people in the association for a guy who also did an awful lot of work and continually does for the association. This is to Dave Vesall for his assistance to the president and the state of Minnesota in organizing the 41st meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners and it is with our thanks for all your work again, Dave.

VESALL: Well, thanks very much. It's been quite a surprise.

POPOWSKI: And that completes the Awards Committee's report, Mr. President.

PRES. HARRIS: Dave, if you give that one that you just received for yourself back to me before you leave, I'll take it back and have your name spelled correctly. We'll take it back and have it corrected and send it to you.

I think it is time for you, Russ, to take over on the resolutions.

STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Thank you, Chuck. Before we begin with the resolutions, I first want to, on behalf of the committee, extend our appreciation to the secretarial staff for the tremendous job that they did and the patience they exhibited while we were not only in committee sessions but in all the typing and retyping and copying that they had to do. Secondly, I want to extend my appreciation to the members of the committee because of the fact they were willing and did start attending committee meetings as early as 7:30 in the morning and at least if they were not feeling too well about it, they did stay until the work was pretty well completed. The Resolutions Committee is perhaps the hardest working committee at any conference that we have. With that, I will get on to the resolutions.

They were passed out, I believe, to all the states and provinces that were in attendance yesterday, and hopefully you had a chance to review them to some degree. If it meets with the approval of the provinces and states, we will not read them. I will give the number and read the title and in some cases there are no titles; if there are no suggested amendments or questions regarding them, we will lay them to one side and act on them as a group. This does not mean that you will not have the opportunity to discuss any one that you so desire. If you do, just make note of the fact. We will lay it on the left hand side, and after we dispose of the bulk of them, we will come back and treat those individually. If this meets with your approval, we'll get on with it.

Resolution 1--Support of the National Animal Damage Control Bills HR 1519 and Senate Bill 1222. Is there any member that wishes to take issue with that or change it in any way? If not, we will go on. I have a tendency to be a little impatient so if I am going too fast, please slow me down.

Resolution 2--Support for Passage of National Aquaculture Development Act HR 370 and S 1117. Anybody want to question that or comment in any way? OK.

Resolution 3--Support for Amendments to Dingell-Johnson Federal Aid and Restoration HR 1534. If you have any suggestions or comments, please indicate as we go along.

Resolution 4--Support for Amendments to Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid and Wildlife Restoration, and there are two bills--HR 13 and S 1294.

Resolution 5--Support of National Fish Disease Control Legislation HR 1083.

Resolution 6--Strengthening U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Role as Biological Arm of the Forest Service.

PETOSKEY, U.S. FOREST SERVICE: Do you take questions from the floor?

STUART: Sure, we'll take questions from the floor, but we won't accept your vote.

PETOSKEY: What is that supposed to mean?

STUART: We'll lay that aside and take it up later on.

Resolution 7--Proposal for Operation Funds for Federal Lakes and Watershed Projects. If any of you in the audience has some question about it or do not understand the intent of the resolution, we will accept your question in regard to that, lay it aside, and then have the sponsor of the resolution discuss it.

Resolution 8--Federal Inspection of Facilities Licensed to Propagate Waterfowl for Release into the Wild for Disease Control Purposes.

Incidentally not all these resolutions came in from member provinces or states of the Midwest. Just after arriving here, I received copies of the resolutions that were submitted and passed by the Western Association which met a week earlier, and we have included some of those resolutions in the group today.

Resolution 9--Animal Disease Control Programs.

Resolution 10--Rescind President's Executive Order 11839 to make certain that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be kept free of political intervention.

Resolution 11--Simplification of D-J and P-R Regulations.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is just a little typographical error in the third paragraph. I think it should be funds instead of fund.

STUART: OK, the second sentence of the third paragraph, if you will add an S to the word fund and make it plural. Any other? OK.

Resolution 12--No title. In that case maybe I should read a portion of the resolve:

> Association to investigate thoroughly the possibility of requesting Congress to amend the basic acts regulating Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson programs to provide direct grants to the states subject to audit and field review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Resolution 13--Dealing with PCBs. You have heard a little bit about them on the program this morning. It's requesting that the association strongly support the action of the Lake Michigan Caustic Substances Committee and likewise recommends to the Environmental Protection Agency institution of a nationwide ban on the importation, manufacture or use of PCBs. Any questions on that? OK.

Resolution 14--Indian Treaties and Indian Hunting and Fishing Rights. Any questions in regard to that?

Resolution 15--This is dealing with the waterbank program and in effect asking for the continuance of the program and that a longer period of time be permitted for sign-up. Dave, you have something.

VESALL, MINNESOTA: There is a question on this one if you want to take it up later.

STUART: OK, I'll set it aside. We'll set aside Resolution 15.

Resolution 16--National Land Use Policy. Any question on that?

Resolution 17--Organic Act for the Bureau of Land Management.

Resolution 18--Extended Jurisdiction and this is dealing with fisheries primarily and requesting Congress to immediately pass legislation adopting a 200 mile economic zone off the coast of the United States in order to conserve and protect this nation's fishery resources. Any questions in regard to that?

Resolution 19--Firearms Legislation. Any question regarding that? OK.

Resolution 20--Fund for Endangered Wildlife. I think you are all aware of the fact that the Endangered Wildlife Act has been passed and authorized for funding but as yet the program has not been funded. Any question regarding that?

Resolution 21--Federal Aid Fund Deferrals. This is something that we have been discussing the last five or six years by this association. Any question in regard to that?

Resolution 22--I'll read the resolve because there is no title:

> That the association of Midwest Fish and Game request that the USDA reconsider the conclusions reached in this report before final publication is prepared.

It's dealing with a report put out by ASCS titled "An Evaluation of the ASCS Pilot Public Access Programs." Some of the states have taken issue with some of the conclusions reached in this report. Any questions in regards to that?

Resolution 23--Federal Relocation Act. I'm sure that any states that have been acquiring land especially on a willing seller basis have run into some problems that are expensive and are very difficult to deal with. Any questions in regard to that?

OK. Would you care to act on that one or would you rather go back to 6 and 15 and act on them in their entirety? What are your wishes?

WARDERS, KANSAS: Aren't you lacking one resolution? No. 24.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move adoption of the resolutions that were laid aside to the right.

STUART: With the exception of 6 and 15 and I believe we are short a resolution. So as moved and seconded. Any discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Before we vote here, I would like to suggest that very soon resolution #18 be produced and forwarded to the Secretary of the International because this deals directly with the mail code that John is conducting now of his board on this legislation which is being discussed right now.

STUART: In the committee hearing, I had marked almost half of these will go to the International. The secretary assured me that they would get at the final drafts of these resolutions, and that they would be submitted. I am acting as chairman of the Resolutions Committee for the International and as soon as I receive them, I'll see that they go to our Washington office and John Gottschalk can distribute them to the other states and provinces.

Any further discussion on the large group of resolutions? If not, all in favor of the motion, signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

STUART: Opposed, same sign. Motion carried.

OK, we have disposed of the bulk of them. We will go back and discuss resolution 6. The state that introduced this, I believe Michigan introduced this. Would you care to speak to the resolution or discuss it. Or is this Minnesota? Oh, it came from the Western so there wouldn't be anybody.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, this did come from the Western and originally came from the Colorado River Wildlife Council. The primary purpose is to strengthen the Fish and Wildlife Service, or the biological arm of the Fish and Wildlife Service. That was the way it was considered and presented and adopted as a resolution.

PETOSKEY: What do you mean by the resolution?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What do you mean what do I mean? I think what we are trying to do is give more money and more status to the Fish and Wildlife Service so they can do the job as the biological arm of the Fish and Wildlife Service and indicate that they are the biological arm and the ones to do the actual work. That was the intent behind it. It was a Utah, New Mexico resolution.

PETOSKEY: You mean Forest Service transfer their monies to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, this applies only to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

PETOSKEY: It discusses the Corps of Engineers and Department of Agriculture in this resolution.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it is primarily the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. They want to review these projects and provide biological evaluations before they are carried out by construction agencies.

PRES. HARRIS: The way I interpreted it is they would give greater attention to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Department of Agriculture mostly as it relates to their land changing programs and gives greater attention to the expertise of the Fish and Wildlife Service in evaluating the effects that those projects may have on the fish and wildlife resources of the nation.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pete, isn't it true though that under Forest Service procedure the Fish and Wildlife Service is recognized officially as the official advisory group to the Forest Service? I believe that is still the policy.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the states.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, the states also. It doesn't conflict with the Forest Service program of wildlife management but does provide the Fish and Wildlife Service is the official advisor.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it applies primarily to the construction agencies and the Department of Interior. We have two of them--no, I'll take that back--we have the Bureau of Reclamation and of course the Corps of Engineers and then as far as the USDA is concerned, you have the construction arm of the Soil Conservation Service under Public Law 566, a small watershed program. I think that is the intent of this resolution to urge that the Corps of Engineers, USDA and USDI consult and get the recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service technical people to a greater extent than they have in the past. At least that is my interpretation of it.

PRES.PRES. HARRIS: I think also is the fact that these other agencies are hiring now and employing biologists and biologists with the Corps of Engineers.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is another thing and this has taken place in my state in several instances and has created some real problems. The Corps has gotten smart or smarter than they have been and they have started going to the universities and contracting with the biology sections in the universities to make an environmental study on a particular project. In some cases, there is no dialogue between these university people and either the Fish and Wildlife Service or the state agency with the result that they come out with something that is not acceptable by the state agency or the Fish and Wildlife Service but here they say, well this is done by a very high caliber group of university people. As they are being hired and paid for by the Corps of Engineers, really in many cases, they will slant the thing the way the sponsor agency such as Corps wants. And this is dangerous, I think.

PETOSKEY: Thank you for the discussion, Russ. I think I recognize the purpose of the resolution.

STUART: Any further discussion?

KEENER, WISCONSIN: I would move approval.

STUART: It has been moved that we approve Resolution 6. Is there a second to that?

POPOWSKI, SOUTH DAKOTA: Second.

STUART: Seconded by Popowski of South Dakota. Any further discussion on it? If not, all those in favor of approving resolution 6 signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

STUART: Opposed, same sign. Motion carried. We have now before us Resolution 15 and somebody brought it up. Dave.

VESALL, MINNESOTA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a little typographical error in first paragraph. But what I wanted to point out in "Now, therefore, be it resolved" you recall in the Resolutions Committee the word minimum was put in. "Sign-up period of a minimum of six months" and "from October to April of each year" was left in there. I think that will have to be deleted now. In some states, the sign-up period might go over six months.

STUART: Would you make that in the form of an amendment to delete.

VESALL: Yes.

STUART: From October to April of each year. Is that your amendment?

VESALL: From October to April.

STUART: OK, from October to April.

VESALL: And of, take the "of" out so it reads "Minimum of six months each year."

STUART: I'll have to have a second before I'll take questions.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

STUART: It has been moved and seconded now.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would that place any burden on any state by not specifying any specific months? Do they want any special time each year for sign-up?

STUART: The gentleman from Michigan will speak to the resolution.

BAILS, MICHIGAN: Arlow Boyce drafted that resolution and I would like to have him explain it.

BOYCE, MICHIGAN: The reason we put the October to April dates in that resolution were the fact that we were running into sign-up periods that were short. They also came at a time when farmers had agricultural crops in and would not participate in the program because it would necessitate disturbing crops that had already been planted or would be harvested, so we put the October to April dates in to make the sign-up period at such a time that it wouldn't interfere with agricultural operations.

VESALL: Mr. Chairman, in Minnesota it has been suggested that the sign-up period could go on throughout the year.

STUART: Does that answer your question?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It answered it, but it still poses a problem. I think we've got a situation where if we put this resolution in the form six months, wouldn't it be better a year? Or Year-round? I'm throwing it up for discussion.

BOYCE, MICHIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that is why we put the word minimum in there. Some states, if they wanted to go year-round, they could. But then we couldn't have the months in there.

STUART: I believe that most states that operate under the waterbank have advisory committees to the state ASCS committee, and I believe in most states again there are members of the state conservation agency sitting on this advisory committee. I believe that I'd go along with Dave on this, that the wordage that is in there now, "a minimum of six months," is giving the individual states the opportunity to take or select a longer period of time or full year if they so desire. But what has happened in some states is that it has been confined to a period of perhaps three months or less.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And three weeks.

STUART: Pardon, three weeks. Yes this is true, and as a result they are not getting the participation because in the first place the information has not been disseminated to the landowners in time for them to come in and sign-up for the program. John.

JOHN: Chairman, in view of Michigan's comments on their reasons for drafting, I don't think it would detract from the resolution to leave the period October to April; it merely qualifies if we are using the minimum six months, it should be between the period October to April which I don't think is restrictive actually.

STUART: Well, we do have an amendment on this resolution, and unless I hear an amendment to the amendment, I'll call for a vote on the amendment and if you are not satisfied with it, you can vote it down. All those in favor of the amendment to Resolution 15, maybe we should have roll on this.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Restate the amendment.

PRES. HARRIS: Yes, restate the amendment.

STUART: Well, the amendment actually deletes "from October to April of." That is part of it and I'll read it with the amendment:

A sign-up period of a minimum of six months each year and designate a minimum of three counties eligible for the waterbank program in each state.

COLORADO: I.
INDIANA: I.
KANSAS: I.
KENTUCKY: I.
MICHIGAN: I.
MINNESOTA: I.
MISSOURI: I.
NEBRASKA: I.
ONTARIO: I.
SOUTH DAKOTA: I.
WISCONSIN: I.

STUART: Motion carried. OK, we found resolution 24. If you people do not have a copy of it, it is short so I will read it.

PETOSKEY, U.S. FOREST SERVICE: I hate to do this to you, Russ but, and it is certainly possibly out of order, but you just voted on the amendment, don't you think you should vote on the resolution.

STUART: Oh, I'm sorry. As I say, I'm impatient. OK, we are now dealing with resolution 15 as amended. Thank you, Pete. Do we have a motion for adoption?

KEENER, WISCONSIN: Motion.

VESALL, MINNESOTA: Second.

STUART: Any discussion on the resolution as amended? If not, all those in favor of the resolution as amended, signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

STUART: Opposed, same sign. Resolution 15 carried. Now, with your permission, Pete, I'll get on to resolution 24. (Read Resolution 24.) And I'll entertain a motion of adoption.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Moved.

STUART: Second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

STUART: There will be no discussion on that. Rather we will have a show of hands for a unanimous vote.

(Complete texts of all resolutions can be found in Appendix C.)

PRES. HARRIS: Very good job. After you have one of these conferences, you kind of appreciate what your predecessors had to go through and all the work they had. It makes it easier though when we have staff people that pitch in. It has been a real pleasure for all of us to have had you here and to have the responsibility for this meeting.

I think the next item on the agenda is is there any old business to be brought up? I think we handled the old business earlier before the association when we adopted the amendment to the By-Laws. Is there any other old business? Is there any other new business to be brought up?

STUART: One more thing that I should have brought to your attention as chairman of the Resolutions Committee and with your indulgence I'll take care of that at this time.

PRES. HARRIS: Sure.

STUART: This does not pertain to any one particular resolution but during the discussions of resolutions, and we did kick out quite a number, there were some dealing with anti-gun legislation and so forth and some of the committee members were suggesting that we do this and that. Well then it boiled down to the discussion of Saturday night specials. And it was suggested, perhaps a definition of a Saturday night special is in order. During the formal sessions nobody came up with any but yesterday a member of the committee did bring one and I will read it. So in future conferences you will have this particular term defined.

The definition of a Saturday night special--an unregistered female loose on Saturday night with a 38 inch bustline saturated with PCB perfume walking a DVE duck on a waterfowl refuge.

PRES. HARRIS: Not being any new business coming forward, I would like to have a report.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman.

PRES. HARRIS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I believe that you also asked the audit committee to consider the need for a change in the By-Laws for our association to become a member of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners. We reviewed the constitution of the International and in our opinion all we would need for formal action would be a motion of some sort, for our Midwest Association to become a formal part of the International Association.

PRES. HARRIS: Would you so move, and then we can get some discussion on that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners become an associate member of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners.

PRES. HARRIS: Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

PRES. HARRIS: Any discussion? I would like to ask this. We were advised by John Gottschalk sometime ago that as far as the International is concerned, that's not necessary; that they already consider us a part of the International without this vote. I think it is up to us. According to John, we are automatically by their changing and it was made in the By-Laws of the International a year or so ago, we automatically became

a member but I think for our official records there is some merit in this motion. Is there any further discussion? You have heard the motion. All those in favor please signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

PRES. HARRIS: Opposed. The motion is carried. Before we get into the nominating committee's report, I'd like to call on our secretary, Gary Boushelle, to give a report on the number of participants and anything else you might like to add, Gary, at this time.

BOUSHELLE: Thanks, Chuck. We had 79 people registered for this conference and that was pretty much what we predicted in our early planning. Also last night at our picnic, despite the little bit of rain we had, we had 110 people that had fish with us.

As a matter of new business, Chuck, I would like to say that I enjoyed serving this past year as secretary to the association; it has been a new experience for me not being associated with many of you except through last year at the annual meeting and this year's work. I find that I have a lot of correspondence coming regarding activities of the association, whether it be how do you get a copy of the proceedings or what do you do, do you have any other types of technical papers and things of this sort. And I would like to project that perhaps with the amount of activity that you do receive being secretary, that maybe this position or a position should be permanently housed similar to Fred Warders who is the treasurer. That would give the association a single mailing address and a corresponding secretary could handle those affairs. That would be my suggestion in addition to the regular secretary appointed by the president. And I would be happy to talk about this with any of you folks if you like and tell you about my past year.

PRES. HARRIS: I think that has some merit. The association does have quite a volume of files and other material that each year has to be moved from one state to another. Dave was gracious enough this past year to bring this over to Lansing one day in a department plane and we will get it over to you, John. But I think it is something that maybe we'd want to appoint a committee for, John, to study the next year the possibilities of establishing a permanent recording secretary in addition to the elected secretary to work with the president in putting on the conference to do the same kind of thing that Fred is doing as far as our money is concerned. I would think this would probably require an amendment to our By-Laws to do that. Russ.

STUART: Would a motion be in order that the amendment to our By-Laws be drafted shortly and mailed.

PRES. HARRIS: Sure.

STUART: OK, I will so move.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

PRES. HARRIS: It has been moved and seconded that a committee be appointed to investigate and come back with recommendations to amending the By-Laws to provide for a permanent recording secretary. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

PRES. HARRIS: Opposed. Motion is carried.

I think the last item on the agenda unless there is some other new business is a report from the Nominations Committee. Dale Haney is not here, but we have Ken Irizawa and I think, Ken, that you are going to make the report for that committee. Right?

IRIZAWA, ONTARIO: News to me.

PRES. HARRIS: News to you?

IRIZAWA: I can ad lib it, I think.

PRES. HARRIS: Dale didn't get to you? Did Dale speak to anyone else about that?

IRIZAWA: He did mention something to me so I think I can.

PRES. HARRIS: Yea, you're the guy.

IRIZAWA: You know, Dale has a funny way of formally asking me to give the report to the committee. He collared me in the hall--what's today, Thursday--on Tuesday sometime and said "Say Ken, you are on the committee and I am acting for Danny Armbrister now I succeeded him." We already have done some backroom work so do you agree with this and I said I sure do. So I will be brief and say that your incoming second vice-president will be John Keener of Wisconsin. Thus ends the report.

PRES. HARRIS: I don't know if that clears up the confusion or not. I am assuming that the Nominating Committee is nominating John Popowski to serve as president for the year 1976, first vice-president will be Willard Barbee of Nebraska, and John Keener as second vice-president for 1976. Are there any other nominations? We will continue Fred Warders as treasurer. Do we have to vote him in every year? I guess we do so we will include that also in the committee's report. Are there any other nominations? If not, then may I have a motion by proclamation that these gentlemen be appointed to these offices for the year 1976.

NOREN, MISSOURI: So moved.

PRES. HARRIS: So moved by Carl Noren. May I have a second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

PRES. HARRIS: Any discussion? All those in favor of the motion of the recommendations of the Nominating Committee, please signify by saying I.

NAMES: I.

PRES. HARRIS: Opposed. I will ask then Carl Noren and I think Willard Barbee to escort the new president that will serve for us beginning in 1976 to the roster. Congratulations, John. I know I am going to turn the gavel over to a real capable individual.

POPOWSKI, SOUTH DAKOTA: Well, thank you very much, Chuck. At the present time, I also would like to introduce the fellow from our department who I am going to have as secretary for the coming year, Chuck Post. Chuck, stand up. As Chuck said, we are going to plan to get together maybe someplace halfway between Michigan and South Dakota to take over all the records that annually transfer between the states involved when the time comes. At the present time, we anticipate that the conference next year will be the week of the 12-16 of July in Rapid City at the edge of the Black Hills. It was there about a dozen years ago. We look forward to next year and having as good a conference next year hopefully as we have had this year. Thanks.

PRES. HARRIS: If any of you have been to the Black Hills, you know that it will be very enjoyable, and knowing John's capability, I'm sure it will be every bit as good if not better than the conference we've had this year. Is there any other business to be brought before the conference?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like to go on record as congratulating Gary and all the work he has done scheduling. I know how it is when you are on a committee. You have to be responsible for everything. We owe him a hand of gratitude.

PRES. HARRIS: We are awarding him by having him play a big part in the International next year. One of the things I'm sure we have gotten out of this meeting is it is going to help us with the momentous task of 1976. We have a little problem facing us right now. Dave Jenkins has been heading that up but he said the hotel we had lined up has gone bankrupt. We don't know if it is going to be operating in 1976. I guess there are a couple of other lodging places in Detroit that evidently have indicated an interest, so I don't think we are going to be caught without a place to meet, but I know that just our experience with this meeting, this is just a sampling of what is going to happen with the American Fisheries Society and the International in the following years. We'll reward Gary with some responsibilities there.

If there is not anything else to bring forward, you have been a wonderful audience. I appreciate your attendance at the meeting. You have been here, you haven't stood out in the hall during the sessions and talk like I do see at some conferences that I go to, and that is greatly appreciated by we who developed the program and the people on the program itself. I think it is a real show of appreciation to those people who did this.

With that I will call the 42nd annual conference of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners adjourned. Thank you.

* * * * * * * * * *

APPENDIX A

ATTENDANCE

Place	Name	Agency Represented
Colorado	Pete Barrows	Division of Wildlife
	Jerry J. Blackard	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Samuel J. Caudill	Division of Wildlife
	Robert L. Evans	Division of Wildlife
	Frank R. Richardson	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Illinois	Absent	
Indiana	William B. Barnes	Dept. of Natural Resources
	George Seketa	Division of Fish & Wildlife
Iowa	Harry M. Harrison	Conservation Commission
Kansas	Fred W. Warders	Fish & Game Commission
Kentucky	Carl E. Kays	Fish & Wildlife Resources Dept.
Manitoba	Absent	
Minnesota	Galen Buterbaugh	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Mike Casey	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Jack E. Hemphill	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Robert A. Hodgins	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Keith Larson	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Del H. Rasmussen	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Dave Vesall	Dept. of Natural Resources
Missouri	P. G. Barnickol	Department of Conservation
	Larry R. Gale	Department of Conservation
	Charles R. Hayes	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Allen C. Hoefelman	Department of Conservation
	Dean A. Murphy	Department of Conservation
	Carl R. Noren	Department of Conservation
	Vernon E. Sievert	Department of Conservation
	Robert F. Wells	Department of Conservation

Place	Name	Agency Represented
Nebraska	Willard R. Barbee	Game & Parks Commission
	Max W. Holden	National Park Service
	H. B. Kuntzelman	Game & Parks Commission
	Linda J. Schrock	Game & Parks Commission
North Dakota	Wilbur J. Boldt	Game & Fish Department
	Russell W. Stuart	Game & Fish Department
Ohio	Dale L. Haney	Dept. of Natural Resources
Oklahoma	Absent	
Ontario	Ken K. Irizawa	Ministry of Natural Resources
	Ken Loftus	Ministry of Natural Resources
Saskatchewan	Absent	
South Dakota	Warren Jackson	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	John Popowski	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Chuck Post	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Rolf Wallenstrom	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Wisconsin	Milton Friend	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	John M. Keener	Dept. of Natural Resources
Washington, D.C.	James L. Baker	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	H. Curt Hammitt	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	William H. Nesbitt	National Rifle Association
	Merrill L. Petoskey	U.S. Forest Service
Michigan Cadillac	Robert Huff	Dept. of Natural Resources
	William Irvine	U.S. Forest Service
Charlevoix	Myrl Keller	Dept. of Natural Resources

Place	Name	Agency Represented
Michigan (cont.)		
Escanaba	DeWayne Campbell	U.S. Forest Service
Lansing	Jack D. Bails	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Ralph I. Blouch	Dept. of Natural Resources
	David P. Borgeson	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Gary Boushelle	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Arlow P. Boyce	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Robert D. Burke	Dept. of Natural Resources
	L. A. Davenport	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Charles J. Guenther	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Charles D. Harris	Dept. of Natural Resources
	David H. Jenkins	Dept. of Natural Resources
	John M. MacGregor	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Samuel A. Milstein	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Vicki L. Robinson	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Warren W. Shapton	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Howard A. Tanner	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Wayne H. Tody	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Henry J. Vondett	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Patricia L. Wagner	Dept. of Natural Resources
	David Weaver	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Douglas Whitcomb	Dept. of Natural Resources
Marquette	Ralph E. Bailey	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Owen J. Bennett	Dept. of Natural Resources
	T. Brad Durling	Dept. of Natural Resources
Roscommon	David A. Dilts	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Nels Johnson	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Jerry L. Manz	Dept. of Natural Resources
	C. Troy Yoder	Dept. of Natural Resources
Traverse City	Robert Odom	Dept. of Natural Resources

APPENDIX B OFFICERS and COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS in 1975

President: Charles D. Harris, Michigan
First Vice-President: John Popowski, South Dakota
Second Vice-President: Willard Barbee, Nebraska
Secretary: Gary Boushelle, Michigan
Treasurer: Fred Warders, Kansas

AUDIT COMMITTEE:

Fred Priewert, Chairman--Iowa
Richard C. Goulden, Manitoba
Dave Vesall, Minnesota

AWARDS COMMITTEE:

John Popowski, Chairman--South Dakota
Milo Casey, Minnesota
I. H. Standefer, Oklahoma

BY-LAWS COMMITTEE:

David B. Vesall, Chairman--Minnesota
Larry R. Gale, Missouri
Fred Warders, Kansas
D. R. Johnston, Ontario
Merrill L. Petoskey, Michigan

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE:

Jack R. Grieb, Chairman--Colorado
Jack Bails, Michigan
Robert L. Herbst, Minnesota
Dave Vesall, Minnesota
Larry R. Gale, Missouri
Les P. Voight, Wisconsin

LIAISON PHEASANT COMMITTEE:

Willard R. Barbee, Chairman--Nebraska
Fred A. Priewert, Iowa

NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

Dale Haney, Chairman--Ohio
Fred Priewert, Iowa
Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario

PRO HUNT COMMITTEE:

Carl R. Noren, Chairman--Missouri
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Fred A. Priewert, Iowa

PROGRAM COMMITTEE:

Arlow P. Boyce, Chairman--Michigan
Larry R. Gale, Missouri
Les P. Voigt, Wisconsin
Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:

Russell W. Stuart, Chairman--North Dakota
Jack R. Grieb, Colorado
Anthony T. Dean, Illinois
Frank Lockhardt, Indiana
Fred A. Priewert, Iowa
Richard Wettersten, Kansas
Arnold Mitchell, Kentucky
Richard C. Goulden, Manitoba
Howard A. Tanner, Michigan
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Carl R. Noren, Missouri
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Dale Haney, Ohio
I. H. Standefer, Oklahoma
Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario
G. E. Couldwell, Saskatchewan
John Popowski, South Dakota
Les P. Voigt, Wisconsin

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE:

Richard Wettersten, Chairman--
Kansas
Carl R. Noren, Missouri
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Anthony T. Dean, Illinois

APPENDIX C

1975 RESOLUTIONS

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

1. Support of National Animal Damage Control Bills (H.R. 1519 and S. 1222)

2. Support for Passage of National Aquaculture Development Act (H.R. 370 and S. 1117)

3. Support for Amendments to Dingell-Johnson Federal Aid in Fish Restoration (H.R. 1534)

4. Support for Amendments to Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration

5. Support of National Fish Disease Control Legislation (H.R. 1083)

6. Strengthening U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Role as the Biological Arm of the Federal Service

7. Proposal for Operation Funds for Federal Lakes and Watershed Projects

8. Federal Inspection of Facilities Licensed to Propagate Waterfowl for Release into the Wild for Disease Control Purposes

9. Animal Disease Control Programs

10. Rescind President's Executive Order 11839 to make Certain that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be Kept Free of Political Intervention

11. Simplification of P-R and D-J Regulations

12. Amendment to the P-R and D-J Acts to Provide Direct Grants to the States

13. Initiate Action to Ban Importation, Manufacture or Use of PCB's

14. Indian Treaties and Indian Hunting and Fishing Rights

15. Support Continuance and Expansion of the Water Bank Program

16. National Land Use Policy

17. Organic Act for the Bureau of Land Management

18. Extended Jurisdiction

19. Firearms Legislation

20. Fund for Endangered Wildlife

21. Federal Aid Fund Deferrals

22. Reconsideration of the Conclusions of "An Evaluation of the ASCS Pilot Public Access Program"

23. Federal Relocation Act

24. Appreciation of Michigan's Hospitality and Excellent Program

RESOLUTION #1

SUPPORT OF NATIONAL ANIMAL DAMAGE CONTROL
BILLS (H.R. 1519 and S. 1222)

WHEREAS, there is a need to establish a national policy relative to the control of predatory and depredating animals; and

WHEREAS, the control programs should be administered by state agencies closest to the problem and most sensitive to the real needs; and

WHEREAS, continuing research is needed at the national level to develop environmentally acceptable methods of animal control and to develop a better understanding of predator/prey relationships; and

WHEREAS, H.R. 1519 and S. 1222 establish national policy, provides federal assistance to the states for animal damage control programs, and authorizes expanded federal research and demonstration projects;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the passage of H.R. 1519 and S. 1222 or similar legislation to assist states in animal damage control programs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #2

SUPPORT FOR PASSAGE OF NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ACT (H.R. 370 and S. 1117)

WHEREAS, there is overwhelming evidence that both the Great Lakes and marine fishery resources of the United States are seriously depleted; and

WHEREAS, the use of aquaculture has been proven as a viable management tool in the rehabilitation of certain fish populations; and

WHEREAS, research and development on fish and shellfish aquacultural techniques is needed to assist the states in their efforts to better manage the fish populations entrusted to them; and

WHEREAS, H.R. 370 and S. 1117 would provide a national program for aquacultural development to assist states and private industry in developing aquacultural facilities and solving related problems such as disease control and hatchery effluent treatment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the passage of H.R. 370 and S. 1117 or similar legislation to assist the states and industry in aquacultural development based on a percentage of the duties collected on foreign fish imports; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these bills be amended in the title to insure that the Great Lakes is specifically included in the title of these bills to make congressional intent clear on the use of these development funds.

RESOLUTION #3

SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS TO DINGELL-JOHNSON FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION (H.R. 1534)

WHEREAS, the Dingell-Johnson Act has been a major source of funds to state fisheries management programs for over 25 years; and

WHEREAS, since the passage of the original act many new items of fishing equipment are now being sold that are exempt from the excise tax which supports the state programs; and

WHEREAS, H.R. 1534 would amend the act to include all the major sport fishing items under the 10 percent excise tax;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the passage of H.R. 1534 which would provide new sources of funds for federal grant-in-aid support to state fish management programs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #4

SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS TO PITTMAN-ROBERTSON
FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

WHEREAS, the Pittman-Robertson Act has been a major source of funding for state wildlife management programs funded on the basis of an excise tax on firearms and ammunition; and

WHEREAS, hand-loading equipment is now used extensively by sportsmen and their component parts of ammunition are not subject to the excise tax; and

WHEREAS, H.R. 1319 and S. 1294 would extend the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act to include an 11 percent excise tax on component parts of ammunition for firearms;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the passage of H.R. 1319 and S. 1294; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #5

SUPPORT OF NATIONAL FISH DISEASE CONTROL
LEGISLATION (H.R. 1083)

WHEREAS, extensive fish hatchery operations in various states are threatened by the transport of diseased fish by private operations; and

WHEREAS, recent experience in the State of Michigan has demonstrated the tremendous losses that can occur when infectious fish diseases such as "whirling disease" infect a state hatchery system; and

WHEREAS, where national legislation solved similar problems in the transmission of disease in domestic livestock; and

WHEREAS, H.R. 1083 would regulate the movement of diseased salmonid fish in interstate commerce, provide for cooperative agreements with the states, authorize disposal and destruction of contaminated fish, and provide compensation for private producers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the passage of H.R. 1083 which would provide a system for national fish disease control; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #6

STRENGTHENING U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE'S ROLE
AS THE BIOLOGICAL ARM OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE

WHEREAS, the National Environmental Protective Act requires federal land administrative and/or construction agencies to prepare environmental assessments and/or impact statements; and

WHEREAS, the various federal land administrative and/or construction agencies have reacted to this need by increasing their biological staffs; and

WHEREAS, this act has caused considerable confusion and concern among state wildlife agencies as to the responsibilities and activities of both the federal and state agencies; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has long been recognized by the state wildlife agencies as the biological arm for the federal services, and is so charged under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; and

WHEREAS, there is presently considerable confusion and duplication;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, does hereby request the Secretaries of the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior and the Chief of the Corps of Engineers to recognize the legal role of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and their responsibilities under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

RESOLUTION #7

PROPOSAL FOR OPERATION FUNDS FOR FEDERAL
LAKES AND WATERSHED PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Federal Government, through the Corps of Engineers and the USDA's Soil Conservation Service, continues to buy more land in the various states for flood control, recreation, and water quality; and

WHEREAS, the state is the logical agency to operate such areas provided they are accessible for public use; and

WHEREAS, states are experiencing problems obtaining adequate funds to carry out current wildlife and non-game programs; and

WHEREAS, the public continues to demand more facilities for outdoor recreation; and

WHEREAS, the state is expected to furnish such facilities and perform needed maintenance thereon;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges that any future federal water-oriented project licensed to a state must be adequately funded with federal monies as direct grants to the state to pay for the operation and maintenance of said projects. Such funds should be made a part of the cost-benefit ratio and calculated for the life of the project.

RESOLUTION #8

FEDERAL INSPECTION OF FACILITIES LICENSED TO PROPAGATE WATERFOWL FOR RELEASE INTO THE WILD FOR DISEASE CONTROL PURPOSES

WHEREAS, waterfowl raised in captivity for release into the wild are subject to a variety of pathological conditions during the rearing process; and

WHEREAS, these birds often intermingle directly or indirectly with wild birds and domestic poultry upon their release through the sharing of common habitat; and

WHEREAS, the mobility and migratory habits of these birds often result in their distribution far from their site of release; and

WHEREAS, the presence of disease stock among them poses a threat to the health and well-being of the wild bird populations this stock is intended to supplement and to domestic poultry that might also be exposed to these birds; and

WHEREAS, these birds are raised in captivity under permits that can be regulated; and

WHEREAS, the confinement of these birds during the rearing process provides a means for health inspection of the birds and the rearing facilities; and

WHEREAS, no present regulations adequately provide for the prevention of introduction of dangerous pathogens into the wild through the intra- or interstate shipment or movement and release of waterfowl reared in captivity; and

WHEREAS, such regulations are both desirable and needed to safeguard the health and well-being of both wildlife resources and the domestic poultry industry;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to develop a cooperative program and appropriate legislation that provides for the inspection of facilities licensed to propagate waterfowl for release into the wild or are engaged in interstate shipment of waterfowl, the testing of these waterfowl for evidence of selected pathogens, and the certification of these flocks as being free of these selected pathogens;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #9

ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROL PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, it is sometimes desirable or necessary to reduce wildlife populations to prevent the establishment or spread of animal diseases in the United States; and

WHEREAS, agricultural interests may be the major beneficiaries of such population reductions; and

WHEREAS, wildlife often may be only peripherally involved in such animal disease problems;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, insists that the appropriate state wildlife agency participate on an equal basis with the USDA in any decision to reduce wildlife populations in the interest of animal disease control, with said state wildlife agency continuing to exercise full jurisdiction and control over resident wildlife; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the USDA reimburse the state wildlife agency for the cost of reducing and/or relocating wildlife in the interest of disease control for the benefit of domestic livestock and poultry; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #10

RESCIND PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER 11839 TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE WILL BE KEPT FREE OF POLITICAL INTERVENTION

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners believes that, in order to adequately protect this nation's fish and wildlife resources, the fish and wildlife profession must be free of political intervention and bias in the gathering of its facts and data, in reaching decisions, and in formulating recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners recognizes that fish and wildlife tradeoffs must ultimately be made at some political level, and believes that these tradeoffs should be made only at the highest levels; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been relatively free of political intervention except at that agency's Washington director level; and

WHEREAS, the President of the United States, Gerald R. Ford, has stated publicly that his policy will be to maintain the integrity of the Civil Service System by not allowing his administration to interfere with the hiring of career civil servants; and

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners believes that Executive Order 11839 is contrary to that stated policy and that this nation's fish and wildlife resources could suffer irretrievable damage as a result of that order;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, recommends and strongly encourages the President of the United States to rescind Executive Order 11839, dated February 15, 1975, amending the Civil Service Rules to Except Certain Positions in Regional Offices from the Career Service; or, to amend or clarify that Executive Order to specifically exclude the position of Regional Directors of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #11

SIMPLIFICATION OF P-R AND D-J REGULATIONS

WHEREAS, the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts providing federal aid in wildlife and fish restoration have been in effect since 1937 and 1950, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the P-R and D-J rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior were designed to ensure that the several states would develop fish and wildlife programs which included activities eligible for financial aid through these acts; and

WHEREAS, over the years the states have developed operative fish and wildlife programs which include activities that would qualify for funds in excess of the apportionments available to them annually through these Acts; and

WHEREAS, restrictive detailed and extensive rules and regulations applying to project documentation, accounting and reporting results in an inordinate amount of paper work; and

WHEREAS, compliance with the existing rules and regulations requires, in many cases, extensive and duplicated expenditures in time and money which detract from the accomplishment of fish and wildlife programs;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, requests the Secretary of the Interior to simplify the rules, regulations and program requirements documented in the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Manual to conform in principle to those followed by the state forestry departments participating in the Clark-McNary Act, whereby cost accounting and reimbursements are based on an annual spending plan prepared in sufficient detail to determine the amount of money to be expanded in eligible activities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Grants-in-Aid Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #12

AMENDMENT TO THE P-R AND D-J ACTS TO
PROVIDE DIRECT GRANTS TO THE STATES

WHEREAS, the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts have provided lasting benefits to the nation's hunters and fishermen; and

WHEREAS, both programs were well conceived and are effectively administered by the states; and

WHEREAS, the states have played a key role in assuring that maximum benefits have been obtained with limited funds; and

WHEREAS, recent trends in federal grant management places increased reliance on the states and every state has developed the expertise to administer P-R and D-J grants-in-aid fund programs adequately and properly;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners to investigate thoroughly the possibility of requesting Congress to amend the basic acts regulating the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson programs to provide direct grants to the states, subject to audit and field review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Grants-in-Aid Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #13

INITIATE ACTION TO BAN IMPORTATION,
MANUFACTURE OR USE OF PCB'S

WHEREAS, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) are closely allied to dichlorodiphenyl trichloroethane (DDT), similarly are persistent in nature and there is substantial evidence that PCB's interfere with the production of viable eggs from at least northern pike and salmon in Lake Michigan and its tributary waters; many fish species including large salmon, lake trout and catfish are so contaminated that they exceed 5.0 ppm PCB's, the current Federal Food and Drug Administration level acceptable for consumer products; and

WHEREAS, despite assurances from the sole United States manufacturer that their sales are now limited to so-called closed systems involving large electrical transformers and capacitors, foreign imports of PCB's and PCB-contained products continue in widespread use in a wide variety of products and utilized in many industrial processes making environmental control through traditional effluent standards virtually impossible; and

WHEREAS, non-persistent substitutes are readily available for major PCB uses, prohibition of use would not cause any significant disruption in our nation's industries, and despite the fine cooperation of many major industrial users who have switched to alternative materials, PCB contamination of many waters remains at the same high level first recorded in 1969; and

WHEREAS, experience with persistent contaminants such as DDT and methyl mercury has shown that once new inputs are halted, contaminant levels in the environment decline; and

WHEREAS, previous independent action at the state level concerning the contaminant DDT and mercury did draw national attention to the environmental problems their use produced, resulting in eventual nationwide controls;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that for protection of fish and wildlife resources the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, does strongly support the action of the Lake Michigan Toxic Substances Committee and likewise recommends to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) institution of a nationwide ban on the importation, manufacture or use of PCB's; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in the event the Environmental Protection Agency fails to act immediately to control the use of this pernicious chemical, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners urges that its member states initiate action to ban the use of PCB's on an individual basis through either an administrative or legislative process whichever brings the most rapid and effective cessation of use; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION # 14

INDIAN TREATIES AND INDIAN
HUNTING AND FISHING RIGHTS

WHEREAS, recent Federal Court decisions relating to Indian treaties and Indian hunting and fishing rights have provided extraordinary rights to Indian beneficiaries of these treaties; and

WHEREAS, it is well known and accepted that, pursuant to a June 1924 Act of Congress, all Indians are citizens of the United States and the State in which they reside, and possess all rights, privileges and protection held in common with all citizens; and

WHEREAS, many citizens feel that whatever rights, privileges and immunities are enjoyed by Indian citizens arise from and should not extend beyond those held in common by all citizens which is clearly spelled out by the 14th Amendment to the Constitution; that equality of law is the essence of citizenship and none may be afforded special privileges or immunities, and are convinced that Congress will soon have to determine whether they wish to see a special minority society in this country or whether they desire equal treatment of all citizens; and

WHEREAS, these extraordinary rights are creating a threat to the legitimate conservation interests of the state relating to the fisheries and wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, unless this extraordinary right is modified by the Congress of the United States, the fish and wildlife resources will be in serious jeopardy; and

WHEREAS, the directors and commissions of natural resources of the sundry affected states have consistently maintained that nondiscriminatory regulation of hunting and fishing is necessary and reasonable to assure the conservation and wise utilization of the resources for the present and future enjoyment of not only Indians but all citizens;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, finds that only the Congress has the authority to cancel or mitigate treaty provisions, and urges Congress to study all existing Indian treating to determine changes necessary to achieve the goal of equal rights for all its citizens and to assure protection of fish and wildlife resources; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #15

SUPPORT CONTINUANCE AND EXPANSION OF
THE WATER BANK PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Water Bank Act (P.L. 91-559 of 1970) was enacted to preserve wetlands in danger of being converted to other uses; and

WHEREAS, the short annual sign-up period (2-3 weeks) designated by the USDA does not permit many interested landowners the opportunity to participate; and

WHEREAS, the limiting of the Water Bank Program to one county in Michigan and comparable limitations in other states does not provide the flexibility needed to take full advantage of the program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, requests the USDA to establish a sign-up period of a minimum of six months each year and designate a minimum of three counties eligible for the Water Bank Program in each state; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture and the chairmen of the U.S. House of Representative and Senate Agriculture Committees, and also to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #16

NATIONAL LAND USE POLICY

WHEREAS, legislation was introduced recently during the 93rd Congress to establish a national land use policy and to authorize grants to assist states in development and implementation of land use programs; and

WHEREAS, the legislation was passed by the Senate, but was stalled by parliamentary procedures in the House; and

WHEREAS, if passed, the act would have coordinated planning efforts on federal and non-federal lands;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges Congress to enact legislation to establish a national land use policy and coordinate with the states planning on federal and non-federal lands.

RESOLUTION #17

ORGANIC ACT FOR THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Land Management administers more than 465 million acres, or over 60 percent, of all federal land; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Land Management lacks the necessary authority to effectively manage, protect and develop those lands; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Land Management is the only major federal land management agency lacking such authority;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges Congress to enact legislation to provide an Organic Act for the Bureau of Land Management including authority to maintain a productive environment for fish and wildlife; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #18

EXTENDED JURISDICTION

WHEREAS, foreign nations are intensively exploiting stocks of marine fish adjacent to the United States coast and over our continental shelf; and

WHEREAS, these vessels are not subject to state regulations designed to conserve our fishery resources; and

WHEREAS, this harvest is conducted concurrently with a United States fishery which is closely regulated to protect these same stocks; and

WHEREAS, many stocks have been overexploited by these high seas fisheries and such overexploitation demonstrates the conservation need for close regulation and supervision of foreign nations; and

WHEREAS, management of many coastal species requires coordinated regulation between states; and

WHEREAS, under an extension of jurisdiction it will be necessary to define state and federal responsibility for management of fishery stocks beyond the territorial waters; and

WHEREAS, such management must be coordinated so that each species is managed by a single authority; and

WHEREAS, management should be accomplished at a regional level for maximum input from a local level;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, requests the Congress to immediately pass legislation adopting a 200-mile economic zone off the coast of the United States in order to conserve and protect this nation's fishery resources; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Association urges that legislation include an appropriately funded management institution to designate and coordinate state and federal responsibilities for marine fish management programs to collect basic information from the fishery resource and to define responsibility for regulatory authority by establishing regional management councils made up of the appropriate state or states and the Federal Government; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #19

FIREARMS LEGISLATION

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners shares the concern of all America's citizens over increasing crime rates and additional restrictions being imposed on the rights and privileges of our people; and

WHEREAS, the member states of this Association have primary responsibility as conservators of their state's wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, in fulfilling this responsibility the member states have dealt at good length with firearms-related recreation and with firearms owners; and

WHEREAS, it has been shown that the vast majority of firearms owners and users are concerned, respectable and responsible individuals; and

WHEREAS, there presently are many broad proposals at the local, state and federal level, which would arbitrarily deprive or unreasonably hinder the legitimate possession, usage and enjoyment of many types of firearms; and

WHEREAS, such broad and restrictive proposals presently do not clearly identify the types of firearms that need to be controlled or removed from private ownership in order to substantially reduce the incidence of firearms-related crimes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, vigorously opposes all firearms-related legislative proposals which would restrict the possession and free use of firearms by all law-abiding citizens until such time that such crime-related firearms are unmistakably identified and categorized; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Association strongly supports any firearms legislation which is directed at the illegal or improper use of firearms and particularly that which attaches strong, mandatory sanctions against those who are found guilty of committing such acts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #20

FUND FOR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE

WHEREAS, H.R. 7009 requires purchase of a $5.00 federal stamp prior to hunting, fishing, or trapping on federal lands, such monies to be used for endangered wildlife; and

WHEREAS, the hunter and angler already carry the burden in financing fish and wildlife programs through license fees and excise taxes which benefit all wildlife including endangered species; and

WHEREAS, the general public has expressed great concern for the plight of endangered fish and wildlife and has become progressively more demanding in seeking protection for such species; and

WHEREAS, the National Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1973 already provides for grants-in-aid to states for non-game management, although no appropriations have been made;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, opposes H.R. 7009 and as an alternative recommends appropriations for implementation of the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1973.

RESOLUTION #21

FEDERAL AID FUND DEFERRALS

WHEREAS, in a special massage to the Congress, on July 1, 1975, President Ford has reported deferrals of federal funds under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, which includes the deferral of $27,800,000 of Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson funds; and

WHEREAS, these deferrals are of funds collected specifically and earmarked for Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration; and

WHEREAS, the justification for the deferrals are based on a forecast inability of the states to match these funds; and

WHEREAS, the mechanics of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts provide for any temporary or local contingencies that might develop to make these funds available for other approved fish and wildlife restoration projects; and

WHEREAS, the need for these funds is critical and increasing at this time; and

WHEREAS, these deferrals can only temporarily mask deficiencies in other areas of the federal budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, respectfully but urgently requests that the President reconsider and restore the deferrals to the states for the purposes described as the intent of the Congress by the Pittman-Robertson and the Dingell-Johnson Acts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #22

RECONSIDERATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF
"AN EVALUATION OF THE ASCS PILOT
PUBLIC ACCESS PROGRAM"

WHEREAS, the USDA has recently published a report entitled "An Evaluation of the ASCS Pilot Public Access Program"; and

WHEREAS, several of the conclusions reached in this report cannot be substantiated from the data included in the report; and

WHEREAS, the USDA plans to give a condensed version of this report wide distribution; and

WHEREAS, this report would be extremely damaging to any state wildlife agency attempting to establish an access program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, request that the USDA reconsider the conclusions reached in this report before a final publication is prepared; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the chairmen of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate Agriculture Committees, and to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION #23

FEDERAL RELOCATION ACT

WHEREAS, state game and fish agencies have limited funds for the purchase of habitat; and

WHEREAS, Public Law 91-646 severely restricts the purchase of land for fish and wildlife purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, urges the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 91-646 so that it does not apply when transactions are between a conservation agency and a willing seller for fish and wildlife purposes.

RESOLUTION #24

APPRECIATION OF MICHIGAN'S HOSPITALITY
AND EXCELLENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners was held in Traverse City, Michigan, July 21-24, 1975; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources served as the host agency;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 42nd Annual Meeting this 24th day of July, 1975, at Traverse City, Michigan, wishes to express appreciation to the State of Michigan; to C. D. Harris, President; and to the staff of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources for their hospitality and excellent program.