

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH & WILDLIFE AGENCIES



48 th ANNUAL MEETING
DES MOINES, IOWA
JULY 13 - 15, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Welcome	
Carolyn Wolter, Chairman	1
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Opening Address	
Larry Wilson, Director	4
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Orientation to Iowa	
Richard Bishop	6
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Wild Turkey Restoration	
Terry Little	9
Iowa Conservation Commission	
White Amur	
Larry Mitzner	18
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Law Enforcement Research	
Jerry Hoilien	24
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Update: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
Jim Gritman	32
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
Report on Private Lands Management Symposium	
Al Farris	35
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Youth Fishing Clinics	
Tom Putnam	39
Iowa Conservation Commission	
Iowa County Conservation Boards	
Pat Meade	43
Johnson County Conservation Board	
How Private Citizen Groups See Fish and Wildlife Management Agencies	
Panel	48
Ron Sutphin - Des Moines Izaak Walton League	
Chuck Mills - Iowa Wildlife Federation	
Gladys Black - Ornithologist	
Gerry Schnepf - Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation	
Business Meeting	63
Treasurer's Report	Appendix
Attendance List	Appendix
Resolutions	Appendix

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND
WILDLIFE AGENCIES
Hotel Ft. Des Moines
Monday Morning, July 13, 1981

Al Farris: I finally got to use the gavel after carrying it around for a year. Thank you, and welcome to Iowa. We arranged some especially hot, humid weather for those who are not used to it. We figured you would want to see it while you are in Iowa, because it is so typical of the state. Those of you who are used to it, we did not want to make you feel like you were really gone away from home so you would be homesick. I kept telling the people I met this morning that I hope it is not like this tomorrow afternoon because it is going to be a little hot at Living History Farms. However, we will try to have some cool refreshments at Walnut Woods that will hopefully pick you up a little bit after that tour. I have a few announcements to make before we get started with our program. Ed Hansen is the chairman of the Resolutions Committee. If you have resolutions you want that committee to consider tomorrow morning, please give them to Ed so that he can ponder them this evening and have them ready to go tomorrow morning when the committee convenes. Also, there will be a reception this afternoon at 5:30, in case any of you were wondering about that. I do have the room number now, it is Room 712. You might want to note that. I will announce it again when the time gets closer. Also at this time, I would like to take an opportunity to introduce the staff members of the Iowa Conservation Commission that are here so that if you have any questions about Des Moines, about Iowa, you need some assistance with something, they are going to be able to help you. I will start back here. Bob Barratt, head of the Wildlife Section; Richard Bishop, Wildlife Research Supervisor; Don Bonneau, Fisheries Research Supervisor; Marion Conover, Fisheries Management Supervisor; Jim Mayhew, Superintendent of Fisheries Section; Don Cummings, Wildlife Management Supervisor; Arnie Sohn, in charge of the Planning staff in the central office; and the rest of them I think are going to be on the program. There will be some more of them shuffling in and out of here and please, if you have any questions or you need anything, get a hold of one of them and let them know right away.

Well, today our official welcome is going to come from Carolyn Wolter who is the chairman of our Commission. Iowa has a long history of having lady Commissioners, and I know I am going to get myself in trouble with that word lady, because she is already given me hell for using the word ladies on the ladies program. But, I believe she is a lady and, so, I use it in reference to her. We have two women on our Commission, have had for quite a while now. We have had women on the Iowa Conservation Commission clear back to almost in the thirties, the time the Commission was formed from the old Fish and Game Commission and the old Parks Commission. They work as hard, if not harder, than anyone else on that Commission and we are very proud of them. I would like to ask Carolyn Wolter to welcome you to the state of Iowa. Carolyn.

Welcome to Iowa
Carolyn Wolter, Chairman
Iowa Conservation Commission

Carolyn Wolter: Thank you, Al, I think. Good afternoon. I was going to address ladies and gentlemen, however, I do not see any ladies in the audience so, good afternoon gentlemen, Mr. Wilson, and President Farris. Having seen several of you in such far-flung places as Vancouver, British Columbia, and Columbus, Ohio, over the years, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome you to the state of

Iowa on behalf of the Iowa Conservation Commission and the people of this state. I hope your stay will be pleasant as well as informative. I am certain that Al and his staff will do everything possible to make this a memorable stay for you. For those of you who are returning to Des Moines after any period of time, you will be immediately struck by all the activity in our downtown area. We are really a community on the go. All this construction prompted an amusing billboard not too long ago by the Southside Chamber of Commerce. It announced in several foot-high letters that downtown Des Moines was closed for repairs. As I stand before you today, it is with a sense of amazement that I realize that it was almost exactly eight years ago that Governor Robert Ray asked me to serve on the Iowa Conservation Commission. These years have flown past, and I must say, they have always been dynamic and exciting. We can take nothing for granted in the field of natural resources management. Some of us thought things were tough when Nixon impounded soil conservation funds in the early 70's. Now, we are faced with tremendous cutbacks and financial losses on both the state and federal levels. Just this weekend, we read with dismay of the untimely end of the Missouri River Basin Commission on September 30 of this year, and the planned phase-out of the Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission by the end of the year. We, in Iowa, have gone from generous appropriations to the Conservation Commission in the early to mid-70's to what is presently a subsistence budget on the state level. We are determined that this be only a momentary setback. Just recently, our staff presented to us a list of some of the issues to be faced here in Iowa in the 80's. I am certain that many of you are confronted by many of the same issues as well as some unique to your own states. I thought I would take advantage of this time here this afternoon to share some of these with you. As most of you are aware, we are an umbrella agency including parks, forestry, and public waters as additional responsibilities. Therefore our issues may be broader-based than those of a strictly fish and wildlife nature, but they are surely interlocking. The issues presented to us have been categorized into three different areas. The first one is entitled "Administrative and Operational Issues". There are four areas identified for further consideration. These are inadequate funding resulting from decreased federal assistance, decreased state appropriations, inadequate revenue sources, and inflationary effects on available funds. I am sure all of you here face those same problems, with the possible exception of the state of Missouri. Another area we would like to look at is improved public relations to develop better awareness and support for conservation and outdoor recreation programs. I see this area as crucial to everything we do. There are also organizational and operational modifications to improve the delivery of conservation and recreation law enforcement services. We have just recently entered into a reorganization to permit more effective usage of our conservation enforcement services. Organizational and administrative improvements to deal with current needs and to optimize the productivity of commission program operations. That is the kind of goal that is really hard to deal with.

The second category of issues is under the heading "Outdoor Recreation Issues". Under this is the following: inadequate facilities and programs for trail-related recreation experiences. This area of trails has been a sore point in the state of Iowa because of landowners' objections to putting abandoned railroad rights-of-ways into recreational trails. Just recently, a private foundation has been able to purchase a 50-mile-long corridor which has become such a political hot potato that the Commission was ordered by the legislature not to expend state funds in the purchase of any of this area. We are also looking at inadequate established areas and programs for wilderness-oriented recreation experiences. We have some problem with that because there are many people who would tell you that Iowa has no wilderness. We also want to look at improved interpretation and outdoor education programs; improved and expanded public access to Iowa's natural

waters and land resource areas; improved recreation facilities and programs on Commission-managed properties consistent with current recreational and environmental needs. We also want to look at a shifting of major recreation demands to more localized levels. You will be hearing tomorrow about Iowa's county conservation boards and the important role they have in assuming much of this responsibility. Lastly, we are looking at additional flat water for boating and fishing. The last category of issues is that of resources in general. They include such concerns as loss of wildlife habitat, identification and protection of Iowa's remaining unique, endangered, or threatened plant and animal resources. Thirdly, the depletion of Iowa's timber resources which have gone from seven million acres to approximately two million acres, protection of wetlands and water areas, improved watershed management or restoration of Iowa's natural and man-made lakes. Another area is improved research and management of nongame resources. We also must consider our border rivers, currently the Missouri River degradation problem and negative environmental impact from federal channelization projects and the proper management and environmental protection of the Mississippi because of increased transportation, commercial, and recreation pressures. And lastly, improved identification, evaluation, and management of the full range of cultural and natural resource features occurring on existing state-owned property. As you have certainly noted, there is nothing startling or innovative about this list, but this is rather a broad-based approach to our problems which should permit some long-range goal-setting as we look at each of these areas more closely. I would like to go back and pick up on two of these which are areas of particular personal interest and concern. They are the nongame program and the interpretive programs. Both of these are currently in operation on a limited basis. There are no substantial funds for the implementation of either one, but they are being implemented nevertheless. Dr. Farris will be able to fill you in on the details of work being done by Dave Newhouse of this staff in the nongame effort. Interpretive programming in the state parks has been a subject of discussion for many years, but has virtually remained in the talking stage until this year when the active support of our new director Larry Wilson, coupled with some enthusiastic field people, has resulted in brochures being printed and programs being carried out. We cannot stand back and say nothing can be done without more money. I think we can provide the public with wanted and needed services by continuing in some cases and changing in others to an attitude of listening, responsiveness, adaptability, and flexibility. These are the same qualities that I, as a commissioner, can ultimately hope for from a staff and they, surely, from us. Most importantly, we must all face the future with a sense of the possible, not the impossible. I would like to close by saying thank you for coming to participate in this program. As someone who has spent eight very good years working with outstanding professionals like yourselves, let me personally applaud all of you for your dedication and hard work. Keep it up. We need you. Thank you.

Al Farris: Thank you very much, Carolyn. I appreciate that and I am sure there is a lot in there that everyone can relate to in their particular state or federal agency. One other member of the Iowa Conservation Commission has just arrived. Mr. Baxter Freese, would you stand up please. Baxter is a new commissioner with the Iowa Conservation Commission. Baxter started July 1, excuse me, May 1, that is right, they changed the law on me. He is from southeast Iowa, a small town of Wellman, he is a farmer. Welcome, I am glad you are here.

Baxter Freese: Thank you.

Al Farris: Well, Carolyn stole a little bit of my thunder there. We do have a new director in the Iowa Conservation Commission. We went for quite a length of

time without a director and I am sure you all remember Carolyn from last year when she was actively seeking a director. I think the Commission did an admirable job in finding a candidate. He happens to come from a very fine state, my home state of Illinois. He worked in the West in the state of Utah for 21 years and has now returned to the heat and humidity of the Midwest. He has been with us since the beginning of January and we are damn glad he is here. Larry Wilson.

Opening Address
Larry Wilson, Director
Iowa Conservation Commission

Larry Wilson: I love this heat and humidity and I am glad you are all back here to share that with me. One thing that I find that really our people in the midwestern states do not differ with our western counterparts and that is that at all conventions and meetings the first row, at least the first row and usually part of the second row, are left vacant. I would like to add my welcome to Des Moines and also to the state of Iowa and while you are here, I would like to encourage you to visit our state capitol complex. I know you do not have a great deal of time, but they have some very beautiful and interesting buildings up there and especially the Historical Society Building. After 21 years in Utah, I am especially attuned to historical buildings or anything of historical significance. Our Conservation headquarters are on the fourth floor of the Wallace State Office Building, and that is one of the newer buildings on the complex, and it is readily noticeable by the unique copper-appearing face to it. There are many things to do here in the city, and I invite you to participate in any of those. I would caution you though, in a little note of humor, to be careful of answering any want ads that might appear in the Register or Tribune that is advertising belly girls and there is more of a story to that that I will not go into right now. But I have viewed this gathering of you people with some anticipation and seen that our issues in the Midwest significantly different than what they are in the West and as Al mentioned, I have spent the last many years in Utah in wildlife resources work and while I have been there I obviously have witnessed and experienced significant biological, environmental management and some political decisions being made. Well, obviously, we are not confronted here with the same western type of problems that we faced in the West such as the M-X location, surface mining regulations, and sage brush rebellion. But we are faced with intense utilization of the land resource here and we usually find this is in conflict with preferred wildlife and fishery uses. Spreading and sprawling urbanization, diminishing areas for wildlife and fisheries and human uses including recreation of the land and attendant ramifications of all of these uses all very obviously are adversely affecting the habitat resources that produce the fish, wildlife, and recreation that we manage. And in my assessment, therefore, while the names and places are different, the game is the same and that is concern over the diminishing wildlife resources that we have in this country. As if the above situation is not significant enough of a task for all of you to face, we are seeing a gradual erosion of support and interest I believe for conservation concerns on the national level. Recent appointments in the Department of the Interior supports this, I believe. The rescission of funds for the 81-82 Land and Water Conservation Program, the dissolution of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, relaxation of OSM regulations, opening of heretofore closed primitive areas and proposed opening of some of the oil-producing areas along the scenic and environmentally-sensitive coast of California further supports my opinion. But do not believe that these concerns are only concerns of the western states where a good portion of those land areas are under federal ownership. To one degree or another, each one of these concerns should and do affect all of us

here. And as a closing example on this matter, I would point out that they in Washington are still struggling and thrashing over the appointment or the selection of a director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. But I have faith in at least our people and in all of you, in your ability to efficiently manage what I see as a diminishing resource. I think I can point out in Iowa, for example, our forest woodlands have decreased from a area of seven million acres down to 2.3 million acres in 1954 and to 1.5 million acres today. Yet, through expert management we have established a turkey program, for example, that yielded a harvest of 1,400 birds this past spring, a record of 22,600 deer were harvested in 1980, and pheasant harvest in 1980 approached 1.5 million birds. At the same time, Iowa has continued in leadership in the production of corn and beans. An effective trout management program has resulted in a seven percent increase each year in angler use on streams in northeastern Iowa. And although limited, comparing northeastern Iowa trout fishery habitat to the western area, this program is becoming more popular every year. An aggressive research and management program with the white amur has caused an increase in fishing pressure on ponds and lakes during the summer months where before shoreline weed problems precluded such fishing use. It has already been mentioned about the recent reorganization changes in our Commission. We have added 15 additional law enforcement officers to the field and two additional supervisors into the field and their responsibilities now are all-encompassing, being responsible for fish, wildlife, water, and navigational enforcement. We have been actively involved in specific law enforcement matters in the past year and been successful in those. My reason for illustrating what we have done, and I am sure each of you have similar examples, is to show that professional conservation management agencies are capable of effective and successful programs in a very complex and intense environment. It is my opinion, therefore, that Midwestern managers enjoy less room, if in fact any room, for error in your management decisions as compared to your western counterparts. I am confident that regardless of public and political influences, professional managers such as yourselves will continue to provide maximum opportunity for the outdoor enthusiast. It is a difficult task and at times a very unappreciated task that you do. But all of you are capable of meeting the challenge successfully. I congratulate you on that and wish you a successful 48th annual meeting. Thank you.

Al Farris: Thank you, Larry. I appreciate that vote of confidence. I really do, and I am going to take it that way because I think that is the way it was meant. Well, you know, when I first started as a biologist for the Iowa Conservation Commission, I lived in the little town of Russell in southern Iowa. It is not too far from Missouri and had a lot of Missouri flavor to it. Things were slower and easier, those folks ate meat and potatoes all of the time. We had a bridge club with the game warden, the local management biologist, myself, a research biologist, and one farmer. We would get together once a month and play bridge and drink a little beer. We were not very good bridge players, we were better at drinking beer than we were at playing bridge. But we had a tradition that whosever house you were at, it was their responsibility and their complete right to serve whatever food they wanted. Well, the game warden and the biologist hated hot food. They just could not tolerate anything that was spicy hot. Well, since we lived in the state of Washington for a while, my wife taught in a HEP program which was a program for children of migrant workers, I got so I liked Mexican food very well and I liked hot Mexican food. So at my house we had hot Mexican food and I tell you old Jack and Rick, they would sit there and they would eat it and they would bitch and the sweat would just roll off of them. And they always complained about it, and I said, well, boys, the rules of the bridge club are when we are at my house we eat what I want and when we are at your house we eat what you want. Well, when I started putting this program together I looked back a

little bit over other programs and I thought about what we had done in other states and I decided I would follow the same rule here, that when you are here, we put together a program that reflects my philosophy of what this meeting ought to be and I think this meeting is an opportunity for the professional fish and wildlife people of the Midwest, state and federal, to get together to know each other, and to pick up some ideas from one another. Share common problems and perhaps look for solutions. That is the reason I structured the program the way it is. I have tried to target some areas that I think we are doing that may be beneficial to you, may stimulate an idea in your mind, may give you something to take home to your agency. Last year when we were in Ohio I remember distinctly on their program was a presentation about the use of video tape equipment and what they were doing in education and it just so happened that at that time we were debating whether or not to buy video tape equipment in the Iowa Conservation Commission and try to use it in a similar way. That presentation convinced me that it was the right way to go and the right thing to do. Now we may not provide any answers like that for you today, but I hope we will somewhere in our program. I think if we create better communication between ourselves or between the Fish and Wildlife Service or if we give you one idea at this conference, it will be well worth it. One other thing I like to do when I go to another state, I like to learn a little bit about that state. One thing I hate to do is fly into Pittsburgh, get off the airplane, ride the cab to the hotel, be there for three days, get back in the cab, go back to the airport and take off, and that is all you know about Pennsylvania. So, what I like to do is, I like to learn a little bit about each place I go and visit. So I have asked Rich Bishop to put together a general overview or an introduction to Iowa so that you will hopefully catch a little bit of the diversity and a little bit of the flavor of Iowa. Richard.

Iowa Orientation
Richard Bishop

Richard Bishop: Thank you, Al. You have been welcomed to the state of Iowa which is basically a state of agriculture. I think that most of you that drove, many of you probably came down on Interstate 80 one way or the other, if you did you had the opportunity to see lots of agriculture in action. We are paying for our corn and bean production. There are about 56,300 square miles of the state of Iowa. Our population is roughly 2.9 million. Des Moines was actually set up as a military station in 1843 at the confluence of the Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers. It was incorporated in 1851 and in 1857, it was coined the capitol of Iowa. It now has in the 1980 census up to 191,000 people. That is down slightly from the 1970 census which gave us 204,000 people. Now that is Des Moines proper, the suburbs would make up considerably more people than that. As you know, we are known for agriculture. Once we had a good mixture of small grains, alfalfa, corn and soybeans. This has changed. We have switched to largely row crop agriculture, especially in what once was the Wisconsin lobe glacier which created the very fine area to grow crops. We are number one in corn production as of a year ago with 1.5 billion bushels of corn. We beat Illinois apparently. We also have 322 million bushels of soybeans produced, which was a leading producer a year ago, to say nothing of our production of cattle and hogs. We owe a lot of this to the fine prairie that once covered a good share of Iowa. Over the thousands of years, this prairie litter added to the soil structure to provide one of the best agricultural areas in this country. We do have a few trees, you may not have seen many of them, there are a few here. It is very interesting that when this country was settled only about 15 percent of Iowa was in timber, and it was significant in the settling of the state because when early settlers came across Iowa, they needed fuel for their campfires and for cooking and that sort of thing, and so

they tended to follow the river valleys which had the majority of the timberland and also providing water, wild game for food, and thus our state tended to be settled along these major river systems. Also, in the early settling days, farmers who came wanted to be close to timber as well as for fuel and for wood for structuring houses. They also needed fenceposts to fence the land in and so they did not want to get too far from the timber. It was noted that in those early years, the first settlers thought the prairies were very sterile areas because they would not grow trees. I guess they did not understand the role of fire in those days. Well, we have now lost a lot of that timber. We now have around four percent in timberland or about 1.5 million acres. We are striving to protect as much of that as we can. In the area that was once the golden area for pheasant hunting in north-central Iowa you see what agriculture has done. We do raise a lot of corn and beans, but it does have a cost. But I hope that you realize that Iowa is not all agriculture. We do have some unique areas and I will just try to jump you around the state and highlight some of these. Minnesota and Wisconsin did not steal all the nice timber and field areas. We do have northeast Iowa, a very scenic area. We have some trout streams as well as many wooded hills and bluffs. We have a nice population of ruffed grouse as well as deer and turkey in that area. On our eastern border along the Mississippi River, which is one of the finest recreational areas that you could find anywhere, you can find excellent fishing, hunting, boating, camping, and swimming. Also it is well-known for its commercial value for hauling grain southward, also hauling fertilizer and petroleum products upriver. We follow that river southward from our northeast part of the state. We will go into the southern area where we have a mixture of hills, grassland, and row crop agriculture. Some of you in wildlife will see that it is kind of a design we might choose for our wildlife management. We have food, we have some water areas, there are a lot of farm ponds constructed in that area. You also see many brush patches growing in that area. That is what makes good wildlife and in southern Iowa we have some of the finest mixed agricultural and wildlife areas that you can find. Going westward across the southern portion of the state we hit the rolling hills that flank the Missouri River valley. These are the Loess Hills, and if you watch the tape it is a windblown soil. This formation is only equaled, they say, in China. It is a very extensive ridge of windblown soil all along that Missouri River valley. We are presently trying to secure considerable ownership in those Loess Hills. Well, that is the Mighty Missouri. It is kind of a troubled area in the state. I guess it has been that way for many years. April 1, 1865, the Bertrand had trouble navigating up this river. It now has been put into a museum at DeSoto Bend Natural Wildlife Refuge. The Missouri had changing channels which made travel difficult up the river. Well, we solved that problem. The Corps of Engineers decided to make a nice big drainage ditch out of it and so consequently I think that is about what we have. But in the meantime, we have lost a lot of wildlife habitat along this area. To compound that, the varying channel has changed property boundaries, both state boundaries and private boundaries, and even recently we are having some of our native Americans challenge that ownership politically. The old Iowa once had roughly six million acres of wetlands, marshes, and shallow lakes, interspersed with tallgrass prairie. Considerable area which once was a very famed waterfowl production as well as hunting area. They used to have trains come from Chicago hauling people to northwest Iowa to the vicinity of Ruthven to hunt ducks. We have lost much of that because of the quest for additional ground for agriculture and the richness of this prairie growth as well as our marshes. We have drained about 95 percent of our wetlands. We have about 37,000 acres which we have control over by keeping it in public ownership. Other areas of the state have some very picturesque interior streams. About 6,600 miles of major warm-water streams in Iowa along with about 260 miles of cold-water streams and 619 miles of border rivers. This provides a lot of recreational opportunities for canoeing and

fishing. We also have several natural lakes, around 33,000 acres in all. The main lakes are Clear Lake, East and West Okoboji, and Spirit Lake, and they do get a lot of use. I happened to live on Clear Lake for around 15 years and it was a very pleasant place to live. I hated to leave it. In a summer like today you would see a lot of boating use, a lot of activity. However, after the main portion of the season's over with I think you can go out and find yourself fairly isolated. Until just a few years ago, it had some of the best walleye fishing. We had a serious winterkill in that lake and so we are in the rebuilding stage now. But like I said we do have intense public use on these lakes at the right time of the year. We have an excellent park system. Therefore, roughly 66 state park and recreation areas around the state covering around 51,000 acres. That may not be a lot to some of the other people, but in the state of Iowa with a lot of agriculture we feel it is a pretty good amount. A variety of use takes place on these state parks--camping, picnicking, horseback riding, in the winter snowmobiling, and the like. We have a good farm pond program for fishing. Our major stocking is bluegill, channel catfish, and largemouth bass. We have roughly 80,000 farm ponds in Iowa mostly in the southern part of the state. Not all of those are stockable, however, but you see we have a sizable potential. Our wildlife program constitutes a balance of a variety of public areas from grasslands to timberlands to wetlands. We have fairly productive areas that have this balance along with agriculture that provides a good food base which makes those turkeys grow big. There is one of our marshes, although we have lost most of them, we still have some fine areas that we produce a number of ducks, especially in years like this. It is like the prairie, our marshes are more than apt to be full, we have our rain, and production is very high. Along the Missouri River, we have a large concentration of snow geese, which you may or may not know. In the fall, we commonly will peak at a quarter million snow geese along our areas including DeSoto Bend, down to the Riverton area and Forney's Lake. We have roughly 260 state wildlife areas with slightly over 300,000 acres in those wildlife areas. Larry already told you we harvested about a million and a half rooster pheasants last year. We are known for our pheasant hunting. We do not have those large populations or clouds of pheasants like there used to be. But what we do have is, we have pheasants in about all areas of the state. I would say that in most cases you could find a rooster pheasant within walking distance from any community in the state. I think this is what has given us our or maintained our large harvest. Iowans no longer go to northern Iowa for our fine pheasant hunting, we have switched to east-central as well as south-central and southwest Iowa. We have roughly about 265,000 licensed hunters. We have had a deer program since the 30's. Very few deer occurred in the state in the past. Today we are at the point where we have deer commonly in all areas of the state and we had our highest harvest ever of about 22,600 deer. We have roughly 77,000 gun hunters and 15,400 bow hunters. Terry might talk a little bit on the turkey program. But turkeys are a very fantastic program. We have exceeded I think all of our expectations. Now Missouri claims a little part of our success because they gave us our first big start. I think we all knew what we were up against. We harvested over 1,400 turkeys this last spring. We are fixing to have a fall season. We are kind of excited about that; however, our timing has not been good. This is probably one of our poorest production years that we have experienced. But, we feel we can look forward to a good fall season. Just to touch bases, we do have some other varieties of hunting as well as other types of fishing that I have not touched upon. We do have a variety of small game hunting, very fine ruffed grouse hunting in northeast Iowa. In fact we have a place that the four of us will commonly have 50 flushes a day. We have a good harvest in northeast Iowa. We also have gray partridge. Harvested around 70,000 of those birds a year ago

and they are primarily in north-central and northwest Iowa. They have been expanding eastward and southward at a fantastic rate, and we do not know where that is going to end up. We have a multitude of small game and we harvest over 600,000 rabbits, 850,000 squirrels and by and large those populations are untouched. Great-horned owls beat us on the rabbits, I am sure. Well, that is just a brief summary of the state of Iowa. I just did not want you going home thinking that Iowa was just nothing but a big cornfield. I know some of you realize it is not because I think you have enjoyed some of our hunting opportunities here. There are also about half a million quail harvested and I think that will go up again this year. It has been down because of a serious blizzard three winters ago. Think you all realize that Iowa is probably the place that really tests the aspect of agriculture and wildlife. My biggest problem in the fall, as well as a lot of other people, is just where do we go and what do we want to hunt. We do not have enough time to take advantage of all the opportunities we have. Our biggest problem right now is wondering what to go after and we are afraid we are going to miss some waterfowl hunting if we go after ruffed grouse, pheasants, or something like this. That is kind of an interesting dilemma to be in. But we are approaching the time where the habitat loss is going to be more significant than what it has been in the past. Iowa is going to be that true test. If we could pass on only a portion of the hunting and fishing and outdoor recreation that we enjoy today to our children, the Iowa conservation programs will be of immense success. Thank you.

Al Farris: Anything else related to Rich? A few years ago in South Dakota, there was an award made to the then Director of the Iowa Conservation Commission. I think maybe Rich is in line for the next award. He is long in that suit anyway. Well, continuing on, we are going to have a talk now about the Iowa turkey program, one, you may be able to tell, Rich is kind of proud of. I think all the people in the fish and wildlife program are. Terry Little, who is a forest wildlife research biologist, is going to be making a presentation. Terry's been with the Conservation Commission for what, eight years now?

Terry Little: Six.

Al Farris: Six. Seems like he has been around here longer than that. He is a native of Minnesota and just last year finished his Ph.D. at the University of Minnesota. Did it the hard way, completing it while he was working in a resource agency, which is really the difficult way. Terry.

Wild Turkey Restoration and Research Program
Terry Little, Wildlife Research Biologist

Thanks, Al. I am going to tell you a little bit about our restoration program and how we got to where we are today. We are way behind Missouri but we are working the best we can. I will talk a little bit about our hunting program, and then a little bit about our research. We will start it off with an education program that we have combined for our wildlife biologists to enable them to get the message out to the public. It is a very popular program, and our turkey hunters are really proud of it and we have tremendous demand for public speaking on the turkey program. We put this together to get it out to the public. In spite of the success of the program, many people do not even know there are wild turkey's in Iowa. The only turkey most Iowans are most familiar with is the one that graces their Thanksgiving or Christmas dinner table. Northern Iowa is a leading producer of the domestic turkey's. These domesticated turkeys have been selected

for thousands of generations to produce the rapidly-growing full-breasted bird whose very name has become a synonym for foolish, dim-witted behavior. Most Iowans are just becoming aware their state has recently been colonized by this white, barnyard fowl's ancestor, the American wild turkey. The two adult gobblers seen here in full strut are North America's largest game birds. They average 20 pounds in weight, not uncommonly reaching 25 to 27 pounds. The hen seen in the foreground is half the weight of the gobbler averaging about 10 pounds, but she is still quite large compared to the pheasants and quail commonly sought by Iowa hunters. Turkeys are relatively long-lived compared to most wild game birds, and may reach six to seven years old in the wild. Unlike their domestic cousins, wild turkeys are renowned for their keen senses of sight and hearing, their extreme waryness, and their abilities to avoid man during his activities in the forest. Because of these qualities, the wild turkey gobbler is one of the most sought-after sporting trophies in North America today. Four subspecies of wild turkey were found in North America when the first European settlers landed at Plymouth Rock. The Rio Grande subspecies inhabited Texas and Oklahoma. The Merriam's subspecies was found in New Mexico, Arizona, and southern Colorado. And the Florida subspecies lived in the southern portions of that state. All together, these subspecies occupied less than one-quarter of the range of the wild turkey and were found in habitats quite unlike Iowa. The most widespread subspecies was the Eastern wild turkey found throughout the region east of the Missouri River, extending from southern Canada to the gulf coast. Iowa fell within the original range of this subspecies. Turkeys were found throughout the state wherever timber was found and provided an abundant source of food for early settlers. At least one river and four creeks are named Turkey in honor of this once-common game bird. Eastern wild turkeys numbered in the millions nationwide during presettlement times, but like most of our native fauna they were unable to withstand the onslaught of white settlement. Land-clearing, uncontrolled fires, grazing, importation of domestic fowl, indiscriminate year-round hunting all played a role in the wild turkey's demise. By 1900, wild turkeys had been eliminated from their entire range north of the Ohio River, and were reduced in other regions. Just 250,000 Eastern wild turkeys remained by 1948. Only 17 percent of their former range was occupied, and just eight states had an open wild turkey hunting season. Beginning about 1920, some of the trends which led to the disappearance of turkeys began to be reversed. Unproductive, farms in the mountainous regions of the south and east were abandoned as people moved to cities to find jobs. State and national forests were established. Fire control was implemented. Grazing was reduced on public lands and states began forming counterparts to Iowa's Conservation Commission to protect vanishing wildlife. As a result, turkey habitat was restored over a wide area. But in much of this range, there were no wild turkeys available to repopulate habitat which was once again suitable. Initial attempts by many state wildlife agencies to restore wild turkeys by breeding domestic or semi-domestic birds resulted in spending uncounted millions of dollars. These attempts all failed, basically because domestic turkeys have been bred to produce a docile bird which would survive and reproduce in captivity. In doing so, the natural waryness and instinct for survival was lost and they soon perished when released in the wild. Today, there are no known wild turkey populations in North America which developed solely from game farm stock. A major breakthrough in turkey restoration was made in the 1950's with the development of the cannon net trap. For the first time, even wary old gobblers could be captured in the wild and transported to suitable but unoccupied habitat to start new populations. With this trapping technique, turkey populations literally exploded throughout the United States. By 1979, all the shaded areas on this slide had turkey populations, most as a result of stocking efforts by state wildlife agencies. Today, there are perhaps 1.2 million free-ranging Eastern wild turkeys, and a half-million birds in the other subspecies. Forty-three states

have some type of open hunting season. While wild turkeys will never be as numerous and widespread as they once were because of permanent habitat loss in many areas, the achievements reached today with wild turkey restoration must rate as one of the major accomplishments of modern wildlife management. The story of the wild turkey in Iowa closely parallels the nationwide trends. Iowa used to have seven million acres of forestland, but this was reduced 63 percent in the first century of settlement. Habitat loss, plus hunting, led to the elimination of wild turkeys from northeast Iowa by 1860 and from the entire state by 1910. The last turkey was shot in Iowa in 1907 and the last verified sighting was made in 1910 in Lucas County in south-central Iowa. The Iowa Conservation Commission was formed in 1922 and turkeys were given full, legal protection from hunting. Early restoration efforts using game farm turkeys were attempted for the next 40 years, but they all failed. In the 1960's, wild trapped turkeys of various subspecies were released in several locations as an experimental approach to turkey restoration. The Conservation Commission traded walleye fingerlings, ruffed grouse, and pheasant at various times to other states for this wild trap/release program. The first experimental turkey releases were Rio Grande turkeys from Texas placed in Yellow River Forest in 1961. Merriam's turkeys from Nebraska were placed in Stephens State Forest in Lucas County in south-central Iowa, and in the Loess Hills in western Iowa in 1966. These releases also failed, primarily because these subspecies were adapted to the warmer, arid portions of the Southwest, and could not survive or reproduce successfully in Iowa's relatively cool, moist climate. The first releases of the native Eastern subspecies were made in Shimek Forest in Lee County in 1966, and in Stephens Forest in 1968. Turkeys at these sites did extremely well, surviving and reproducing in excellent fashion. Populations grew rapidly until there were 400 to 500 turkeys at each site by 1974. The success of the Eastern turkey releases led to trapping efforts by Conservation Commission personnel to provide release stock for other sites. Turkeys are baited to trapping sites with corn, and captured with a rocket net. A 60-foot by 40-foot mesh net is folded into a long, narrow line and coated with plastic and leaves for camouflage. The net is attached with a chain to three or four heavy metal rockets loaded with gun powder. Rockets are detonated by an electric charge set off by an observer sitting in a blind 50 to 100 yards from a net site. Trapping is most effective in winter when snow covers their natural foods, but even then turkeys visit net sites irregularly. Often trappers sit on a site for a week or more during the cold months of the year waiting for a sign like this--turkeys at the bait. When detonated, rockets are propelled over the back of the turkeys entangling them in the net. They are removed, transported in individual crates to a new site, and released within a day of capture. Since 1972, Eastern wild turkeys have been released at 78 sites in Iowa, about half wild trapping efforts at Stephens and Shimek State Forests, and half from a "pheasants-for-turkeys" trade initiated with the Missouri Department of Conservation in 1975. To understand the success of Iowa's turkey restoration program, one must be familiar with the nature of wild turkey habitat and Iowa's forest resources. Wild turkeys are birds of the forest, relying on extensive stands of timber to provide their habitat needs. Their primary food is mast, a term for the acorns, hickories, and other nuts and seeds produced by trees and shrubs. Mast crops vary greatly from year to year, thus the need for extensively forested areas. As recently as 10 years ago, turkey biologists felt that 5,000 acres of continuous timber were necessary to support a wild turkey population. If this were true, Iowa has little turkey habitat remaining. The state's remaining 1.5 million acres of timber are concentrated in four regions, the northeast, southern, and western regions, plus several scattered riverbottoms, most in the central or east-central region. The northeast region has the largest stand of continuous timber as seen in this view of Yellow River Forest. In the northeast region, valleys and ridgetops are used for agriculture

and only steep slopes are forested. The southern region has few areas of timber as large as 1,000 acres. This view of Shimek Forest is a notable exception. Most of the southern region has timber broken up into small stands by cropfields and pastures. Timber in the western region is concentrated in a narrow band of loess hills running along the western border of the state. Timber is restricted to steep slopes and hillsides. In the central region, timber is found in narrow broken stands on steep slopes carved from flat agricultural land by Little Sioux, Des Moines, Skunk, Iowa, Cedar, Wapsipinicon, and Maquoketa Rivers. Clearly, timber in none of these regions fits the description of classical wild turkey habitat. Yet the turkey restoration program has been spectacularly successful. Stars on this map represent successful release sites. Red circles and triangles represent recently-introduced and rapidly-growing turkey populations. Turkeys are well on their way to inhabiting a half-million acres of timber, and may eventually occupy a million acres. Populations in all regions are doing well, although they have been just recently introduced in the northwest and western regions. Conservation Commission biologists are practically as surprised by this success as anyone. Iowa's forests do not produce more mast than other regions in wild turkey range, but a definite shift in food habitat occurred which has apparently allowed turkeys to thrive in Iowa. Scenes such as this--turkeys in cornfields foraging waste grain--are common throughout Iowa's turkey range. Turkeys are able to supplement scarce winter foods with corn to a degree that they have nearly eliminated winter mortality as a limiting factor and have built up excellent populations. Turkey numbers in the best timber habitats are three to six times greater per square mile of forest than are found in traditional turkey range in the southern and eastern states. Biologists now suspect that interspersed croplands, pastures, and timber may be more suitable turkey habitat than larger forested areas. This slide sums up the general impression of Iowa's turkey populations. An excellent number of turkeys are thriving in a farmland environment quite unlike what was originally thought suitable. However, turkeys cannot survive without forest lands. The minimum forest acreage necessary to maintain a turkey population is not known. Perhaps 1,000 acres is a good guess, but it is certainly much less than was previously expected. A second surprising aspect of our turkey restoration program has been the success of spring gobblers-only hunting seasons. No thought was given to opening hunting seasons when the first turkeys were introduced. When initial releases did so well that spring seasons were opened by 1974. Spring gobblers-only hunting seasons were implemented because this type of trophy hunt has no impact on population growth or survival. Turkeys are promiscuous. Only the largest, most dominant gobblers are able to defend harems of one to a dozen hens. A few gobblers do nearly all the breeding, leaving excess gobblers which can be hunted without affecting the number of young produced. Three zones were opened for the first year with a limited number of licenses for each zone. Just 450 licenses were issued in 1974 and 113 gobblers were bagged. New areas have been opened and the number of licenses expanded each year as populations have grown. By 1980, nearly all of southern Iowa, most of northeast Iowa, and parts of southwest and east-central Iowa were opened to hunting. The license quota had increased to allow 4,110 hunters and 988 hunters brought home a gobbler. Averaged over seven years, 24 percent of Iowa turkey hunters have been successful, and 2,702 gobblers had been harvested. Compared to many other types of hunting with which Iowans are familiar, spring gobbler hunting may not seem very successful. The gobbler hunting is one of the most challenging sports. Most states do not achieve hunting success rates greater than 10 percent. In the Midwest, only Missouri, with 10 times our forest resource, harvests more turkeys than Iowa and has comparable hunter success rates. Spring turkey hunting is Iowa's premier trophy hunt and has provided many thrilling moments for hunters. For those hunters fortunate enough to get a license, Iowa provides some of the finest spring turkey hunting in the nation.

Certainly no one could predict the outstanding success achieved by Iowa's wild turkey restoration program. We hope to provide scenes such as this to as many Iowans as possible by restoring turkeys to all remaining suitable habitats. So far the program has greatly exceeded expectations. This objective will be pursued by stocking forest habitat until the minimum general requirements for turkeys are known. Areas will be opened to spring hunting, hunting license quotas will increase, and perhaps fall hunting is a possibility. In short, the near future is bright. In the long-run, however, the picture is more dim. Iowa has just one and one-half million acres of timber left, 99 percent in private ownership and one to two percent of these forested lands are being cleared each year as demands for more agricultural land escalate. The Conservation Commission has done nearly all that it can for the wild turkey in Iowa. Without additional funding to purchase forest land and protect it from clearing, the wild turkey may face a future even more dim than it did a century ago--permanent loss of habitat. The future of the wild turkey is in the hands of sportsmen groups and outdoor enthusiasts of all kinds. Without concerted efforts on the part of concerned citizens, the long-term future appears much less promising.

That pretty well sums up what we have done so far in turkey restoration. I would like to hit a couple of additional points that will bring you up to date. So far, we have not had any stocking failures of Eastern wild turkeys as of last winter. That involves moving some 1,200 birds, a little over 400 from the state of Missouri. The bulk of those releases are since 1972 and many of the birds have come from our two original release sites in Stephens and Shimek Forests in southeast Iowa. Fifty-nine of these releases are now classified as successful out of the 83. The remainder are all in the very promising stage. We have not yet had a failure, that is, we have not put out turkeys at any site and had them simply disappear, with one exception where the birds were very badly heat-stressed. Most of the older stocking sites are in southern Iowa and northeast Iowa. We have only recently moved into north-central and the northwest part of the state. We think we have about a million acres of habitat inhabited by turkeys that are well-established and about a half of that remaining and they are rapidly expanding into the remaining half. I believe right now if we stopped stocking today 85 percent of our remaining timber in the state would eventually have turkey populations. The remaining 15 percent of the timber is questionable wild turkey habitat. However, we have decided, based on our past mistakes in selling the wild turkey short, that we are going to stock that remaining 15 percent and find out just what the birds can do. We have about 50 additional potential wild turkey release sites identified that have not yet been stocked, virtually all in the north-central and northwest regions. To show you how small they are getting, we stocked one area two years ago that was only 900 acres of isolated timber. We have decided to pretty much let the birds decide that for themselves. We have kind of quit prejudging. When I first started to work in Iowa some other biologists and I went through the state of Iowa and we eliminated at least a third of those sites that are now successful. We have learned a lot since then. You have heard about three times now that we shot 1,400 gobblers this year. We have opted from the beginning for turkey hunting quality--a trophy-type hunt. To do this, we have had a number of different zones opened over the years, but we have gone with a three season per zone format. A hunter must apply for one season in one zone and the computer picks a successful applicant. That hunter can only hunt in that one season and zone combination. This allows us to triple the number of hunters we put in the field at the same time keeping the hunter densities at any given time to acceptable levels. We have areas where we have as many as ten hunters per square mile of timber each season. Other areas where you have a hard time finding a hunter. We have had no tradition for turkey hunting in the state. There are probably only a handful of hunters in Iowa who had ever

tried to kill a wild turkey, and had no idea how to even call. We have been active in the hunter education programs, but we felt we needed to spread the hunters out by zoning the state. The zones in western, central, and northeast Iowa all have a greater potential number of hunters that they will carry simply because they are fairly new zones open for only two or three years and we are just acclimating the hunter and landowner to the fact that there are turkeys there to be hunted. Over the eight years, we have bagged about 4,100 turkeys and we averaged 25 percent hunter success. Now one of the reasons our success rates are so high is we limit the number of hunters. But our hunter densities you see are comparable with many other states. We are getting in the neighborhood of three to four per square mile of forest. But we do harvest a large number of turkeys even where we have five simply because there is a lot of birds there. I believe that our spring hunting would allow about 10,000 hunters eventually in acceptable levels of hunter success and hunting quality. That is assuming that the other zones other than Zone 4 develop the same kind of turkey populations. That would translate into the 2,500 to 3,000 a year turkey harvest. It became obvious to us in the mid-1970's, we had some acceptable turkey populations and some rather unacceptable turkey habitat. We started a research program in 1977 trying to find out what combinations of land management were allowing us to have turkey densities of this type where we did not expect them. We selected south-central Iowa because it was one of the very first Eastern wild turkey release sites. We felt that since birds had been there for eleven years they had sufficient time to probably build up and stabilize and we knew we had good turkey densities there. Over the years before 1974 and 1977, we were estimating in the neighborhood of 25 turkeys per square mile of forest. We have been harvesting eight to nine gobblers per square mile of forest in this zone. So we knew we had excellent turkey densities. In fact, our first estimates of turkey populations in that area indicated we had 80 to 100 turkeys per square mile. In the wintertime, we have seen flocks as large as 175 birds. So we wanted to look at one of our better areas to find out what it is about this area that is producing these high turkey populations. We wanted to look at habitat use and population dynamics in this area. Our principal tools were radio telemetry equipment. The radio's weight was about a quarter of a pound. These apparently had no effect on turkey behavior or survival whatsoever. We have caught over 400 turkeys in four years of research on the area. All them wear some sort of identification, as you see a combination of wing and neck markers. If you look closely you can see colored neck bands on these birds. Just less than 200 have carried radios in the four years. The first few years of the project we were interested primarily in habitat use at two times of the year--winter and brood habitat in the early summer. We had two graduate students in the field full-time for two years. The primary reason, or one of the reasons for high turkey densities is that in the wintertime they will shift to use cornfields. Turkeys begin moving to cornfields as early as October and November. From December through March, they spend as much as 25 to 30 percent of their time foraging corn. The reason is that there is five to six times as much food available during harvest in cornfields as there is in the adjacent timber. In fact, by the end of March when the turkeys and deer and squirrels and the cattle have pretty well cleaned up the cornfield, there is still more food in these cornfields than there was in the forest the previous fall. But we do not think turkeys necessarily live year-round on corn, but it does provide an important energy subsidy in the wintertime. In fact, from the 200 marked birds during two of the most severe winters in southern Iowa in 40 years and we found less than 10 percent mortality in wild turkeys in this area. The other thing we are interested in and have fairly well documented is the extensive use of open grasslands by turkey in the spring and summer. In addition to being preferred nesting habitat, these grazed pastures, old fields, and hayfields provide prime brood habitat. We found that turkeys moved to these openings when the poults were about two weeks of

age and for two to ten weeks use of these openings and grassy areas increased throughout the brood period. By the time the broods were six to eight weeks old, they were spending as much as 75 percent of their daylight hours in these openings or along the edges. We are in the process now of documenting higher insect abundance and seed abundance in the openings. The reason we think this is particularly beneficial is that we found only about 50 percent poult mortality in this study area which is quite a bit lower than was documented in other studies of poult survival in more extensively-forested areas. So we think the mix of open crop ground, pastures, and timber is ideal turkey habitat. The other thing the radios allowed us to do is look at mortality. With the new radios we have now we can get anywhere from one to three years of radio life on one turkey. They allow us to identify annual and seasonal mortality rates. We found that from about October when we first started putting radios on until the next October, we were losing about a third of our juvenile males, but about half of our juvenile hens in that one year. In fact, 70 percent of the loss of juvenile hens occurred in October, November, and December before winter is even a severe factor in their ecology. The time of the year when most biologists would say it should be the real easy-going time of the year for turkeys, predation is the cause and in southern Iowa right now, the coyote appears as the primary turkey predator at least from the time they get to be half to two-thirds grown. Juvenile males, as I said, only had about a third mortality and two-thirds of those were illegal hunting. Very little mortality of juvenile males as compared to juvenile hens. The difference is apparently different size. By September, a juvenile male is noticeably larger than a hen. The adult hen segment lost about 40 percent each year. Over half occurred during the breeding and nesting period as you might expect. We have just about decided the adult male can live forever if it were not for hunting. We lose about 70 percent of our adult male turkeys every year and 90 percent of that to legal hunting during the three-week season in the spring. They are just not very vulnerable to anything else and we are apparently cropping them hard enough that old age is not a problem. So there are some real differences in survival of different population segments. The radios also allow us to key in on hens to monitor productivity. We get in closer to hens using hand-held antennas and try to locate it to within half an acre to an acre and we monitor that hen until the hen will leave. Then we go in and find out what happened. We find in these high density populations very low productivity. First, all hens breed but juvenile hens seldom make it as far as incubation. Once they lose a nest, they give up. Virtually all the adult hens will make it to incubation, but over half will be lost during the incubation period to predators. Coon, coyote, skunks, and fox are most important. As a result, only 10 percent of our juvenile hens have ever produced a brood, 10 percent of those alive on the first of April, and about 30 percent of the adult hens. If you want to put it in more perspective, juvenile hens on the average add only one juvenile to the population. The adult hens add a little bit more than three juveniles to the population. When you add in 50 percent survival, you see that one reason we had high density populations are fairly stable and productivity is very low in spite of reasonably good survival. We view this data as very useful for management purposes. We put together computer models that estimate with our survival and productivity rate that we could harvest in the fall 20 percent of our fall population and see no decline in turkey populations. The high mortality of juvenile hens and the very low productivity by them means that they can be removed from the population and you essentially see no changes. It is the adult hen that really contributes to the population. So we proposed and will have our first fall any-sex season this fall. It will be approximately the last two weeks in October, it will be in southern Iowa and that part of the state is where populations are probably at or approaching maximum densities. We will have two zones with 1,000 shotgun hunters per zone and unlimited archery sales and archery is not restricted to either zone.

We think that this will allow a harvest of about six to eight hundred birds. That would be slightly less than ten percent of the estimated fall population in those hunting zones.

Al Farris: I do not want to let Terry slip away that easy. Are there any questions that we could entertain right now, that you have for Terry about the turkey program? As far as stocking, harvest, or anything else? Yes, Ed. Go right ahead.

Ed Hansen: Have you had, found any problems with interbreeding of domestic turkeys?

Terry Little: No problems have been particularly evident, although we did have a 38-pound gobbler in our harvest this spring. In the past, there has been no problem. We had a lot of game farm turkeys being released when we started the program. We pretty well killed that with some I&E effort and talking to people. Then, all of a sudden, the program got very successful and now we have got more people putting game farm turkeys in their little woodlots than we ever had before. However, they seem to pass out of the picture quickly. But there has been a resurgence of game farm turkeys in the last three or four years.

Kay Kool: In South Dakota, we have a particular problem with people who have released birds in their woodlots with the intention. I was just wondering what Iowa does about enforcement because we had problems with people doing that thing that they are (inaudible) and we've pretty much decided not to press that question too readily because of problems with that.

Terry Little: Game farm birds can fool anybody occasionally. We have not yet had these problems come up yet where people are hunting those birds out of season. It is very difficult to enforce. We have not had a problem yet and we have not had to address that problem of out of season hunting.

???: When are your hunting seasons?

Terry Little: This year, it was the 14th of April till the end of May, all three seasons. The third season had two weekends.

Jack Griebe: Do you permit the use of center fire rifles?

Terry Little: Shotguns or bow and arrow only. We have limitations on the type of shotguns, nothing smaller than .20-gauge.

???: What about poaching?

Terry Little: Poaching has become more popular the older the program gets. Generally, the populations have filled out pretty well in most areas and poaching has not been a problem yet. The other thing very few people know is that we have about three to five percent of the hens illegally killed during the spring season. The last couple years this has gone down; I would like to think it is because our hunters are better educated now. I think they are better educated due to the fact that we have radioed turkeys in the woods.

???: You had a picture of a turkey eating in the standing corn, where did you find that?

Terry: Standing corn? That is one of our management areas. The estimate of five to six times the food available in a harvested field was obtained by digging up all the snow and all the corn we could get out of these fields and we found five to six times as much total available food. I think the grain operators estimate they have two percent loss when they pick a cornfield.

???: Our spring season we feel after the 23rd or 24th of April some of the hunters feel that that's too late and past the peak of gobblers, where the gobblers are attracted to the call. The biologists feel if you make it much shorter than that it is going to upset the hens that are attempting to incubate or not well-established in their incubation. Do you folks have a biologist spokesman differ in that area?

Terry Little: We are looking at that very carefully with our radio birds because our hunting season falls right into the peak of gobbling in the spring right when the hens are nesting. We find very little nest loss during this time. All our nests are lost after the hunting season is completely over.

???: (Inaudible.)

Terry Little: One of the reasons that comes out and we have quite a bit of data to look at this is that this slope comes down in gobbling activity is that the gobblers do not have to gobble near as much. Those hens are right there and that is where the breeding's going on. It is after that time that you get into the nest establishment and incubation and most of our hens do not begin laying until the end of April or the first part of May, begin incubation along about the tenth of May and will hatch the first week of June. If we get our hunters out of the field by the tenth of May, it means that the bulk of the incubation time is left. It's just after the hunters are gone. We have a lot of hens moving around a lot in that late April - early May time when they would be laying, but again most of them will nest after this time. We think another reason of low productivity is because there are so many hens out there. Predation seems to be the cause of nest loss, not the hunters in the field.

(Inaudible.)

Terry Little: We do not know. The point is I guess that when you have 400 hens on a study area and all these hunters (inaudible), you know, that is still a lot of brood on that area. You keep your population high, once you get high density built up, something's got to get rid of them. And, we had 50 percent nest success (inaudible) all the turkeys (inaudible).

Al Farris: That is a lot of turkeys. I think, from my observations down there, probably the bigger problem than the hunter with the nesting female turkey is the mushroom hunters, mushroom pickers. I think they really root around in the timber more than the hunter does during the nesting season and a little later on when it may be more critical.

Terry Little: A very good point. Mushroom hunters are a bigger problem to the nesting turkey than the hunters.

Al Farris: That is kind of an interesting situation. Any more questions for Terry? He will be around. I am not sure we have got quite that many turkeys that they are going to break the limbs off of trees in Stephens Forest yet, but I hope I live to see the day. I think if any of you are in a management agency where you have not been in the turkey program yet and you are thinking about getting into

one, it is money well spent. It is right now the hottest, the most successful, the most talked-about program in the fish and wildlife division. Of course it is new, it is exciting, people are excited about it. I would encourage you to talk to Terry if you have the opportunity. Almost anybody has as many trees as we do. Right now, is the coffee here? Coffee's here. Okay, let's break for coffee. It will be right outside.

Al Farris: Come to order. If we could get back to our program, the white amur, or the grass carp, is the subject of the next presentation. I am a little disappointed that there is not somebody here from Minnesota. They sometimes get a little upset with Iowa, I think, for our experimentation and introduction of the grass carp or white amur. With us today is Iowa's foremost authority, Larry Mitzner, who has conducted a lot of the research investigations concerning the grass carp and has been invited to national conferences to present his findings on the white amur. He's going to describe a little bit about the white amur research and the white amur program in Iowa. Larry.

White Amur: Problem or Solution?
Larry Mitzner, Fisheries Research Biologist

Larry Mitzner: I am sure that each of you have been confronted with the white amur or the grass carp controversy. And, many of you have undoubtedly been involved in policy decisions regarding grass carp. Regardless of what your decisions have been, there is a great deal of confusion and misinformation surrounding the grass carp. Much of this stems from the press. For example, I have a few quotations I would like to read. There are opponents and there are proponents of the grass carp, and this carries over into the press. This is a quotation from the Galesburg Register Mail: "He feeds by smell rather than sight. He rolls the water and makes it muddy which creates serious diet problems for other fish." From the Centennial Star, Orlando, Florida: "The fish's effect on largemouth bass is devastating; it does not control noxious weeds." On the other side, we have the proponents, I suppose you could say, this is from Mechanics Illustrated: "As wiley a game fish as the trout, as scrappy when hooked as the mighty tarpin, as tasty when cooked as the red snapper, it also has the potential to surpass beans as a source of protein." And this one. Talk about misinformation, it sounds like I am taking the magazines on this afternoon, this is from the American Legion magazine, lead story, it says: "Through the years, a monster has invaded our lakes, ponds, and streams; it is the grass carp. The fish was introduced into this country from Germany in 1872." The article was complete with a picture of the European carp. In the early 70's, we in Iowa began to investigate and to sort out what we thought to be true and of course what was simply window-dressing, and the remainder of my presentation will deal with the experience that we have had in Iowa with the grass carp. So, with that, let's turn off the lights and have the first slide please. In Iowa we do have many man-made lakes ranging in size from 100 acres to 500 acres. I would guess we probably have from 100 to 150 of this type of lake. The people can go right down to the shoreline and fish. However, in many cases, and I am sure you have all seen this in your state too, the real problem, particularly for shoreline fishermen, this is what one of our lakes looked like in 1973. As a matter of fact, it is our study lake. So in 1973 we experimentally introduced grass carp into Red Haw Lake. We wanted to look at three things. First of all, at the effectiveness of the grass carp; would they indeed do the job? Could they control vegetation? Back then, there was little known about their effectiveness. There were people who said they would not even eat vegetation, or they would do very

little to control vegetation. Secondly, we were concerned about the water quality in these lakes; if indeed they did control the vegetation, what would the water quality be? And also, the sport fishery. What impact would they have on sport fishery? We introduced 550 fish, they were about a pound each, 12 inches long, into this 70-acre lake. That figured out to be about eight per acre. They do look some like a carp, except the body of the white amur, grass carp is more cylindrical. The mouth is terminal; the placement of the eyes is different as you can see. This would give you a view from the front of the fish. Here you can see the torpedo-shape of the fish. We did tag the fish, the first batch of fish that we stocked, you can see the tag that has been placed on the fish. The vegetation was sampled prior to their introduction and then from 1973 to 1978, every year during the summer months at ten permanently located sample positions. We had a quadrant that was placed at the bottom and all the vegetation was extracted from that quadrant and then brought up to the surface and weighed. Plants were identified and compared then from station to station, month to month, and year to year. We also looked at water quality, transparency, (inaudible) reproduction of the algae, along with a multitude of other parameters such as nitrogen, nitrate, nitrite, phosphates, fish community, harvest, and so on. And we also looked at the growth pattern of the grass carp after they were introduced. This is a picture of a floating gill net that we used to catch the grass carp from time to time during the investigation. Of course, we also gill-netted under the ice. This is a grass carp that was taken several years later; you can see we were just pulling it in onto the ice right there. This is a fish three years old, and as we mentioned, it was stocked at about twelve inches long; they were approximately (inaudible); one of the first things we discovered, yes indeed they did eat a lot of vegetation. Secondly, they grew extremely rapidly. The fish weighed about 22½ pounds and it was full of both vegetation and eggs. The fish, the eggs were being reabsorbed; they have not reproduced in Red Haw Lake. They have been in there since 1973 and have not reproduced, so the eggs are reabsorbed. We looked at their feeding habits, looked at the gut, their alimentary tract to determine what plants they consumed and which plants they favored most. We also did some telemetry work with a few of the fish. We placed a radio in the abdominal cavity; closed the incision with sutures and then traced the movement of these nine fish during the period of about a year. Some of the movements were extremely simple, they had very simple straightforward-type movements, although some of the fish had extremely complex, complex movement patterns. As I already hinted, the fish do indeed control vegetation. This is a picture of the vegetative conditions that existed prior to 1973. We had partial control then in 1974, I believe about 40 percent reduction, in 75 we were up to about in the neighborhood of 70 percent control, and thereafter, there was a good degree of control. As a matter of fact, we have nearly 100 percent control now. This is a before-and-after shot; this picture in 1973 and in the same part of the lake two years later in 1975. You can see little areas of vegetation, more vegetation here and there, along the shoreline but, basically, it is pretty well been cleaned up. I might have to talk a little bit about the sport fishery because, obviously, we did creel surveys there in 1973 and previous to that in 1972, 71, previous to the introduction of the grass carp and then again in 1974, 76, 1979. This is a pretty clear picture of the fish that are in Red Haw--crappie, bluegill, a few bullheads, the thing that is missing there is largemouth bass (there is a good largemouth bass population there). We found that the sport fish population did not decline; really no change. We could find absolutely no difference in the population of sport fish that were there. The important thing that did change was that 2½ times more fishermen could fish the shoreline than did ever fish before. Comparing the old creel census with the creel census after grass carp were introduced, they had about 2½ times more people fishing the shoreline. One of the favorite species at Red Haw Lake is bluegill, and I am also going to have to mention the farm pond

program. In Iowa, it is illegal to introduce grass carp because it is an exotic species. We have a blanket exotic species law. Three years ago, we issued permits to those landowners that wanted to introduce grass carp into their farm ponds. The first year that all the farms were inspected, and recently we have been issuing permits by interviewing the landowner on the telephone. To date, I would guess we have in the neighborhood of approximately 2,000 farm ponds that have grass carp in them, and public fishing lakes probably in the neighborhood of about 50 to 60. Last year, I think they were counted at about 53 state-owned fishing lakes which have grass carp introduced in them. With that, I think, let's just open it up to questions. Usually at every grass carp talk I give there are a lot of comments and questions.

Question: (Inaudible.)

Larry Mitzner: No. There were quite a few of them caught, taken last year when we had the 17-year cicada. We had one weekend, I think, we had about three caught. The cicadas were falling in the water, people taking advantage of it, taking out their poppers and catching them on poppers. But, they have not become important in the sport fishery. Now, there are a few taken, a few hundreds of pounds taken in commercial fisheries, particularly in Missouri. I do not know, I do not think we have had hardly any reported in Iowa; I am sure there are some. As a matter of fact, it is so rare that one of the guys that was taking care of the commercial fisheries statistics called me one day and asked if it would be unusual to have a grass carp in the commercial fishery and I said no, it would not.

Question: Why has everybody been afraid of grass carp?

Larry Mitzner: Much of it has to do with the German carp or European carp stigma. The stigma that is attached to any exotic. If you would read the literature, a lot of the literature that has been written on the grass carp, and know their life history, the restrictive spawning requirements, and so on, it would be easier to compare the grass carp, let's say, to a trout, than it would be to compare the grass carp to the German carp. They are vastly different, although they are of the same family.

Question: They did not spawn?

Larry Mitzner: No, and to date there has not been documented evidence that they have reproduced in North America.

Question: Under controlled conditions?

Larry Mitzner: Oh, under natural conditions they have not. They have been in the Mississippi watershed since approximately 1964, 65. The first introduction was in 62. They were introduced into Arkansas, so they have been with us almost twenty years.

Question: There is no evidence they have ever reproduced?

Larry Mitzner: No, the fish that have been in, caught in the commercial catches in Missouri could well have come from flushings from hatchery ponds and that situation.

Question: What are the spawning requirements?

Larry Mitzner: They are extremely restrictive; they require at least about four feet per second of velocity. There has to be flooding conditions just previous to the act of spawning itself. In other words, this stimulates them to spawn, brings them into spawn. Once they are fertile, the eggs are fertilized, they have to drift approximately three days and at that point where they hatch, at that point also, there has to be the backwaters that the fry can go into to feed on the plankton. The temperature, you are talking roughly about 70 degrees, between 70 and 73 degrees.

Question: How easily do they control vegetation?

Larry Mitzner: We have recommended ten to fifteen fish per acre. Talking to some of the farmers just that I know of who have stocked, some suggest we may have recommended a little bit too high and they are suggesting to us that if they were to do it again, they would go with a little bit lighter stocking. However, we are talking about most of these people having a half-acre pond so you are talking about just so few fish that, personally, I think I would rather go a little heavy than too light.

Question: What happens to the turbidity of the water? Is there any change?

Larry Mitzner: No, there are changes from year to year in every lake whether you have grass carp there or not. This is the change we came up with. One year it might be up, the next year it might be clearer than it was previous, but we just have these natural fluctuations.

Question: Their eating the vegetation plays no role in the nutrient cycle. That appears illogical?

Larry Mitzner: Yes, it does. That is the first thing that, my thoughts were this. That yes, they would eat the aquatic vegetation; they would put the nutrients back into the system and you would have a heavy algae bloom, microscopic algae bloom. That would be a reasonable guess. This did not happen. It was clear water many of the years, and so I talked to one of the limnologists at Iowa State University and his thoughts, he was baffled at first too, and then his guess was that these manure pellets, in effect, were going to the bottom of the lake. Red Haw stratifies severely during the summer and the manure pellets were being tied up below the thermocline. In other words, the thermocline itself was a sump for the nutrients. This is the only explanation that seems reasonable.

Question: How about the survival of fry of game fish. Have you had no predation with any of them?

Larry Mitzner: In our electrofishing last year, I was simply amazed at the clouds of the bluegill. We would go out in October with the shocking gear and see just clouds of bluegill fry. They will consume aquatic insects and other fish if there is not any vegetation there. This has been proven. We know that from other studies. However, they are extremely inefficient at it. I have watched them consume little larval bluegill and little minnows in an aquarium. The grass carp is extremely inefficient at selecting a prey item and grabbing it. They are inept. They are not a predator, but they do consume some aquatic insects.

Question: Figure out the pound per acre with this phenomenal growth rate. There cannot be an unlimited base for them to grow on, or to eat.

Larry Mitzner: I cannot give you any data that we have worked on because we did not determine mortality of the grass carp. A guy by the name of Terril down in Georgia did some work on that. He purposely stocked some grass carp in a pond that did not have any aquatic vegetation just to see what would happen and those grass carp lost weight. He put them in the spring, drained the pond in the fall, and the average weight of the grass carp decreased by a tremendous amount. He did some stomach work on those too and he did indeed find that they were eating aquatic insects but they were losing at it.

Question: Well, I am still puzzled.

???: You are not alone.

Question: I think we are finally going to try some of our fishing lakes in Colorado. What is the bad part about it? Is there any bad part?

Larry Mitzner: Okay, we have heard some, talking to some of the biologists in Arkansas. They have lakes down there that have diked. In other words, they are diked on three sides. They will put grass carp in these lakes that have a tremendous vegetation problem. They will control the vegetation, and then all of a sudden they get a little more wave action on the shoreline. That aquatic vegetation attenuates the wave action, so they are getting more wave action along their dikes, some of their lakes, particularly their larger dike lakes where the wind can get a good sweep at it.

Question: I have heard some other bad news, I heard of a guy who was killed by one who was jumping and must have weighed 90 pounds and knocked him out on the ground.

Larry Mitzner: That sounds like a rumor to me.

???: I thought I heard that at the barber shop. That is one story we did not use.

Question: How do they taste?

Larry Mitzner: Good. They are good eating fish; it is hard to describe the taste. They do have the mud line, or what you call the lateral line, but they are not oily like the common carp.

Question: Bony?

Larry Mitzner: Like the common carp. Same family.

Question: Do they have a preference on aquatic vegetation, higher aquatics?

Larry Mitzner: Yeah, but usually the softer species like the pondweed and the niad, they like it. Something like coontail is less preferred. Then, of course, you get into the cattail, bulrush, and they do not really control those at all.

Question: What about the cara?

Larry Mitzner: I do not know, but one of our biologists stocked grass carp in one of our lakes that does have cara and so we are going to find out for sure.

Question: One concern that I have heard about is that they get into marshes they could destroy the vegetation.

Larry Mitzner: If they were stocked in a marsh to the density we are talking about, they definitely would take care of the vegetation. First of all, they would have to be stocked in there as a pair of them at least to naturally reproduce. Okay, we are certain that they will not naturally reproduce in that marsh, so one, they are going to have to be stocked in there; two, they are going to have to move in there, in great numbers. Florida has been concerned with this, they are using them now. They have been in an experimental on- and off-again program for about five years now and they are pretty much sold on them. That was one of their concerns, was with the aquatic vegetation, some of their production areas.

Question: How do they overwinter?

Larry Mitzner: I really do not know. Some of the fish that we listened to under the ice were fairly sedentary.

Question: You mean survival?

Larry Mitzner: Survive, yeah, we have not had any great mortality. We did have, the most mortality we had was from a lake that summerkilled. Had a summerkill lake that we lost all our grass carp in.

Question: What do you figure the pounds per acre for grass carp is?

Larry Mitzner: Based upon another lake that we know of for sure that we have a pretty good estimate is, it is probably around 70. Could easily be 70 pounds per acre.

Question: How about cost? How much is it going to cost to do that? I know the more you put out, the cheaper it would be.

Larry Mitzner: Well, I am going to have to relate you now to the private owners who are putting the grass carp in their ponds. They are paying, what, Jim, I do not even know what the going price is.

Jim Mayhew: Six dollars.

Larry Mitzner: Six dollars a fish. They are about, what, a foot long?

Jim Mayhew: Ten to twelve inches.

Question: How old a fish is that?

Jim Mayhew: A fingerling. We have not been able to reproduce this fish in Iowa. We have tried twice and either the people in Arkansas are not telling us the whole story or we do not know the whole story, but we have not been able to do it here, so we have some problem there. Now likewise, all the private pond owners are now getting their fish from Arkansas.

???: (Inaudible).

Jim Mayhew: We have them in about sixty lakes right now. This is the only thing we have found that works.

Al Farris: I hate to shut off an interesting discussion, and this is the kind of discussion I hoped the white amurs would generate. Larry's going to be around. Jim Mayhew is also very knowledgeable about white amurs. Marion, Don, would be glad to talk to any of you about them. When the fish were originally stocked at Red Haw in 1973, I was the wildlife research biologist down there and I remember Chuck Schwartz, who was my partner at that time, and I were very concerned about this. We had several long discussions with Jim and Larry about white amurs and what the potential might be and we had the same fears about marshes and all of those things. I did end up helping stock some of those fish and quite frankly, now we are convinced that it is a viable management tool for midwestern lakes where you have this shoreline vegetation problem. Jim, yes.

Jim: As a conclusion here, we stocked in Iowa in 1973 and we were not the first ones to bring them into the states. They were brought into the country, imported from Malaysia in 1963 in (inaudible). I know of one person who has a farm pond in Woodburn, Iowa, that had them in his pond in 1968 and when we stocked them, we put out some news releases that we were importing them here and why we were doing it and what we hoped to achieve, to let the people know because the controversy was really raging at that time. Thirty-three states have outlawed their possession; we did not have to do it here because we had a blanket exotic species statute. I can always remember George coming into our office down at Chariton saying, ah, shutting the door behind him so you know he has got something on his mind. He said, what is the deal on the grass carp? You know, George, we are going to bring them here and we are going to do some research on them. He said, well, God, I have had them since 1968 in my pond, five years after they were brought from Malaysia. Here is a farmer from Iowa who had them in his farm pond. I said, well, do they work? Oh hell, yes. He said they worked. He said, well I just wanted to know. I said, well, how many did you have? I cannot remember the number, but the guy told me that I needed five, but he sold me ten. So, it is not that we were the first ones to bring them here. They were being brought in. (Inaudible) farm pond harvests, etc., from (inaudible) that you can buy them and the foundation of our study was that we ought to know just a little bit more about them because Iowans are going to bring them here, so that is what we did.

Al Farris: Okay, shifting gears just a little bit.... Now we got so caught up in the discussion here we forgot the applause. Thank you very much, Larry. I am sure there are going to be some people wanting to talk to you later on. We are going to shift gears a little bit now and move into the area of conservation law enforcement. Jerry Hoilien has been a conservation officer with the Iowa Conservation Commission for many years. He has always, or at least in the most recent years, has had quite an interest in new developments, new techniques, new ways of aiding the conservation officer in doing his job. So, I have asked him to come today to share some of those techniques and developments with you. Jerry, are you going to come up here? Okay. Jerry Hoilien.

Law Enforcement Research and New Techniques
Jerry Hoilien, Conservation Officer

Jerry Hoilien: Well, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to address a distinguished group of this type today. I have had the privilege of working in fish and game law enforcement for a little over 20 years now. Not too much surprises me, but occasionally it does happen like the other day when I received the complaint about the old man in the marsh. It seems that the fellow was out shooting just pretty early in the morning before the legal hours and he was

driving all the ducks off the marsh and the legal hunters were complaining, so, well, we knew the old man and we kind of hated to pinch him, but then a complaint is a complaint, so we went out. I got up in the black of the night and as you know everything we are interested in usually happens darn early in the morning or real late at night but, anyway, I got up and I drove my car over to the marsh. I hid my car behind some trees. That is kind of sneaky, but when you deal with sneaky people you have got to have sneaky ways. So, I got on my hip boots, my rain gear, it started to rain by now, it always rains on us. Got on my long eyes and I started out across the marsh over where the old man had his cabin. And I stepped in a few muskrat runs; by the time I got there I had one foot wet, but I settled down on top of a muskrat house to wait and sure enough, I did not have to wait long. The light came on in the cabin. The old man was going to go hunting. And as I settled down, all of a sudden the door came open and the light from the inside of the cabin came on across the porch and down the steps and out into the marsh. And the old man stepped out and looked around rather suspiciously, but in a loud clear voice said, "Warden, you just as well come in and have a cup of coffee." And I thought, boy, I blew that one. So I marched across the marsh and up the steps and into the place. I sat down, had a cup of coffee, and about halfway through the second cup I could not take it anymore and I said, "Say, how the blue blazes did you know I was out there this morning?" And the old man looked at me with a twinkle in his eye and he said, "I didn't. I have been doing that for 20 years. That's the first time I got an answer." Well, law enforcement has changed radically in those short 20 years that I have spent with it. Law enforcement is no longer a seat of the pants type of an operation. Today, there are full degrees in law enforcement from colleges. There are courses in methods, reasonings, public reactions, scientific evaluation, criminology, psychology, and the whole bit. Today's law enforcement officer is expected to be an accurate observer with almost electronic recall of details and happenings. The digestion of facts and circumstances and exacting and tabulations and then expert in handling the problem to the satisfaction of the individuals, his superiors, the public, and in the cool, unhurried atmosphere of a courtroom where his actions are rehashed and digested for any and all errors in misjudgment or procedure. Yes, today, we expect the law enforcement officer to be almost letter perfect at all times. That is in law enforcement, and we expect almost the exact same thing in all his additional duties as well. Well, what have we done toward this goal of training our officers? To be sure, we have looked toward younger, more efficient men with broader backgrounds, higher intelligence, and more education. We are more selective in our hiring, we work toward an early retirement of the older officers and advancement in rank to the aggressive. We have established training schools for the newly-appointed, and in-service training for the established officers and all the new court procedures, the ever-changing laws, rules, and regulations. We in fish and game especially must train our people in the reasonings behind these rules so that we can better gain public acceptance and backing. We have always known that through understanding and willing compliance for the majority works far better than strictly law enforcement with our limited numbers. Well, what have we done toward giving the better-trained individual better tools with which to work? Now, I am not speaking of better cars or bigger cars, motors, boats, snowmobiles, important as these things may be, but I am speaking of scientific research for a specific problem in the field of fish and game law enforcement. We have regulations as to hours with one tool, the watch. We have regulations as to species and sex with no more than the names in the books to follow. We need to develop tools for these men to assist them in their better determination and the results of their investigations, such as time of death, feather, hair, blood identification. Some of the states have been working toward this in one way or another. We in Iowa have developed a feather identification series, showing the wing, tail, and body feathers of our upland game species such

as pheasant, quail, grouse, turkey, as well as waterfowl and the protected species. Beak and feet collections for training and identification, with sex determination for dressed game such as pheasants and deer as you see in the front. Working with the determination of time of death, we have approached it from a temperature, electrical reaction, and eye appearance and to a high degree of success. I would like to show you a series of slides on some of the efforts that we have worked on. I think I will just take a step back here. Somebody put that in my evidence kit one day and I thought it was a good title for this series so we started out with it. A number of years ago, we had a tri-state meeting with Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin and I thought we would have a little game with the officers so, I planted these wings on a car, told them that they had a halfway-complying individual here. He had left a fully-feathered wing on all of these birds, and now can they identify it and it is your move. It is kind of interesting. I will help you out a little bit. An interesting thing is a good number of enforcement personnel are not very good at identifying shorebirds. In fact, there are not too many people that can identify a shorebird. I would challenge you, what does your state do for the education of a hunter? I ran into a snipe hunter one day in Des Moines. He said, "Boy, have I been having fun out there in the marsh! Snipe are just going all over that place." He said, "How come some of them got long bills and some got short bills?" I said, "Well, I hope you do not have any with you." He said, "No". And we got to discussing them, I asked him if he knew his different shorebirds and he said, "No, I guess maybe I do not." But he said, "If you have got a book that shows me how" and I had to answer him "No, I do not have". As matter of fact, I do not know of any state that does, teach their hunters how to identify shorebirds. In Iowa, we have approached this method for teaching our duck hunters; we just took the wing and attached it to a silhouette. Because we hunt ducks early in the season, not many of them have complete plumage and so we went to the wing. And we were very successful in this method. And of course, we had to teach our officers how to do it too before we got into that point, so we developed this type of a board showing the various species and the methods in which you can sex and identify them as they go through. It is an excellent training tool. Got started and interested in this a number of years ago and this one's kind of personal. If you look at the date if you can read it, it goes back to 1965. But the lower picture, the lower feathers do not have any skin or bone on them. Those were feathers that I located in an incinerator and the fellow assured me that those were feathers from a Rhode Island Rock. You can tell that because of all that salt and pepper effect on those, on the feathers from the shoulder. Well, I never saw a Rhode Island Rock with a speckled feather in it, so we seized all the feathers and that lower portion is held together with a hint of Elmer's glue. We just happened to have a scaup which is up on the top in spring plumage, so we took this to the court along with a fall plumage bird and if you note the day, that is April 24, and the judge looked at that. You want to remember we had old J.P.'s back there in those days and I can remember his exact words. He said "I'll be darned, that will be \$100." Not too long after that, we received a bunch of feathers from one of our officers asking if we could identify them as pheasant feathers. They are located over on the right. These were found in the trunk of a car just a couple of weeks before our pheasant season opened. The fellow was driving rather slowly on the road with a shotgun looking rather hungrily into the ditch. The officer got him to stop and these feathers were in the trunk of his car. They were very soft, they were fresh, not from the year before. So he set them down and we took a study skin and just slipped a piece of blue paper in underneath so we could tell him not only were they pheasant feathers, but whereabouts on the bird that they came from. There were some additional feathers there and they are at the top of the screen. And we hooked them onto the study skin from a hen. So when the officer called, I asked him what he was going to charge the man with and he said, "Well, if you say

they are pheasant feathers, I am going to charge him with unlawful possession of parts thereof during the closed season." So I told him "Well, you can just double your charge because half of them came from a hen and the other half came from a rooster." You are looking at \$200 worth of feathers there. Much of our work started a number of years ago when I was in northeast Iowa up at Luther College. We had been running into an awful lot of dressed birds, the feathers were completely gone. In Iowa, we do not have to leave any foot or wing or anything on the upland game birds, and so it was a problem for us to identify the birds. These are some of the original slides that we took simply gutting the birds out, showing the testes, and a little closeup of it. Then another one of the ovary, a closeup. Actually in the dormant stage you can see the eggs. There they are quite small, but nevertheless very visual when you go through a pile of birds out of the freezer. I always like the way that one of our officers would go through it, he would count them out and say "One, two, three, oops, that one is mine, four, five, here is another one that is mine". It was quite effective. He never did really explain how he was doing that, but they knew what we were talking about. We have advanced a long way since then, we not only have a Bureau of Criminal Investigation and they have cooperated with us a thousand percent doing a lot of our work, actually training our officers for identification of things in the field, such as deer hair, which all you need really is a microscope with not too large a power to identify deer hair. It is about as easy as identifying a shaggy bark hickory in the woods. It is pretty obvious as to what it is. We have even gone to the point of doing some of our own electrophoresis where we do (inaudible) I will tell you at the end of the series that has replaced this type of work. Back in 1976, we decided we were going into this modified bucks season with some of our hunters having a license required a deer with at least one forked antler on it. And we had a little trouble determining the sex once they got them home and got them skinned out or in this position with the head off. Well, there had to be a way. So we began to experiment and work with it and while we had been at it for about a year, I remember Al Farris sending me this and the only thing that made me mad about it was I wished he had sent it to me a year before that. We had to do the work anyway, but this work was done in California back in 1956 showing the method to sex white-tail and they did the work on black-tail as well. It is very, very simple. Once you get into it, it is easy to do. It is almost like teaching you sex by Braille and that is not too bad. Larry was up to the front just a few minutes ago before we started and I showed him the two pelvises that I have in front. It took him about 30 seconds for him to learn how to sex those deer by pelvic. It is very simple. This shows a dry pelvis next to a fresh one up on the top. I should not tell this story about another state, but I was called to a neighboring state to assist in identifying a pelvis. When I arrived over there, the guy got it out and he said, "You got your slides showing how you do that?" And I said, "sure". So we showed it to the group that had gathered there and then they showed me the suspicious leg that they had. As I looked at it I was a little bit embarrassed; I tried to get the fellow off to the side and he said, "No, let us see how you do this." So I showed him the soup spoon effect. If I was closer I could show you. If you look at the line of bone there, and then it almost looks like a soup spoon. Can you see it? It is quite large and in the female, it is flat. Okay, you can see by the diagram how the male is much thicker in that one particular portion than the female. The carcass was very similar to this and as I say, I was a little embarrassed because, there laying over the top, that long, white thing was a penis. So I said, "Boy, you have got no problem with this because does do not have penises." Then we have practical things, we have this fellow who cut the head off the deer and took all the sex organs, he really worked on it. As you can barely read there, it says "deer with at least one forked antler". He did all the work of taking the head off and the sex organs, but he left the mammary glands. So, you got to take the easy ones. It has given

us a lot of information. We have set up some demonstrations for our officers showing them the relative size to the leg bones and the pelvises, if you compare a juvenile deer to an adult deer. When we ended up, we did complete two complete skeletons for our study. It is quite effective when you walk into a courtroom with these skeletons like that and you are testifying from them. It works very, very well in the courtroom. A number of years ago we had a problem with night rabbit hunting. It does not seem to exist quite so much as it used to. We had a tremendous need for telling how long a rabbit had been dead. Every time we would stop a vehicle at two or three o'clock in the morning and he had two or three rabbits in the back seat, he would always give us the story of how he had been rabbit hunting that afternoon and assure us they were taken during the legal season. So we got out the thermometer and ran a study on just how long it takes to cool a rabbit under varying conditions. Actually, we ran a whole series of these and encouraged our officers to shoot a rabbit, put a thermometer in him, take the temperature of the container or the vehicle temperature around the rabbit and run a series of tests on him. We got better than 500 of these now. Then we went to a lab and did a controlled study on it and found that we could compare our field results very, very well with the lab results. We have a complete study on that. I will back up a minute and you will see the other side of the picture there. It is a study on the time of death by an electrical stimulus. While we were doing the lab work on this thing, we got to talking with one of the professors about a shock. He said if you could give your animal a shock, you are going to see a visual reaction early right after death. So we fooled around with all kinds of electrical things and came up with batteries and regulators and we decided we needed a pulsating current to give it more movement and all of a sudden it hit us that we were carrying around the thing that we needed and that was our car. So we simply attached it to the spark plug wire, not the spark plugs. A spark plug does not have any spark to itself. So we had to reach in there and connect it to the spark plug wire, the other one goes to any ground. But before we go any further, I would strongly advise you to do this when the motor's shut off. But then you hold it and if you remember your physics years ago, you hold those two needles close together and you get an arc. Of course, every time that cylinder comes around you get a pop, pop, pop sound. Now it is not necessary to penetrate the bird completely, merely to touch the skin. You can see the muscle reaction that you get relative to the time of death. You lose it after about two hours. It is just completely gone. Now the only thing we found that really affects this is extremely cold weather. If you get into a freezing situation, then it is going to be a little bit different. But we have even done this with dressed birds, we have done it with rabbits, in this condition, we have dressed the rabbits, gutted them, found that the reaction times are basically the same. As a matter of fact, you can even figure it out what seems to lose it the quickest. You can see the ribs lose it, when the hind leg hangs on a little longer, the ear, and the front foot seems to hold it the longest. Now I am not a pathologist, I cannot tell you what makes it do that, I only know what it does. Now, the thing of it is, at two o'clock in the morning when we get a fella and we get an electrical reaction on that rabbit, there is no way that he is going to convince me or the judge that he got that thing at four o'clock in the afternoon because you will lose all reaction after about two hours. It is an effective tool. I gave this to the Nebraska people. They grabbed it real fast and went to work on it. One night they lost a shiner in amongst some cabins. The plane was coming down on him but the officer did not get there quite in time and he got into a cabin. The officer stuck around a little while and pretty soon some boys came out of the cabin and got into a car and started to drive off and he stopped them. He said, "What have you boys been doing?" "Oh", they said, "we are just cleaning our rabbits. We had been out rabbit hunting early in the afternoon." So he ended up, he said, "Well, I would like to see your rabbits." They got them out. They

were floating in a sink in the cabin. Well, the officer got them out. He learned another important thing. Do not lay wet rabbits on your fender if you are going to charge them, either. That electrical stimulus goes right on through. But at any rate, when he got done, he laid them out in the order in which they were shot and he said, and none of them had been dead over two hours. This was like three in the morning. And one boy said, "You know, he is right. There is the one I shot in the leg." We worked this on deer. Deer will hold that reaction much longer, you will get up in the time of four hours. Actually, this muscle reaction works even on a severed head, which is kind of interesting. Sometimes that is all you have got is just the head or the carcass. Again, we do not try to get exact. We are not trying to tell anybody that he killed that one hour and fifteen minutes ago, but if we get any reaction we know that the deer has been dead no longer than four hours. We also, and you should never go on one factor on the time of death, in spite of what Quincy says. You use a combination. You use temperature, you use electrical response, and you use the appearance of the eye. We worked on a number of them on eye, and I will run through these next four very quickly. This period of time (inaudible) and you see a fresh eye. Here is one that has been dead a while, it is beginning to dry. Note the cloudiness that is appearing behind the retina in that one. Then of course, the drying one. We are working on that series. A lot of things, or factors within that, so you cannot just say that is it. Moisture has an awful effect, and temperature has an awful effect on it. But it is a method, and when you combine with several methods, it will work. Wounds were an interest to us, particularly from the archery standpoint. Any of you that are archers, you know that a bow makes a nice clean cut, very much like a surgeon's knife. Those of you that hunt deer with a firearm often have noted the range of impact that comes from a firearm. We in Iowa here, of course, hunt our deer legally with shotgun slugs only and looking at the pin, we have got a little problem with the size of that one. It does make it a little better when you look on the other side and dig out the .3006 slug that caused the thing. But it does give you an idea when you've got a deer with an archery tag on it when you have got that kind of a wound you might look a little bit further. Trapping is a multimillion dollar business within the state of Iowa as I am sure it is in yours and how much work can be done on determination of when the furs were taken. It always amazed me when I watch these furriers or these people who are buying furs run their hands over the furs. I never knew what they were doing really, whether they just kind of got their kicks from feeling that fur or what it was. But, if you note the flatness of the fur ahead of that, of his fingers. I will advance to the next one and notice how the fur is standing up. Now he is not feeling that fur, he is measuring the length of it between his fingers. Now this particular gentleman, as you can tell, he is getting up there in age, but he laid the fox, the sixteen fox hides that I had there that day all in the order in which they were taken by date and then he turned to me and said, "And none of them were taken during season". They know what they are talking about. These two gentlemen are the fur experts in Wisconsin and they have been working for a good number of years on otter and beaver. When I took this picture, they were arguing over one of those otter, the one that he has in his hand. They had laid them all out, they came in a box, and they were laying them out in the order in which they were taken by the month. Then they got into this little discussion and I was curious, I was standing on this side of the table so I was close to the tags and picked up the tags and looked at the dates. The two that they were arguing over were two weeks apart. They are good at it. They are experts. In fact, if you have an interest in that field, Wisconsin has produced a videotape of their particular presentation which is a very, very excellent presentation on not only identification of furs, but how they go about telling the time of year the fur has been taken, the kind of fur, and that sort of thing. Wisconsin will produce that tape for you on your tape if you send it to them for no charge as a service. We have gone into beak

and feet collections. Simply as a program sometimes of interest to the sportsman and to the people, but we also use it as a training thing for our new officers. So when they run into something like this hanging from the guy's rearview mirror, they can identify it at that particular time. Most of our officers carry an evidence kit which consists of various envelopes, marking devices, electrical response, thermometers, seizure tags, what have you. More recently, we have added the hemotest, which is simply a test for blood. It will not tell you what species of blood it is, but it will tell you whether it is blood or not. It is quite an effective psychological tool. If the fella says, "Oh, that is just a bunch of grease on the back-end of my car". You can get out this little powder and sprinkle it on there and put a drop on it and you say, "Now, if that turns blue, that is blood". About the time you put the drop of water on it and you get that blue reaction that is on the right-hand side, he says, "Wait a minute, Jerry, let me tell you how this happened. That brother of mine..." Most of our officers carry a complete set of feathers in their car. Note the hen up on the top and the rooster on the bottom. The interesting thing I was talking to Nebraska the other day and they were asking about the feathers on the juvenile birds. So we did a little checking on it and found that you can sex the very, very young birds from that feather up on the, leading feather up on top of the primaries. Note that the coloration goes with the feather on the male and across on the female, if you can catch that. It is right at the top of the wing. The bars go across the feather and on the male, it goes lengthwise. We found that even in the young ones before they got colored up at all you can still follow that. So it is a very easy way to sex that bird. There again, we carry it for the quail, Hungarian partridge, ruffed grouse, the turkey. We have gotten into the field of work on tranquilizers. Any time that you work in a metropolitan area and you have to dispatch an animal, you have got a problem, not only with people that are there, but with the press and it becomes a real problem. Particularly, up on the Capitol Hill. You approach that building with an outfit like that and I do not care if you do have a badge on your chest, you are going to get cross-eyed looks. That is all there is to it. People get nervous, I guess, but at any rate, this method does not upset anybody. You can go on into a man's home with the use of a blowgun, it is not a firearm, it is quiet. This officer, he was the officer in Polk County; became so efficient in tranquilizing the problem animals within a metropolitan area that very often he did not even carry a live cage with him. He would just lay it in the trunk because he knew about how long they were going to be out and he would drive to the northern limits and lay the coon or whatever it is over the fence and let it wake up by itself. The other methods that we use for delivery of tranquilizer was a jab pole. I have one up front; I will show it to you. Somebody told me one time that a skunk can throw about eight feet, so I made a twelve-foot jab pole. Now I make no guarantees whatsoever, do not misquote me on that. We have had a real success with the use of some tranquilizers in handling this type of a problem animal. That takes a pretty brave warden to reach over and pick one up like that. But they are a problem. Even a deer carrier is an aid to our officers. I do not know if any of you have ever seen this type of deer carrier, but the idea was originally swiped from Wisconsin and we made them up for our officers. But, it is just a handle that hooks on to the back of the car and then you lift the individual handle and then lock it on to a chain, and as you can see it works pretty effectively. That is a lot better than climbing up on the trunk of that car and trying to hoist it up there. That whole thing was really spawned one night when I climbed up on the back and got a hold of a big deer and ended up laying flat on my back on the highway behind the car. You can get an officer hurt pretty badly that way. We developed a better carrier that works pretty effectively. Another item that we have worked on, is the use of an electrical fence for the control of beaver and muskrat. They do not like electricity in any way, shape, or form. I have never killed a beaver with these

things, but I have never really had one bother a dam afterwards. They just seem to mostly just move out to find greener pastures. But, in this particular case, they were going to tear out this farm pond because it was getting too high. The beaver wanted a little bit, had a good thing and they wanted it even better so they kept building it up. And they were going to remove it. So we went in with a, just a portable shocker; we set that wire about two inches above the new water level where we wanted it, and they do not cross the line. Once in a while we are shorted out with a stick or the wind blows something in there so you have check it. But, it is an effective method of controlling. This is the one that I told you I would tell you about a little earlier. The method that we believe will eliminate the electrophoresis or at least the (inaudible). Electrophoresis or any of those methods take about 24 hours and they are good. Not a thing wrong with them, they have stood up in court. We have worked on what we call a sensitive latex which we merely put the antigen on to a carrier and then by introducing a known versus an unknown, set up the reactions. The one on the left is the clumpy or the curdling, as I call it, of the reaction on deer, and the one on the right is the negative control which we use. I'm particularly partial to this method because the young lady that is pictured in there is basically responsible for an awful lot of the work that was done. She got her masters in hematology, that is my oldest daughter. Sending our men out in the field without proper tools is just a little like sending them out into the field without binoculars. A necessary thing. The more tools we have, the better they are going to be. Oftentimes, they are out there in the middle of the night by themselves. They are dealing with people that have forgotten all about sportsmanship. There is no sporting aspect in it, any more than there were in this group that we encountered this last spring. Shooting geese in the spring of the year. You got market hunting in your state whether you know it or whether you do not, but it is there. I can go on for another hour in describing some of our Iowa modern tools, cars, tell you about some of the wildlife that we have in our fields and streams. But this is kind of the end of my tale of telling the good guys from the bad guys.

Al Farris: At this time, I am sure Jerry will entertain, oh, you are not ready for questions.

Jerry: Nope.

Al Farris: Okay, excuse me.

Jerry: I am going to tell you a couple more things. A few years ago, the challenge was issued at the annual meeting of the Association of Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers for a cooperative effort for better tools for law enforcement. A few short years passed, and we had the first meeting of forensic science for fish and game law enforcement held in Alberta. Do we have anybody from Alberta here? No? This was followed by an international meeting in Wisconsin in 1979. We have pooled our efforts. The results are an open-end two volume what we call blue books. I invite you to look at them afterwards. The ideas are a composite of what the efforts of all the various states and provinces efforts in the field of tools for fish and game law enforcement with the idea that each state was to take back a copy. We made 25 copies, and each state took one copy back. They went through it, utilized what they could, and distributed it to the various personnel. Obviously, Iowa does not need anything regarding moose or elk or that sort of thing, we only had one moose in Iowa, somebody tumbled that, but they can pick out what they need and then they could distribute that. Some of the material in there is obviously only applicable to a lab, such as crime lab or maybe a scientific lab, but a lot of it is very, very good for the officer. Our goal is simple. It is to aid the officer in the field, to make them efficient,

trained in investigative techniques, and professional in his approach so we can create what I call a deterrent. And that deterrent in the violator's mind is what is going to save us, the fish and game that we love. Fish and game law enforcement research is a new concept. So new that many agencies have just begun to think about it, and yet so dynamic that some agencies have already hired full-time men to work in that field alone, complete with budgets and personnel. At this point, I am kind of reminded about that story about the Polish village where for four generations no real decisions were made except by the old Jewish patriarch who had the final say. Nobody ever questioned his authority. But a couple of young fellas decided that they kind of wanted to get into the business of, a voice into the affairs of the village. There were only two ways they could do it. They could either do in the old man, which their moral fiber would not let them do; or they could discredit him. So, they came up with a foolproof method in which to discredit the old gentleman. At the next meeting, there was going to be a young man approach him and challenge the old man as to what he had in his hand. And in his hand he would have a bird. He would ask the old man if he knew what it was and if the old man guessed anything but a bird, all he had to do was open up his hand, the bird would fly out, and he would be discredited in the eyes of the villagers. But if he was so lucky as to guess that it was a bird, then his next challenge would be is it alive or dead. If he said dead, he would open up his hands, the bird would fly out and he would be discredited. But if he should say alive, then the young fellow would take his thumb, secretly break its neck, and open up his hands and the bird would be dead. And again, he had a foolproof system. So on the appointed day, the young man approached the old gentleman, he had his hands cupped and he challenged him. He said, "Old wise and venerable prophet, what do I have in my hand?" And the old man looked him in the eye and he said, "It is a bird, my son. It is a bird." And he said "Yes. Old wise and venerable prophet, is it alive or is it dead?" And the old man said "It is in your hands, my son. It is in your hands." I challenge you that the future of fish and game enforcement is most likely in the hands of the people that are in this very room. Thank you.

Al Farris: Are there any questions that Jerry could respond to? If not, I am sure that he will hang around here and you are welcome to come up and look at the bag of tricks when we adjourn later this afternoon. Thank you, Jerry. I thought it would be appropriate for all of us when someone from the Fish and Wildlife Service is here to talk to us about changes in the Fish and Wildlife Service, what is going on, and where that agency is going. I contacted Jim Gritman to see if he would do that and he said if he could figure it out. No, he did not really say that. He said, yes, he would be glad to, but he was not sure what he could tell us but I am sure that he has some valuable information for us. Jim.

Update: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jim Gritman, Deputy Regional Director

Jim Gritman: Thank you, Al. I wish you would have picked a different subject, and I wish I had not have said I would do it, because probably all of you sitting out there know more about the Fish and Wildlife Service today than I do because it is anyone's guess. As you know, we have a new administration. Ray Arnett is the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. Dr. F. Eugene Hester is the Acting Deputy Director. Now, you may wonder why he is the Acting Deputy Director. It so happens in some legislation that was enacted a few years ago it says the Fish and Wildlife Service cannot have an acting director for over 30 days. Well, gentlemen, it has only been over six months and we have not had one. That is why

he is the acting deputy. Gene, can tell you some stories about what is going on in Washington now and so forth, but Saturday I was at DeSoto Refuge here in Iowa for the dedication of the visitor center and I think I can tell you what his most embarrassing moment has been since he has been the acting deputy director and that was he introduced Governor Ray of Iowa as Governor Ryan. There were only about a thousand people present. There are some things that have come down from Washington in just the last couple of weeks and it is kind of surprising since we do not have a director named yet. But Kaylor Martenson, the Regional Director in Portland, has been ordered to transfer to the regional director's post in Albuquerque. Dick Myjack(?), the Associate Director in Washington to Wildlife Resources, has been ordered to Portland to take Kaylor's place; and Harvey Nelson, my boss, has been ordered back to Washington to take over the associate's job that he just left two years ago when he came out to Minneapolis. Now, I have no update as to what is going on outside of what they have been told and where they are to report. We have two men waiting in the wings in Washington to be the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. One of them, I am sure you all know, is Bob Jansen, the former director of the Game and Fish Department in Arizona. The other one is a Dr. Roberts who I know very little about his background, and that is that he is a veterinarian and he comes from the state of California. But both of them are in Washington, I understand they are both on the third floor of Interior and they pass each other quite frequently. I am willing to book bets as to who is going to be the director, but it appears that it is going to be one of those two. Now, there are some cuts that have taken place already and there are more coming in 1982. Where they will really affect the states are in the anadromous fish grants; apparently there are none. There will be no money. In Section 6, there will be no endangered species grants. Now, this is all iffy because the Senate has already gone forward with theirs, it does not include this and does not include the wildlife and fish co-op units either. However, in the House these things were added back in. So now they must have a conference committee to see what happens. The only thing that we have been assured of is we will not receive any more money. So if these things are added back in it means something else has to be cut out. So it is really a great time to be an administrator in the Fish and Wildlife Service because there is a guessing game going on every day. But, this is the way it appears right now. That the co-op units are out. I said it appears; I do not know for sure. That is the way it appears. That our habitat preservation or closer to the field ecological services, biological services have been cut. This will affect the field. Also, the endangered species money for law enforcement has been cut. This is really hurting us in this region because we are supposed to have 28 agents and we are now down to 21 and apparently if these cuts hold, we will only have 19 in the field. That is for eight states so that is not a heck of a lot of assistance to speak of. However, people with their great knowledge said that the states could take over the enforcement and we could just drop it. It is very hard, as all of you know, to get the state enforcement people to cooperate with you if you have no enforcement people of your own out in the field to cooperate with the states. It makes it very difficult to be in a give and take position when there is nothing you can give. The fishery assistance program has been cut back and the areas that have been cut back in are assistance to other federal agencies. In our region it comes out to be mostly the Forest Service and the Department of Defense and to the Indians. We will carry on with the plans that are over half completed, but when it comes to the implementation of these programs, we will not be involved. Our acquisition funds have been really cut and cut seriously. Land and Water Conservation Funds for the Fish and Wildlife Service for next year has zero. The wetland acquisition program has no money. There was \$10 million when it started, now it is down to zero so it will just be the receipts from duck stamp sales. The construction budget is nonexistent; we do not have one. In region three last

year, we had \$9 million in that region alone. This year we have nothing. What effect is this really having? From a personnel standpoint, come July 22 in region three there will be 55 reduction enforced letters issued. Those 55 people will be off the payroll by September 18. We have tried to take as many of these cuts as possible in the regional office. But in the field, we have three in fishery assistants that will be lost. A minimum of three in environment, because I heard we just got cut another 122 thousand in this region. If that is so, we are probably talking about eight positions in the field rather than three. Two enforcement positions, three survey crews for a total of eleven in the field, which means that 44 of them are being absorbed in the regional office. The biggest cut in the regional office is in environment where we are going from a staff of 18 down to 11. There are other cuts that are coming, but none of them are quite that severe when it comes to professional biologists. Because of no construction funding, our engineering staff is just being zapped, practically wiped out. Some of the other administrative jobs are going. Which means that the few that are remaining are going to have to work harder, plus there will be less assistance to the field, which upsets field people to no end. However, they would much rather see the cuts taken in the regional office than in the field. Since the field really is where all the work is done and if it were not for all those people out there doing an outstanding job, there would be no regional offices anyway. So, that is where we stand and until the conference committees agree on what is going to be cut and what stays, it is very difficult to predict anything at this point in time. I would be happy to put off any other questions just like I have given you all this information now. Any questions from anyone? Yeh, Larry.

Larry Gale: I was just wondering if you have any information about the effects of the transfer of the regional director?

Gritman: I am trying to think of what the letter said that Harvey got. It said no sooner than 15 days... that is all it said I believe. It was no sooner than 15 days.

Larry: How about area offices?

Gritman: Well, area offices in the 82 budget, they are still in. The 83 budget that went from the Fish and Wildlife Service forward had area offices. When it came back from the budget in the department, they came back and they said why don't you look this over again and we recommend that you eliminate the area offices for a savings of something like seven million dollars. Now, I do not know how they came up with that figure of seven million dollars because there is no way that that amount of money can possibly be saved. I mean, because there is not that much money out there in area offices. But since they got the figure someplace, if the area offices are eliminated, it means that somehow we are going to have to absorb seven million dollars when probably really it would save us about three. So, I do not know how that figure came down, but somebody picked it up somewhere.

Al Farris: You mean, seven million in the region?

Gritman: Seven million nationwide. So, they told us to look at that plus they also said look at closing 31 fish hatcheries and some other things that they thought could be done. Any other questions? Yes, you know, it is very difficult to be in the Fish and Wildlife Service at this particular moment, but you know all the people and states want the same thing, when you have a change in administrations and you get all these people in there that really do not know all

the interworkings or what it takes to get something done, but they have all got their own idea and that is what we have got now are all these ideas coming out and I am sure some of them will bear fruit and we will have to live with what the decision is. Okay, thank you.

Al Farris: Well, you always like to have a guy on the program that brings good news.

???: When's he coming?

Al Farris: Boy, I hope that was not him, to tell you the truth. Yes. Austere times, it is austere times I guess in a lot of places. I feel fortunate. I thought it was a little austere in Iowa, but after hearing that it is not very austere at all. Our next member of the program is Dr. Keith Harman. Keith called me last Thursday and told me he would not be here. He said his remarks were in the mail and they were coming to me. He is involved in a court case in Nebraska and had to appear in court today and I was in a real panic because I had not received his comments, but I finally got them. I apologize to you because I'm going to have to read them. I have not had time to do anything with them. So, I am going to present for Keith Harman the summary of the private lands symposium. For those of you who were not aware of it, a private lands management symposium was held in early May, basically the first week in May in Madison, Wisconsin, this year. I am going to give you a bit of a summary of that. The symposium, wildlife management on private lands, has an objective of accelerating the application of wildlife management practices on private lands. The conference was intended to be the first step in a structured approach to improve private lands management for the benefit of wildlife and associated natural resources. Perhaps the principal contributions of the conference were 1) the additional attention focused on this resource management problem; 2) a current appraisal of our state of knowledge; 3) the opportunity to discuss strategies for attaining the symposium objective. Many papers recognized the importance of economics in determining current attitudes and actions and future reactions toward wildlife management on private lands. We were reminded by Jack Berryman that a large, very large sale of grain to India or Russia does more to influence wildlife habitat than anything the fish and wildlife agencies can accomplish. The increase in human population worldwide, a related issue, has a direct effect on wildlife. As the human population expands, increasingly more pressure is placed on all natural resources. In 1980, the agricultural production from one out of every three acres was exported. The opportunities for managing wildlife appear to be inverse to the value of the land for cropping. The merits of attempting wildlife habitat management in the intensively-farmed grainbelt was a subject of lively informal debate among the conferees. Some argued that the emphasis should be given to moderately farmed regions where a modicum of wildlife habitat still exists. Steve Kellert and his associates from Session 1 which is really a background session on what influences the landowner and the sociological information that has been gathered, explored the influences that determine the attitude of people toward wildlife management on private lands. The economic or commodity benefits and the aesthetic or noncommodity values of wildlife were concerned. Richard Bishop, who is an economist at the University of Wisconsin, stated that landowner behavior depends on market incentives, unfortunately wildlife related matters are not well integrated into the market system. If land resources are to be allocated to wildlife in amounts that are economically justified, government intervention in the market system is necessary. The alternative is to face continued erosion of our priceless wildlife heritage, not from economic necessity, but as a result of distorted signals to private landowners from the market system. Jim Miller and his associates in Session 3 outlined the basic elements necessary in effective

education and public relation programs. Attitude change is rarely if ever achievable through short-term communication programs. Nor is attitude usually or necessarily a prediction of actual behavior. Ecological recognitions do not necessarily lead to an ecological (inaudible), nor to ecological action. Although the mass media may stimulate awareness of ideas, most human behavior and attitudes are rooted in the individual's socio-economic system. The most repeated conclusions of researchers interested in persuasion is that effectiveness is magnified by complimenting media messages with local audience groups organized for listening, discussion, and deciding. Thus, a cooperative adult education mechanism linking federal and state instrumentalities to county groups is an essential two-way flow of communication and may provide the best single mouth for helping to achieve wildlife management on private lands. If there could be a measure of coercion associated with communication, it's chances of persuasiveness would seem to be enhanced. A review of past programs to include improved land use revealed that integrated natural resource programs were often more successful from a wildlife management standpoint. Likewise, the integral management of soil, water, plant, and animal resources appears to be the most rationale approach for future actions. The need to look at wildlife from the landowner's point of view was highlighted. Chester McConnell pointed out that some seemingly excellent programs for private lands failed because the landowners did not react as predicted. Chester identified six elements common in successful programs. 1) Landowner understanding and acceptance; 2) compatibility with the primary land use; 3) reasonably suitable habitat; 4) habitat type, that is habitat programs were least successful on agricultural lands; 5) acceptability to those who pay for the programs and to elected officials who approve them; and 6) mechanisms to assure compliance if other than voluntary. Wildlife programs have been successful on forest industry lands because 1) wildlife production was not inconsistent with other marketplace demands; 2) hunting represented a major recreational use of private forest lands; and 3) economic incentives existed to produce superior hunting. Murray Walton concluded that by and large the greatest amount of habitat preservation on private lands will result from voluntary action by landowners. It is simply impossible and publicly unacceptable to control every use and provide some type of financial incentive to every landowner. It was further concluded that wildlife interests must continue to rely heavily on programs that emphasize nonmonetary incentives, technical assistance, education, and activism. Awareness and involvement were underlying themes of Session 4 which have the charge of identifying opportunities for action. Ruppert Culter, who was recently of the Department of Agriculture, challenged the audience to become at least part-time political activists on behalf of the earth and its inheritors or there will be far less for them to inherit. He suggested involvement at many levels including the ASCS county committee and further urged membership in advocacy groups organized to give the facts, educate people, mobilize the grassroot constituents, lobby the legislators and administrators, and "sue the bastards" as environmental lawyers put it when such action is necessary. Marty Strange called for an awareness of alternative farming practices. He argued that productivity and efficiency have directed farm policy and we have forsaken resourcefulness, that is the capacity to make best long-term use of what we have to work with as an agricultural policy goal. In fact, we have been deluded into believing that productivity and efficiency can escape the measure of resourcefulness. Standards for a resourceful agriculture were proposed, that is, it is renewable and sustainable. It preserves for future generations the blessings of the present generations abundant resources. It relies on the craft of the farmer more than the complexity of his machines for its productivity. Craft secures independence; complexity breeds civility. It provides economic opportunity for people who work the land for a living to own it. Rewarding effort with just and adequate returns and preventing concentration of resources. It affirms stewardship as a principle of farming

where a right to own the land carries with it an equally important responsibility to use it well. It nourishes the human spirit of farmers rather than subduing it with meanness. Keith Harman identified three possibilities for future action, that is 1) influence government programs that financially compensate landowners for land use practices; 2) compensate landowners for producing wildlife; and 3) encourage government programs that involve land use planning, performance standards, and regulations. Each alternative should be pursued by some measure and Keith has offered suggestions in his paper. The proposed attention toward wildlife management on private land, excuse me, the proposed changes involve redirected emphasis but is believed that increased attention toward wildlife management on private land would be cost-free is unrealistic. Keith noted that a few dedicated individuals will not accomplish what will require millions of dollars and thousands of hours of staff time. They can recommend and identify actions, but the responsibility for management of wildlife on private land ultimately rests squarely on the users of the resource and the agencies and organizations that represent them. Unless they are willing to establish goals and objectives, define input levels, identify programs and costs and set priorities, this symposium's final product will be the transactions. There was a call for future action which Keith summarized in here. In a proceeding, Session 4, which was the last session, must be structured so that opportunities for action are explicit and the mechanisms for assuring future involvement are clearly delineated. In other words, what they are trying to do is from the results of that last session, which was a summary session and explore opportunities for future management, to formulate a program this time as I understand it, a rather undefined program that would carry forward some plan of action for increasing private lands management. I apologize for reading that to you, but I had no opportunity to review it before this morning. Are there any questions or any discussions. I unfortunately was not able to attend this session even though I was scheduled to give a paper. I did not get out-of-state travel authority. One of our people who did go gave the paper for me. I hope you had some of your people there. I hope it was a worthwhile conference and they came away with some new ideas. I am really sorry that Keith could not be here to discuss it more completely because he was very actively involved in it and did attend the conference and was the session leader for Session 4. Are there any comments? Yes, Jack.

Jack Griebe: I do not have a comment, but we will be discussing in the business session a resolution that will be aimed at perhaps furthering some of our activities in this area and I think we said a lot of the things at this meeting a year ago, talk is cheap and that is all we have been doing. For how many years?

Al Farris: A while. For a while. Any other comments? I am sure that that resolution has already been handed to Ed Hansen. It came from the state of Colorado and that will be coming up tomorrow morning. I decided to handle the resolutions committee a little bit differently. A couple of times I have met in somebody's room after everybody had had three or four beers and it does not really come off very well, so I decided to try at 8:30 in the morning when everyone will at least be sober, and hopefully wide awake. Yes, Carl.

Carl Mosely: Ohio sent a representative to the meeting in Wisconsin. We have received nothing new really here but a reaffirmation of what we already know. And that is what Keith said and what you just said. If we want it or whoever wants it they are going to have to put the bucks down to pay for it. I think that is the first thing. The second thing is that we are never going to achieve it on a broad scale without getting into a program which is in itself a broad-scale program and that is the national policy and programs on agricultural land use. I think that

is what we said last year. I think in Ohio we are a little closer from the same point, maybe not closer than other states, but closer from our own viewpoint in that we have now picked out 50 chief counties, or 54 counties of the total 88 counties in the state which are the major agricultural counties and we have selected out of that 202 townships where we are going to put the money down to obtain the habitat that we feel we need to provide a minimum level of wildlife production in intensive agricultural land. That is going to cost more than two and a half million dollars a year for a 20-year period to achieve our objective, but I see that as the only realistic route for us to go. In the meantime, I think we still need to work on that national agricultural program.

Al Farris: Are you going to do that by easement?

Carl Mosely: It will be a combination of things; some of them will be leases, some of it will be agreements with the highway department on some of the massive right-of-ways that they own. Some of it will be actual acquisition of land; we will use every combination of tools we have to use to acquire mainly nesting areas that we need, undisturbed nesting areas. We are still in our preliminary program which was trading pheasants for people that we put up so much as far as undisturbed nesting habitat, but we knew that would not get us very far along when we started into it. We are at a level of about 20,000 acres in that program right now.

Al Farris: Yes, Jack.

Jack Griebel: Personally, I like Missouri's approach. You buy up the whole state and then you sell it back to the people on your conditions.

Al Farris: Yes, Dean.

Dean Murphy: I think the basic proposal of this symposium was the establishment of a new organization for lobbying at the Washington level and the question was raised at the symposium of establishing a new organization or adding this onto the function of established organizations such as the international or wildlife management institute (inaudible).

Al Farris: Was there any resolution reached on that?

Dean Murphy: It was left up to the steering committee of the symposium to develop the program.

Al Farris: And I have not heard yet that they have made any decision and Keith did not mention any when I talked to him Thursday morning on the phone.

Dean Murphy: I think this resolution of Colorado's is close.

Al Farris: Okay, we will discuss that tomorrow morning and then in the business meeting. Are there any additional comments? I would like to finish up by reminding you at 5:30 there is a reception sponsored by Mr. Dale Haney and the Woodstream Corporation in Room 712. You're all invited to that. Dinner is on your own tonight. If you have questions about restaurants, places to go, I would be glad to talk to you or give you some suggestions. If you have a car, it is much easier; if you are hoofin' it, it is a little tougher. But there will be some of the Iowa folks around. There will be some other folks around that have cars. There are some fine restaurants here, depends on how far you want to go and how much you want to spend and what you like.

Bob Barratt: You might mention, Al, that in this town a two or three dollar cab might get them to a lot of restaurants. It is not a fifty dollar cab ride anyplace in Des Moines.

Tuesday Morning, July 14

Al Farris: There is one additional member of the Fish and Wildlife Division staff that has joined us this morning. I would like to introduce him to you. Rick McGeough. Would you stand up please, Rick. Rick is in charge of our law enforcement section in the fish and wildlife division and has been in that capacity for about six months now. He is doing a fine job. This morning I want to continue on with our program. The fisheries section has developed a new program of youth fishing clinics. The program has taken off very well and has been very successful. Tom Putnam, who is a fisheries management biologist in central Iowa, is here today to tell us about it. Tom, do you want to talk from up here or back there? Okay, Tom Putnam.

Youth Fishing Clinics: Making Future Anglers
Tom Putnam, Fisheries Management Biologist

Tom Putnam: Thank you, Al. Well, we are about 25 minutes behind time. So, I am going to take an hour and a half talk and run it into five minutes if I can. It is not too bad standing in here today after being outside with that 87 percent humidity and 85 degree weather already at 9:00 this morning. It is going to be miserable today. Fish and game agencies have for years been encouraging participation in the sports they advocate, namely fishing and hunting. Administrators in these agencies do so for at least two important reasons. First of all, the fishing and hunting sports are worthwhile ways to use leisure time and should be promoted. Secondly, because of the more legal age hunters and fishermen you have, the more revenue that will be derived for these agencies' use. In the fishing sport, a variety of youth programs have been developed to encourage angling and especially in the urban situation. According to a paper by Michael W. Detweiler entitled "Urban Sport Fishing, A Review of Literature and Programs", there are several special programs used by large metropolitan areas to encourage angling interests in young people who are not normally exposed to the sport. These include kids fishing areas only. In this type of program, they either have a large lake and they section off an area of it or a small lake or a small pond such as a park pond or even a fishing pier and they close it for the summer for kids-fishing only. Only kids eighteen years of age or younger can fish. It is an honorable thought to try to set up a program such as this but it is difficult to enforce to keep older people out of it so it does not really work all that well in many cases. Another program that has been used widely and probably is the most common throughout the United States is the youth fishing derbies and in this type of program adult fish or catchable size fish at least are stocked in a small pond. Usually they use either channel catfish, rainbow trout, or in Iowa, the more desirable black bullhead and these are allowed to be fished by the kids on a one-day fishing frenzy more or less. The kids are allowed to keep their catch and the best catch is rewarded by some sort of prize or compensation. This type of a derby does not really promote any learning experience to speak of. There is usually little if any instruction in the fishing sport along with the derby. It does promote competition which is probably not necessarily desirable. A third type of program is the day fishing camps that are used especially in the larger metropolitan areas and these are put on through the

parks and recreation departments. Usually transportation is provided for the kids to go to a lake for a day of fishing, but also equipment is provided for them. Some limited instruction is given to them in the use of the equipment and handling fish and then they are given some time to fish with adult supervision. This works out pretty well, but especially in larger areas where you have enough populus to keep this program alive. The fourth program and one which we are really interested in here in Iowa is the youth fishing clinic. This type of program is education-oriented. That is our ultimate goal, to educate young anglers to try to help them become better anglers, better fishermen and try to keep this, or instill this in them as a lifetime hobby. Along with this type of a program there is usually not an opportunity for the kids to fish that particular day. In the Iowa experience, we have been involved in the fishing derbies for a number of years. I think we started in the late 1940's and usually it was a small town or even a larger town with a small park pond with either the city or a club in the town promoting a kids fishing day. The Conservation Commission was responsible for stocking bullheads in the pond, adult-sized bullheads, and there was a one-day experience for the kids. They really did not learn anything except they caught a bunch of fish and were able to drag them home in the hot sun and I am sure they were proud of that. But we really did not get much out of it, we spent a lot of money collecting fish and transporting them and really did not educate these kids at all any more about the fishing sport. Because of the cost especially, we got out of the program in the early 1970's. In 1979, I was approached to set up a protege fishing clinic because I had the largest metropolitan area in my district. So we set one up here in Des Moines and since then we have had clinics in twelve cities in 1979 and 1980. We have had an attendance of about 12,000 people. Fifteen percent of these have been adults who have been tag-alongs usually related to one of the kids that was taking the clinic. We were glad to have them along too because it was nice to have the father and son or the mother and son or daughter learn along together. We found it was extremely important when setting up our clinics to have a sponsor and hopefully one that could sponsor this on an annual basis and make a club project out of it. So we have had several different sponsors throughout the state including the Izaak Walton League, several bass clubs, a parks and recreation department, YMCA, county conservation board, Kiwanis club, Lions club, Big Brother/Little Brother program. So we have had a real variety of people and clubs involved. I have a few slides I would like to show you about some of our clinics. I think I will step back there. Okay, now this is the youth fishing clinic that has been going on in Iowa for about a year now and it is very important again to have a sponsoring club. Not only a sponsoring club, it has so many in that club that is interested in fishing but also knows something about fishing and has the ability to pass that on to other people through a fishing experience. We have been really fortunate so far in finding clubs to help us along that route and find some really experienced teachers to teach kids a little about the fishing sport. We found it is extremely important to have as much publicity as you can get about one of our clinics because it seems like some people need to be bombarded from four different directions before they are going to show up for an event. So, for instance in the Des Moines area for a clinic here we had a preregistration form and a flier in the Des Moines Tribune on several occasions. We had a flier circulated around the Des Moines boat and vacation show in March. We had the information broadcast on eleven radio stations. We also had it on three television stations prior to the event. And then we had same-day coverage while the event was going on by all three TV stations so that evening they could go back and put it on TV and sit at home and say damn, I wish I would have known about that earlier and maybe they will send their kids next year. Hopefully that is the way it will work out. This is the type of flier that we use and it just explains a variety of information about the clinic but nothing in real detail, but it did tell a few of the

demonstrations that were going to take place, plus of course, the time and date and location. Also, the preregistration form on the bottom. It gives us some idea of how many people are going to show up. I think probably the largest clinic we have had has been around 250 or 300 people. Most of them run around 150 or so. It is important also to have a location that is central to the city if possible and we were real fortunate here in Des Moines to have Gray's Lake which is dead center in the middle of the metropolitan area so it was an easy place to get to for a lot of people. Our clinics throughout the state are set up basically with six stations, usually a half hour station. There has been some variation on these, but usually all this information is included in each one of the clinics. We have a station for fish regulations and water safety. We have one for fly fishing and fly fishing techniques. We have one for gear, including everything except fly fishing, spin casting, bait casting and all the casting techniques to go with fishing with that type of gear. We have fish cleaning stations, spin casting stations which is a practice session. Also, fish management and fish identification stations. A little bit about each one of our stations. In the fish regulations and water safety session, we have an officer come in and talk a little bit about the fishing regulations that fishermen have to adhere to if he wants to fish here in the state of Iowa. Granted, a lot of these kids are small, they are young. We have had kids that were five or six years old and most of this is not going to sink in to the, but we are not giving them very much time with it, ten or fifteen minutes, but yet they will at least leave knowing that there are a set of regulations that they are responsible to follow if they do fish. And possibly it will keep them out of trouble down the road. We also have a little about water safety. Again, just briefly, fifteen minutes or so. But, we are mostly trying to get across to the kids that when you are in a boat there are some safety devices that need to be in that boat, they are mandatory. It is just to get them to think a little bit more about it, even if we only have one or two of the kids remember it down the road, it is worth the effort. The fly fishing session was one which we stuck in. We were not sure how that was going to go over. We thought we would try it the first year to see how it went and it turns out it was very well accepted. I think there was a reason for this really. I guess I have to back up a little bit and explain to you what urban means in Iowa. The definition in Iowa is if you can drive across the town in ten to fifteen minutes, then that is an urban situation. That is about as urban as you can get in Iowa. So, plus the fact that we have quite a number of fishing areas in most of our metropolitan areas such as Des Moines, for example, we have almost 7,000 acres of water, lakes within 15 or 20 minutes of the center of Des Moines plus we have the Des Moines River, one of the largest rivers in the state, running right through the center of Des Moines. So there are very few kids that are really deprived of fishing, if they wanted to make the effort to go there are plenty of fishing holes close by. So we are mostly dealing with kids that have had some fishing experience already. But, with a fly fishing station, most of these kids have not had any exposure to fly fishing at all and it is something really new to them and something that was worthwhile I think because we had such good instructors that really helped these kids learn a little bit about the sport. So not only were they able to attempt the handling of a rod, but there was an explanation of the different types of flies and how they work and what kind of fish you can fish for. We were even lucky enough to have at a couple of the clinics an expert fly-tier and this fellow really brought a lot more interest into another hobby that the kids were not familiar with. We had a gear and technique station again covering almost everything except the fly fishing aspect of fishing. This, usually what would happen was the guy would just bring a tackle box along and open it up and let the kids look through it and talk about the different types

of lures that are in there. We wanted to stress in this station that it was important to talk about the simple things too because most of these kids are going to be using simple gear. We want to be able to have them learn how to tie knots, how to bait a nightcrawler, a minnow, something like that. The types of baits they are probably going to be using to start out. But there were a lot of questions there. There was quite a bit of material to look at. We had a fish cleaning station that was, I suppose that had the most interest and most involvement of any station, the kids really got in there close to see this because a lot of them had never seen a fish cleaned before. We had fellows skinning bullheads out, we had them filleting crappies by the conventional fillet knife. We had some electricity close so we also demonstrated the electric knife method of filleting. It was really something that the kids had never experienced before. We are happy to say that in two years we have only had two kids pass out here at the fish cleaning station. It turns out both of them were boys too. We had a casting station and this was designed especially to get the kids to learn how to use spin-cast type rod and reel correctly. So we gave them some instructions to begin with on how to cast that particular outfit. They were allowed to practice along the shoreline by throwing a rubber plug out into the lake. I think maybe one of our main goals here was we got some of the young people again that are taking these clinics and maybe some time down the road we are going to save an adult, save one of these kids in a boat from getting a hook in an ear, giving some instructions here. Our final station was the fish management and fish identification station. The primary goal here was just to show the kids some of the fish that they will be catching in Iowa, some of the most familiar species, allow them to handle them, what the identifying features of them, each of the species. Just get them a little more familiar with some of the fish that are found in Iowa. Then we also like to throw in a little fish management. You know, most of these kids do not even know that there is a fish biologist in this world, let alone that there are several of them in the state, so we like to make ourselves known a little bit. Like to let them know that once they are sixteen years of age and they are fishing and need a fishing license in Iowa, they are going to be paying our wages and we are out there to try to promote fishing. So, we want them to have some idea we are out there. All the talk about some of the fish management programs that we are involved in to make fishing better. At the end of the program, we usually have a drawing for prizes. Now, I do not particularly like the kids to come to any kind of clinic like this with the announcement that there are going to be prizes awarded, so we usually do not say anything about it, but we have prizes anyway. Normally, there is at least one prize for each child. It is just something to take home to make them a little more proud of the fact that they did complete the clinic, plus they can show it around to some of the friends and possibly we will get some of their friends to come the following year. So, it has worked out real well for us in Iowa in the past two years. We have 18 clinics ongoing this year, so we have increased quite a bit over the past couple of years.

Al Farris: Thank you, Tom. I appreciate it. In Iowa, we have a rather unique system of county conservation boards. Of the 99 counties of the state of Iowa, we have 98 county conservation boards. Allamakee County, which is the extreme northeast county in Iowa, does not have a county conservation board. The emphasis of these county conservation boards varies depending on the composition of that board, but all of them to a greater or lesser extent have involvement in fish and wildlife management and in parks. Here today to talk to you a little bit more about the county conservation board system and their local involvement in the local conservation efforts is Pat Meade, President of the Iowa Association of County Conservation Boards and a member of the Johnson County Conservation Board which is the Iowa City area. Pat Meade.

County Conservation Boards: Local Involvement in Conservation
Pat Meade, President, Iowa Association of County Conservation Boards

Pat Meade: Thank you, Al. I am very happy to be here today and hope that by the time I finish speaking to you that I have exuded a little bit of enthusiasm that I have for the county conservation program. If I can get rid of the shaking stomach and the knocking knees, why maybe I can get that task performed. When Al called me about two weeks ago and asked me to participate in the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Conference, he told me that he would give me every opportunity to back out. That sort of puzzled me after I thought about just a little bit. So I decided to try to study that a bit and see if I could figure just exactly why he said that. Since I have been involved in county conservation board work for about ten years, I felt I was somewhat knowledgeable about the program and its process. So I further deducted that he may have been concerned that my presentation might be a bit too long. I tend to tell stories once and a while; maybe he was a little worried about that. Or maybe he was afraid that I might get into a long winded about the drapes that could be used in the operation centers of the local conservation boards. So I guaranteed Al I would do none of these. I will not even mention the name W-a-t-t-s. As Al mentioned, Iowa does have one the most unique local programs for conservation recreation in these United States. The county conservation board program is a very, very successful program. It is based upon participation of a variety of projects. The voters, as Al said, in 98 of 99 counties approved formation of these boards which provide parks, recreation areas, preserves, forest, wildlife areas, river access and greenbelts, natural preserves, museums, and programs of environmental education, wildlife habitat improvement, public education, a great number of very, very good programs. The county conservation board role is to provide local program for conservation and outdoor recreation for the residents of a particular county. The county conservation board program is a cooperative program in which counties work with other counties, cities, the state and federal governments, and private organizations. County conservation boards fill a void between the state and municipal resource and recreation programs. This is a very critical void because the rural setting in my mind is the future of Iowa's programs, of Iowa's resource programs. The success of future resource programs rely on the efforts of local people identifying local needs and critical resources and then devising cooperative methods of resource preservation and management. Since the adoption of the county conservation board law by the state legislature in 1955, counties have become a significant component of conservation, recreation, and resource management programs for the state. The boards, the county boards are comprised of five members who serve five-year staggered terms. There are 490 conservation board members and approximately 290 full-time employees. County residents have a great amount of input into these programs, because it is local and they are aware of what is needed. Each county program is set by its own particular board members. Their policy is determined by what they feel is the most important need. Taxes paid by property owners in the county go directly into the county conservation board fund to support this program as well as miscellaneous receipts brought forth by possibly a golf course, campground, this type of thing. We also have funding from government agencies. County conservation boards presently manage or own 69,400 acres. Sixty-five counties provide acres for wildlife. This program helps to establish cover on public and private land for game and nongame species. Sixty-three counties provide environmental education services to teach understanding, respect, and appreciation of natural values. A great amount of the success of the county program can be attributed to our State Conservation Commission. Their cooperation and teaching has been very invaluable. County

conservation boards are responsible to the State Conservation Commission in many ways. This is required by 111A, Code of Iowa. I would like to interject here that Doyle Adams is the county coordinator for county conservation board activities, or is the state coordinator for county conservation board activities for the State Conservation Commission, and in my mind, this is a personal opinion, he has done more than any one individual to stimulate the success of these county conservation board programs. He has the monumental task of keeping the counties happy as well as the state, and that is not particularly easy. He has to conjoin and advise and plead and soothe and do anything that it takes to make the things work for both the county and the state board. Their development programs and land acquisition requires authorization from the state; I am speaking of HCRS in particular which, as most of you know, may no longer be. Annual financial and activity reports of the county conservation boards are required by the state. Federal land and water funds are administered by the State Conservation Commission and are allocated to the individual county boards for land acquisition and development. We speak to Lester Fleming when requesting for this type of thing. He is the coordinator for the State Commission. Iowa's wildlife habitat stamp funds are shared by the State Conservation Commission. Project approvals are given to buy land, to purchase seedlings and shrubs, prairie grasses, etc. Just to give a few examples. We would speak to Al Farris about this particular type of thing. Snowmobile registration money is shared by the State Commission also. Twenty-five percent of the registration fees from each individual county goes directly into the county conservation board and then the remaining seventy-five percent is shared through requests and approval of projects. Marine fuel tax funds are also shared and funds from the state for employment of the elderly are also shared by the counties and this is called the Green Thumb Program. I think you have gotten the idea now of how the state works with us. I would like to make a few points on how the county conservation boards assist the state program. The boards work jointly with the fisheries section of the state on fish management on small lakes. A signed agreement between the state on fish management provides the county with different fish species being stocked at no charge. For example, the catfish program. The state provides the catfish, the county provides the manpower for feeding, depositing and releasing of fish. The state provides the fisheries biologist who determines the amount of food to feed and data on growth rates. Another example may be that studies are made by the state on county board lakes for the number of species in any one given lake. Cooperation is excellent from the state fisheries department. A second example of county boards working with the state could be with the forestry department. They have worked together on reforestation projects, both on the county and private properties. The district forester assists in determining the cause of woody plant kill or (inaudible). Technical assistance on corrective pruning of young trees. He may determine the growth rate of a young hardwood timber. Thinning the number of trees per acre to allow for merchantable timber are just a few of the services that the forestry department provides. A third cooperative effort between county and state may be through the state's wildlife section. Again, counties work closely with the district wildlife biologist on wildlife habitat management on county and private property. There may be seed collections for the state nursery, or advice for the county on wildlife food patches, which we are very happy to see bringing back more and more wildlife to the state. This brings to mind a story. I promise I would give just one. There was this C.O. who was working in his particular area and he came across this man, very large man, who had a twine tied around his waist and hanging from this twine were probably eight or ten or twelve squirrel. It was not squirrel hunting season. The C.O. walked up to him and he said, "I am sorry, sir, I am going to have to write a citation for shooting squirrel out of season." And

the guy says, "I ain't shooting no squirrels." Well, the C.O. did not see a gun, so he did not want to argue about that, so he said, "Bow and arrow?" "Nope." "Slingshot?" "Nope." "Are you throwing rocks at them?" "Nope." He was puzzled. He said "Are you trapping them?" He finally said, "Well, how are you getting these squirrels?" "I'm uglying them down." He said, "You are what?" "I'm uglying them down." He said, "Well, I am sorry, I do not understand. Could you show me how you are uglying them down?" So the old guy waited a few minutes and in a tree not too far away a squirrel came scurrying out on the limb. So then this big old guy walks over there and he just beads right in on this squirrel, looks him right straight in the eye. When the squirrel looks at this guy, it was not a matter of seconds until the squirrel went "schhhutt" and he was deader than a doornail. And the guy says, "My god, I have never even heard of such a thing, let alone seen such a thing. I do not understand this. How did you learn how to do this?" The guy says, "My wife." And the C.O. says, "Your wife? Does she do this?" "Not any more. It blows 'em up so much we can't eat 'em." My 30-year-old son told me that story the other day. County conservation boards also have their own state association and it is called the Iowa Association of County Conservation Boards, IACCB for short. We have just in the past few months employed what we think is a very, very qualified executive director. We are in the embryo stage of our project even though the system has been in effect for a number of years. As a matter of fact, one of the State Conservation Commissioners, Mr. Kemler, was directly involved in the establishment of the state program. We are elected at a conference. It is held once a year. Our main goals are education, legislation, and service to counties. We hope to work very, very closely with the State Conservation Commission. We hope to be very, very effective in making this old place, this old world a better place to live. I promised Al I would not talk very long, I promised one story, and I promised not to talk about the drapes, so I think at that point, I will just open it up for questions and answers and see if anyone does have any questions for me. I would be happy to answer them; that is the way you really learn about our program.

Al Farris: Questions?

???: Do the boards maintain a payroll then for people who run the areas?

Pat Meade: Yes, we do. I can give you the specifics of our particularly county. Our fiscal year budget for 1982 is \$433,250 for our particular county. Of that budget, \$332,787 will go for, no now wait a minute. Sorry about that. \$332,787 comes in from our own county tax monies and a difference from that comes in from miscellaneous receipts and from monies shared by the state and federal government. We have ten full-time employees and about twelve part-time employees. The total salary and wages for our county is approximately 50 percent of our total budget which is \$226,457. I think that is pretty good when you stop and consider that most municipalities expect to expend about 65 percent of their budget for salaries. The money is allocated by the state. We get what we may collect up to as much as one mil, 27¢ per thousand. That goes directly into the county conservation board budget and the board members then set up the budget and determine how it should be spent.

???: Does your chairman (inaudible)?

Pat Meade: I have to say in all honesty that it varies in counties. I depends on the exec officer in each county. We look to him in our particular county, and I can speak best about my county. We have an excellent director and we look to him

for expertise but we really make the decisions in our board. We are a very active board. And I would like to say it is that way in every county but I would be kidding myself and you too if I said that.

???: Do you provide a good salary for your executive officer?

Pat Meade: For the exec officer? Yes, our exec officer realizes \$26,000 a year plus a home and car and what have you. This is in this particular county.

???: (Inaudible.)

Pat Meade: Oh yes, very much so. I feel that they respect our work greatly because they feel that we can get out and add to their program. We do a lot of education in this respect. I think that's what's needed. I think this is what we have to do to get things to start preserving and conserving.

???: How much money do you get to be a board member?

Pat Meade: I am going to tell you right now, the pay's terrible. There is no pay. The system is thus; we have the county supervisor program. Each county in Iowa has a county supervisor program. They are the ones who appoint the county conservation board member, and as I said, there are five members on each county board. We are, so to speak, volunteers.

???: Supervisors are elected?

Pat Meade: The supervisors are elected by the local populus, and then we are appointed. Some people would say it is a political appointment which maybe I could not argue, but I do believe that once the people are appointed to this board, they become so engrossed in conservation that it is not political at all. So when they argue with me on that from another county, working across the state I do not see too much political input into it. That does not mean to say that we do not do a lot of legislative work. We are political in that respect, but we are not fighting as to whether or not we are Democrats or Republicans, we are fighting to get a good program.

???: What is the budget considerations of county boards?

Pat Meade: Ooo, I cannot answer that. I know that statewide, the county projects expend about \$18 million so the greater share of that would come from county tax money, local money. Now the balance would come from special, you know like golf courses and this kind of thing, and from federal funding. They are very successful programs. If you have any interest at all, if your state has any interest at all, I would just encourage you to come talk to us about it. It is highly successful. I hope I pointed out in my little talk here that it has been a very cooperative effort between the state and county programs. I am sure we would not have been successful if it had not been for the State Conservation Commission and I am not trying to make points with anyone here today. Yes?

???: Maybe you covered it, I did not hear. What was the origin of county conservation, was there state legislation?

Pat Meade: Yes, there was state legislation in 1955 that states "a county may set up a county conservation board"; may, it was not required, only one county in the state, of the 99 counties, has not done so. And they may allocate up to one mil, 27¢ per thousand of tax receipts. Yes.

???: What percent of your budget is recreation --nonhunting and fishing activities compared to hunting and fishing?

Pat Meade: As a state, I cannot answer, statewide I cannot answer that either. Only in my own county. Can you answer that, Al?

Al Farris: It varies so much by county and by county conservation board membership and by executive director interest. It runs all the way from counties that have practically no involvement in hunting and fishing to maybe Worth or Cerro Gordo County in northern Iowa that are almost exclusively hunting and fishing interest and very few parks. And then ones in between. So it varies all over the board. I might say that of late, I do not know what we are up to now, but probably 50, 60 percent of the executive officers, full-time executive officers are fish and wildlife degree graduates from either Iowa State or from South Dakota State, it seems like.

Pat Meade: It is a great program. Even some from Montana.

Al Farris: Yes, but a lot, quite a few of them are fish and wildlife degree people in the executive officer positions.

Pat Meade: In our own county, we work quite a bit toward fish and wildlife. We have the feed programs and reforestation. I think since I have been on the board in our own local county we have planted over 100,000 trees and shrubs. Of that, one-third of them were planted by what we call our youth tree planting day and we extended an invitation to all the local youth to come and help plant trees. It is a great project. I was thinking when Tom was talking about his fishing project, we do about the same thing with tree planting. It has been very successful. We have wildlife food patches. We do not happen to have a particular area where they can go hunting. It is next on our agenda. We are hoping to get some funds to buy an area with upland hardwood timber so we can allow hunting in particular places and times. Yes.

???: You are doing the best job in environmental education I think of any group in the state. I am specifically referring to Warren County. Those two girls are balls of fire. They have something going practically every week.

Pat Meade: Thank you. We are working very hard on this. We are happy with our exec director that we have hired and with the feeling that we really are waking up people. The general populus is becoming concerned about conservation preservation of our natural resources that we are going to get the job done and I think it is going to be through the state and county cooperative program.

Al Farris: Thank you very much, Pat. Pat will be around the rest of the morning. She is going to stay and have lunch with myself and the panel from the next part of the program. Dick Bishop came up and told me that I should make some announcement about the tour this afternoon. There seems to be some concern or questions about it. The plans are that we will break at about 2:00 this afternoon, meet out in front of the hotel at 2:30. We will have an MTA bus to take us to Living History Farms. Living History Farms closes around 5:00; we will get back on the bus at Living History Farms and go directly to Walnut Woods State Park where the picnic will be held and then the bus will bring us back from Walnut Woods State Park back to the hotel. Now, I know of one individual, Jim Helfrich that has a problem.

We will have to arrange a special ride for him from Living History Farms. If any of the rest of you have problems, see me or Dick Bishop or one of the other staff members here afterwards. Okay, let's take a coffee break right now and reconvene at about 10:45.

How Private Citizen Groups See Fish and Wildlife Management Agencies

This morning, we are going to finish up this morning with a panel of Iowa residents and Iowa experts. I had to do a little arm-twisting to get some of them up here. What I had in mind was a presentation by each of them with perhaps questions and discussions stimulated by you and by what they have to say about what private citizens and private citizen groups expect from governmental agencies in the way of fish and wildlife management, be it a federal agency or a state agency. Not only what they expect those agencies to do, but what they think they as citizens or citizen groups can do. I gave them pretty much carte blanche, I said you can go almost anywhere within that topic. I tried to get representatives of different groups. You will notice that there is no one here specifically oriented towards fishing groups. I tried to get Mr. Jim McDonald who is president of the Iowa Great Lakes Fishing Club. We do have great lakes in Iowa and it is the largest fishing organization in the state, but like all good fishermen, he is in Canada on a fishing trip right now. So, he was unable to attend. But we have some excellent panelists here, some people who are involved in one way or another at different levels and different degrees of intensity in conservation movements in the state of Iowa and from different perspectives. I would like to introduce the people at this time. On my far left, is Chuck Mills, President of the Iowa Wildlife Federation. Chuck is from Dubuque which is over on the Mississippi River. On my immediate right is Gladys Black. I put down noted Iowa ornithologist and actually she is more than that. She is the best known ornithologist in the state of Iowa. She is an author of a book. She is a nurse by training, long retired. Birder by avocation and interest and a frequent writer in the Des Moines Register and Tribune and other papers about birds and birdlife, and an active spokesman for nongame in the state of Iowa. To my immediate left is Ron Sutphin. Ron is an attorney from here in Des Moines. He is legal adviser for the Iowa division of the Izaak Walton League of America. He is a member of the board of directors and past president of the Des Moines chapter of the Izaak Walton League. The Des Moines chapter of the Izaak Walton League is the largest chapter of the Izaak Walton League in the United States. Is that not correct?

Ron Sutphin: Right.

Al Farris: In the center is Gerald Schnepf. Gerry is a former employee of the Iowa Conservation Commission in the planning section and he is now executive secretary of the Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation which is a private group. And so we are going to start off our discussion with the first presentation by Chuck Mills.

Chuck Mills: My ego was uplifted when Al Farris said that an expert was needed to discuss the relationship between private citizen conservation groups and the professional agencies. Al almost sent me in orbit when he mentioned that the group I was to discuss this issue with included professionals from the eastern states of Ohio, Kentucky, west to Colorado, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, as well as

three provinces in Canada. When I shared this joy with my wife, she calmly reminded me about the definition of expert. She asked to break the term into component parts--X and spurt. X is an unknown quantity, and spurt, as we all know, is an uncontrollable dripping. Therefore, it is with humble pleasure that I greet you today and welcome the opportunity to discuss the real issues of communication, cooperation, and relationships between the private and public professional conservation organizations. To begin with, may I remind all of you that I am a citizen of Iowa and that my views are from this perspective. I should also mention that because of my national affiliation with the National Wildlife Federation, I am able to meet at least twice a year with my counterparts from the north-central states region, and once a year with the full assemblage at our national convention. Therefore, I am acquainted with some of their opportunities, although I am no expert, as my wife has reminded me. One truism that can enthusiastically be said for all of us in Iowa and probably elsewhere is that the private citizen conservation group would much rather work with the professional state or ministry rather than against the agency. The professional agency has things needed by the private groups, and on the other hand the private group because of its grass-roots structure has things needed by the professionals. Cooperation is essential. You scratch my back, I will scratch your back. The only problem with cooperation is trust. I have to trust you and you have to trust me. Good communications is the best trust fund I know. Let us work together--not sleep together. Let us develop mutual respect. Do not ask for more than can be given, but set attainable challenging goals. Another very important point to keep in mind is that the professional agency has the power, but the private citizen group has the bomb. Keeping this premise in mind, cooperation is mutually advantageous. Sometimes the trust area becomes a problem. But hopefully communications can clear the air. Forgive me, Al. A typical example of the power in the bomb is something that happened here in Iowa several years ago. The Iowa agency and I am referring to the Conservation Commission tried to establish a dove hunting season. They had the power to do that, or the majority of the power. Unfortunately, the program did not go over very well. Many groups were opposed. Criticism went uncontrolled. The editorial section of the paper was one issue for many, many weeks. Congressional telephone calls and letters were one-sided. The bomb was dropped. The damage is still in evidence today. So communication and cooperation could have possibly saved the day. In the spirit of cooperation, you should understand that the private citizen group respects your position and knowledge. Most of us in the private sector are volunteers. We would love to have the opportunity to practice our avocation full-time. In most discussions, you will win the argument because you have the knowledge. But you must remember not to abuse that power because the private citizen group still has the bomb. You may win the argument but lose the sale. A good public image never hurt anybody; let's just keep it in balance. A final contribution the professional agency can provide is to become the central element in establishing dialogue between similar and diverse private citizen groups. The public hearing program is well-known. I am not talking about that program. I am specifically referring to dialogue in the planning stages when policies are first being formulated. I would have been pleased as I am sure others would have been to have been contacted prior to any dove hunting announcement in order to participate as a sounding board as to our members' feelings regarding that particular issue. It would have been even more meaningful if this discussion could have included Gladys Black or other interested private organizations. I realize such meetings take time and effort, but I feel that if a program was early evaluated from the private side, chances of its success and acceptance would be much greater. By way of summary, I would rather work with you than against you. You have the power, we have the bomb. We respect

your knowledge and position and finally we hope that you could establish a dialogue among the private organizations across our state. I thank you for the opportunity to discuss this subject of interest to both of us. I hope you have an enjoyable and enlightening convention and come back to Iowa real soon. Thank you.

Al Farris: Thank you, Chuck. I had not heard that analogy before but I think it is very true. Next for comments is going to be Gladys Black. I think we will go through all the individuals on the panel before we get into any discussions. So, if you have any questions, maybe you could jot them down or make a little note of them in your memory. Gladys.

Gladys Black: Ladies and gentlemen, your president, Dr. Al Farris is a trusting soul to ask me to serve on a panel devoted to how private citizen groups see fish and wildlife management agencies, knowing that I have in the past been critical of certain actions of the Iowa Conservation Commission and further that I aired my opinions and views in newspapers, on radio, and on television. I do thank Al for the flattery, for listing me as a noted ornithologist. Actually, I am an amateur, but practically all of my adult life has been devoted to conservation. Twenty years as a public health nurse dealing with conservation of human health and preventive medicine and the past twenty-five years since the death of my husband and my return to Iowa from Georgia to care for my aged mother, I have devoted to field studies of birds, observations, and so forth often doing 350 nest studies per summer. Also, environmental education through field trips, slide shows, outdoor education days for students elementary through college, civic and church groups, all volunteer work. A monthly bird article in the Des Moines Sunday Register and a weekly story in four weekly newspapers. Also radio and television appearances. During the last months of Theodore Roosevelt's administration, some 72 years ago, I was born on a rich prairie farm five miles east of Pleasantville. The house was surrounded by a two-acre windbreak grove. My mother knew birds, so by the time I was seven years old I could identify at least 25 species. I also saw the last few years of the rape and killings of our wildlife. Spring hunting of waterfowl was still legal. There was a year-round closed season of bobwhite quail and wood ducks throughout my childhood and I saw my last flock of prairie chickens at the age of four. They overwintered in the shucked corn across the road from our house. The list of organizations to which I belong is too long; I will mention only a few. Sierra Club Nature Conservancy, American Ornithologists' Union, Iowa Ornithologists' Union, Bird Banding, Wilson Society, National Audubon, Des Moines and Indianola Audubon, also the Iowa Wildlife Society. I do not belong to any anti-hunting society as I have been accused. I hunted throughout my youth and until a few years ago. We have been pleased to see the Iowa Conservation Commission grow from a political football with a few game wardens to a large group of qualified scientists governed by a seven-member commission which is supposed to be free of political sabotage. With thousands of acres in parks, forests, and game management areas. The only Iowa park that I can recall in my childhood is the Ledges near Boone. Yes, you have come a long, long way and we are proud of you. We now have in Iowa, I cannot tell you how many state parks, well over 100 is it not. All have lakes and fishing and most have camping. Our park rangers, the ones I know in southeast and central Iowa, are outstanding men, well-educated and skilled at their jobs. When the state legislature opened state parks to drinking, it was a sad, sad day. The beer busts and keggers are an abomination with rangers often being seriously injured and subject to unnecessary strains, which often brings on heart attacks. These groups of drugs do not belong in state parks and it is the duty of the legislature to remedy this disgraceful situation. This is no way to be construed as a criticism of the Iowa Conservation Commission.

I am sure other states have the same problem. My niece in Illinois told me that one of their state parks had to be closed because of the rowdies. Now, no one can use it. Such situations are intolerable. In general, our parks are understaffed and underfunded in this economic crunch. To tell you the truth, the state was not overly generous even when they had surplus dollars in the treasury. The law enforcement arm of the Iowa Conservation Commission, the conservation officers and the game wardens, are hard-working, dedicated, often working 12 to 18 hours a day. They, too, are understaffed, 60 officers for 99 counties. Perhaps the new reorganization will help. The chief of the law enforcement, Rick McGeough, was for several years the conservation officer for my county which includes Lake Red Rock and Red Rock Refuge. He is a dedicated officer, and also did a fine job of education in the schools on outdoor education days and with civic groups. The biggest complaint in my area is with the slob hunter which I have about decided cannot be educated. Much of the trouble lies with the justices and the judges who are much too lenient on hunters who break the law. Sometimes I wonder how many belong to the hawk-shooting slob club. Their attitude toward wildlife discourages many a fine conservation officer. In the past, we have had a few lemons. For instance, one conservation officer was quoted in a county newspaper as saying he was not going to arrest those hunters. They paid his salary. Consequently, farmer/hunter relationships deteriorated in that county. Nails were scattered in driveways of most farms, cattle shot, and bullets placed in mailboxes. With Rick in command, I think that sort of thing will cease. Fishing is probably the most important sport in Iowa, and our fisheries biologists are tops. Let us go back to the early 30's which none of you will remember. When Iowa had no lakes except the natural lakes in northwest Iowa, how simply wonderful it was when Ahquabi near Indianola; Red Haw, Chariton; Keomah, Oskaloosa; and Wapello in Davis County were built, along with many others over the state. You young men cannot begin to realize how happy we were to have lakes and water and lovely parks. It was pure heaven. And in recent years, many more state and county parks have been acquired also four big Corps of Engineers reservoirs. I was there when Red Rock was built. They said it would take two years to fill with water. Huh, it took four days. I have studied the bird population trends and we now have 256 species recorded in the area surrounding the 10,000 acre lake at the 26,500-acre Red Rock Refuge. Elk Rock State Park lies on either side of the upper end of the lake, ably managed for the past twelve years by park ranger Wes Jones. Red Rock Refuge, the game management area under Conservation Commission supervision, has had several fine wildlife biologists in charge. Very cooperative, even with this little old lady in ragged tennies. Believe me, they have been patient. Sometimes putting up with my presence daily, day after day after day, when I was doing buzzard studies or other population studies. Now, the record on nongame species, and we have 75 blue-listed in Iowa, is perhaps the poorest. But that is improving. The Iowa Conservation Commission has long had the reputation of being hunter oriented. However, the acquisition of game management land also benefits nongame. Water habitat is perhaps our biggest problem. With the widespread use of pesticides and deadly herbicides along all our gravel roads is still a factor in the population decline, I am sure. Unfortunately, it has been almost impossible to get chemical analysis done because the Iowa Conservation Commission was reluctant to release funds for this nongame research. It took three years of complete nesting failures in the great blue heron rookery at Red Rock from 1970 to 72 and a lot of screaming before we got the research done. The number of chemicals in those eggs was appalling. Dr. Larry Wing's testimony was a factor in getting dieldrin banned. Once I succeeded in getting an analysis of a baby horned owl that died when less than 24 hours old, it too died due to chemicals. Our bluebird babies are being killed by the poisons in young cornfields that are put in there to kill corn

rootworm and cutworms. It seems strange to me that my father was able to farm and raise corn without, even with a few cutworms and we did not have to put poison in the ground. The bluebird babies are being killed by these poisons. The parent bluebirds collect the cutworms in the early morning hours before the worms have returned into the ground. It is not only lack of nesting places. The Knoxville biology classes put up a hundred boxes and we only had five occupied and of those five, the first babies died of poisoning. Iowa is doing almost nothing in the integrated pest control program on farms. At ISU they seem wedded to the the chemical companies, an unholy alliance. Iowa's noxious weed law is another thing that bugs me. It belongs to the 19th century and should be abolished. Most states have abolished it, knowing full well that every farm field is treated with herbicides when the crop is put in. But the county supervisors force the Iowa Conservation Commission biologists to mow or spray their game management areas even though that field may be producing 300 ducklings and scads of baby songbirds. Some documented studies and a good PR program should help to get the noxious weed law abolished. Of course the chemical companies can be depended on to lobby for the retention of this antiquated law. The nongame program needs money. Lots of money. We tried, God knows we tried to get the chickadee checkoff bill passed last year, only to be defeated by the lobby of the head of the Iowa Tax Division who came from another state and certainly does not give a damn about Iowa's nongame wildlife. He influenced the Republican leader of the Senate to table the checkoff bill and it was never brought to a vote. The lame excuse was that all sorts of private groups such as cancer and heart would want a checkoff. It is sad that the Senate leader could not see that Iowa nongame wildlife is state business and it is the duty of the state to protect these species. At least 75 Iowa birds are blue-listed or threatened having suffered drastic population declines in recent years. The ICC backed the checkoff bill and in recent years has taken great interest in nongame and now have the nongame wildlife biologist. With the new director, Larry Wilson, we feel that nongame wildlife has found a friend after a century of neglect. In the field of public relations, there were times in the past when we wondered if the Iowa Conservation Commission stuck their necks out just to have their heads chopped off. I did not fully realize myself how powerful the written word was until I began writing a monthly bird article in the Des Moines Sunday Register twelve years ago. Every single day I received letters and long-distance telephone calls from readers of my column. Four years ago when I asked for reports on the evening grosbeak invasion, I received reports of 300 flocks. And that was a winter we also had a lot of other birds. So the letters were in the thousands. Last winter I received reports of 107 snowy owls in Iowa. The interest in wildlife is great, both game and nongame, and I feel the Iowa Conservation Commission should publicize their good works which are many. In other words, he who tooteth not his own horn, the same shall not be tooted.

Al Farris: I hope you were listening. There is one thing you can always depend on from Gladys, she is going to give it to you very straight. She may pat you on the back or she may kick you down a little lower, but you are going to get an honest answer from her and an honest greeting. And I think, if you were really listening, there were probably statements there of general principles that would apply to any other state as well as Iowa, although she used Iowa for the role model here, as to the interests of citizens such as here in other states. Thank you very much. Our next panel member is Mr. Ron Sutphin from the Izaak Walton League.

Ron Sutphin: Thank you, Al. First of all, I would like to say that I welcome the opportunity to be here. Like everybody else, I somewhat question what I was

intended when they called me an expert. After I heard the definition, I figured that must be me. After I heard Gladys, I now know what an expert really is. What I am is a person that has a certain interest in the outdoors and in particular, hunting. One who happened to stand around long enough and say enough things and I got involved. I guess that makes me an expert. I started as a young boy in a family that was a hunting family, bird doggers, and a farm background. So it just kind of came natural. As I went through school and got out of law school, I became interested in trying to do something because I say that there are some serious problems facing people with interests such as myself. As a result, I have gotten involved in the Izaak Walton League and the Ding Darling Foundation. I think that most of you know and I do not think that I need to talk about the things that are concerning the groups like the Izaak Walton League. We are concerned as to what is happening to the future of the environment and how that future impacts on each one of us. In particular, on how it impacts on our desires and needs for recreation. The Izaak Walton League as most of you probably know is a broad-based sportsmen's group. We represent them all. We represent the campers, the hikers, the backpackers, probably more important and more predominantly the hunters and the fishermen. We also are environmentally oriented. We have been involved in numerous environmental programs here in the state of Iowa and elsewhere. I am sure most of you have heard of our Save Our Stream Program which has achieved some national popularity. It has been very active here in the state of Iowa. We have been involved in the boundary waters canoe area issues in Iowa. We just finished the film, the Iowa division just finished a film on hazardous waste where we work very closely with Environmental Quality and I think the things that Gladys talked about we would feel about the same way that she does. I would like to, I think, sound more on some of the recreation aspects of what we are interested in the Izaak Walton because I think these other people are probably talking more about the environmental impact. Recreation is a very important need that people have. You know, there are two problems that are facing us today. Number one is the population and the movement of the population. I just heard statistics that three out of four people now live in urban areas. That means just 25 percent of our population is still back on the land someplace. And people have shown a greater and greater need now that they have gotten into the city to get back to the land. We hear things like "back to nature", things like that. What people are talking about is they are talking about a need for solitude. The people that are talking in that way are people who look at recreation as a form of solitude in their life. All the way from the person that wants to go out and sit on some riverbank for an hour and maybe catch a catfish to a person who wants to have an extended wilderness experience up in the boundary waters area. I think that if there is anything that private sportsmen's groups could ask of wildlife management agencies is to do everything that is possible to enhance the quality of that recreation experience, of that experience of solitude. Wilderness can be right in your own back yard. It can be in a game management area where the birders can go see the birds. It can be the boundary waters area, but it can be anyplace and that is what the sportsmen's groups would like to see I think more than anything from you people. I think that the sportsmen's groups would like to be involved as much as possible. We heard that communication and cooperation are a key and I cannot stress that enough. We constantly at the Izaak Walton League are looking for projects to get involved in. I am involved in the Memorial Fund committee for the Izaak Walton League here in Des Moines and we constantly are looking for projects to put money in. If you can imagine that. Here we are 2,000 members strong, and we are constantly looking for something to do. You do not realize how important input from the agencies could be to organizations such as ours to help us identify things that we can get

involved in. I think that because of the population trends and what is happening, I think that the public attitude is changing considerably. I think that sportsmen and environmentalists need to develop an ethic. I think that that is probably one of the most important and prior things that need to be done right now by all of us. I think that your sportsmen's organizations can be very instrumental in providing that ethic and helping provide that ethic. I think that a lot of that has got to come from you but I think that the sportsmen's organizations can best serve the public by making the public aware of getting out and doing some education of trying to help the public sentiment. We talked about what do we expect from the agencies? I think that by the same token I think you have to say who are you asking that of. I think if you go to the beginning, the boy that just got his first shotgun or the person that just got interested in fishing, he is liable to say, I want a lot of things to shot, I want a lot of things to catch. We find as we study people that over a period of time, their involvement in outdoor recreation and outdoor sports leads to a certain amount of specialization. For instance, the child that gets a cane pole and goes bullhead fishing with a worm someday is the fly fisherman that ties his own flies and goes after trout. And as a result, he becomes to a certain extent looked up to. We see an awful lot of outdoor literature being sold. People are looking for this, people are trying to learn how to do it, to follow in the right steps and things like this. Your sportsmen's groups like the Izaak Walton League, Ducks Unlimited, organizations like this are made up to a great extent of those people who have advanced from the stage of the worm fisherman with the cane pole to the fly rodder. And they can set a certain example and through this example they can do an awful lot to educate the public. I think that with the right kind of communication, with the right kind of cooperation, and with the right input from the agencies, I think the private organizations can do an awful lot to help make people more aware of what we need to do to preserve the recreational quality of this country. I want to conclude on one note and that is do not forget to keep us involved. Let us know what you want us to do. I think to a certain extent we are there to give you input and I think our input is important because we do represent the grass roots, but I want to leave here with this one thought in mind. That we want to work with you people and we need to know what you want us to do. I cannot stress that enough. Thank you.

Al Farris: Thank you very much, Ron. Our last speaker today is Gerry Schnepf, who represents yet a different perspective of the previous three. Mr. Schnepf.

Gerry Schnepf: Thank you much, Al. I am glad to have you all in the state of Iowa. I hope you enjoy it. The heat is everywhere, so you cannot escape. So bear with us, and that is just typical Iowa. Tell you a little bit about myself. I was born and raised in northwest Iowa, went to College at South Dakota State, I guess the name's changed now. Went to Iowa State and graduated from there in forestry and range management, believe it or not. They do not offer that anymore I do not think. Went up to University of Minnesota. What?

Al Farris: They certainly do not promote it.

Gerry Schnepf: Never understood why I took it either. Anyhow, I ended up going to the University of Minnesota and received my masters in forest economics and outdoor recreation. From there I went up to Canada, spent five years in southeast Manitoba and came down back to Iowa and spent ten years with the State Conservation Commission. So really all my working lifetime has been involved as a public employee. So in that, I feel I am in a position to use the term "we" when

I start to talk about we in public employ, meaning county, state, federal, any kind of governmental employee. I think that entitles me to do that. Next, I want to talk just briefly about the Foundation. The Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation is a new concept; it is two years old. It is sponsored by the Governor. It originally had twelve trustees, it now contains fifty trustees from across the state. And they are the prominent leadership of this state. They reflect a rather diverse set of backgrounds. The role of the Foundation is to involve and to work with the private sector to become supporters, participants, and contributors to natural resource management in this state. This state is an agricultural state. You have agricultural interests coming out of your ears. But in terms of natural resource interests, in outdoor recreation you do not have the establishment reflecting the concern for the management of the state's resource. It is our purpose to try to get them involved, to become a participate, and in fact contribute. Our efforts during the past two years consisted of three areas. One to assist in the acquisition of natural lands around the state, and since our existence, we have been involved in the acquisition of over 2,600 acres of land, some of which was with and for the State Conservation Commission. Some of those projects are also with county conservation boards. We have on the books now over 80 plus different projects waiting for us to participate in. In addition, we have got a program of public awareness through public service announcements. Have special efforts in terms, particularly in terms of a book that is coming out on Iowa's natural heritage. It will be a 352-page volume. One other state has done this, Ohio, and we use Ohio as a method for building on and working on a book that we are in the process of developing. It will not be out until September of 82. We have a project this afternoon, you are going to Living History Farms. You will note that there are three farms out there. A farm of the 1840's, I believe; the farm of the turn of the century; and the farm, I think of today and tomorrow or today's farm. We are working with them on a project called the farm of the native Iowan, the Indian, because it was the Indian that first brought agriculture to this state. It is important that we see because of the exposure of the public over 400,000 visitors a year to Living History Farms, that they understand the role of agriculture and the role of the natural resource and the way to do that is through the development of a farm of the native Indian. We have original seed sources and so on. I am taking too much time to talk about that, but that will be a program that will be underway this fall. We have a third area that we work in and that is long-range planning and research. One of the best things that we can do in the state is leave a heritage of good data, information to make better decisions. We started a project with the State Conservation Commission for statewide fisheries survey. We will be working toward the development of long-range goals for the state, working with the Governor's Office on that kind of a strategy. That is just a very brief background. I want to talk now about the topic that Al mentioned. As private citizen groups, how we see you. Well, the fact is we always use a term and I know that I use it, use the term public. How can we get more public involvement. Well, I will tell you what, let me do away with the myth. There is no such thing as a public. There are lots of individuals, there are lots of organizations, there are lots of groups, there are lots of special interests out there. There is no such thing as a general public. Every one of those individuals or groups have a particular concern or a particular need that you need to hone in on. For example, we are in the process of raising a \$5 million fund. The way we are doing that, and by the way, we have about a million and a half. We started our program in January to raise the funds. It is not a very casual thing to go out and raise dollars. That takes a very concentrated effort and I like to equate just an example how we go about it. We received a major grant from John Deere in Moline. John Deere employs about 30,000

Iowans. But we made the approach from the start of our approach to the John Deere Company to the receipt of the grant was eight months. So, it is not something that you do very rapidly. You must learn to be patient. The same thing goes when you are talking about dealing with a group or an individual. Take the time and the patience to learn about that individual or that group or that organization, and I think Chuck, you said you do not need to sleep with them. That is not the point, but by golly you better understand them. We spent in that eight-month period of waiting, of working on that grant, we ended up knowing more about the John Deere Company than I think many officials in John Deere know. We learned every strategy, we learned every personal kind of concern and interest and the grant we received was almost \$600,000. That involved also a trip by the Governor. That was the largest single grant that John Deere has ever made. So take careful research, careful thought about dealing with anybody, a group or organization is critical. I tell you another deal that I have always heard and I find myself changing in my perspective. Spent time in government, why I thought I was a truly dedicated public employee. The only way to get things done was by government. Okay, now I have been out two years and I have almost found myself switched to the other side because the role of involvement of private people is just essential. We have gotten, I think, in our short period of existence a heck of a lot done. But in being with public entities, the term always came up professional opinion. Now, and I know that all of you sometimes get aggravated because a decision is made and it was not based upon your professional opinion, not totally. Now they may have considered your judgment as part of the opinion, but finally when they cut it, there are social concerns, economic concerns, political concerns, and let me tell you last of all, personalities. It is personalities that make a program go. So in that sense, you need to just simply understand that, that the package of factors that go into a decision are not just simply a professional opinion. Now that can be positive, because if you understand it and you learn to work in the realm of politics. I took out a definition from a dictionary, politics always has the connotation of being less than desirable. Well, let me tell you politics is the history of this country. It is the way it came about; it is the way the states came about; and it is the way that we felt worked. You got to understand for politics is the art or science concerned with the guidance or influencing of governmental policy. Now they used in here the term governmental policy. I think that is inappropriate. Because as Ron will tell you, there is a political policy within the Ikes. Chuck would say the same thing, and I am sure that anybody in any organization, ornithologists alike, would say there are politics within that organization and structure. Okay, take the time to find out what that politics is. You know, we have got the need to understand each organization very carefully. Now, that takes time and effort. You do not do this casually, and you do not do it as a part-time job. I do not know how many organizations have an individual or a person that works totally in the field of politics and public relations. Now I am using the term politics in the broader sense because that is critical. It is critical to spend time to cultivate and understand. What you need to develop for each individual public or each individual organization public is a specific strategy on how you work with them and one of the basic things that you can determine is to learn how to disagree. You do not agree on how to disagree. That may be one of the most important things that you get out of it in all cases because always accentuate the positive elements of any organization where your areas of concern are alike, work on those, accentuate those. Where you have areas of concern that are in conflict, do not walk away from them. Sit there, try to understand that organization and why they have that area of concern, and that could also be a private corporation, by the way. Find out why they have that area of concern. You do not have to agree, but you better understand it,

then start to develop programs to minimize that area of concern. Be positive, turn that negative element into a positive element and you will gain their support. What you need to do is learn also to match your people's personalities with the organization you are dealing with. That is a very basic thing. If you can sense or learn that there is an immediate conflict, switch, get someone else to take that particular job on and then work very assuredly. Matching is all part of the strategy that you have to develop. You have got to recognize the bomb. But if you lay out a strategy, frankly you know what you can do is diffuse the bomb. You hope you can make that just nothing more than a little firecracker and it turns out it helps you and it helps the organization. We run through kind of a checklist. We need to broaden our perspectives as resource people, get the blinders off. Need to learn the political system like you never thought you could. You need to understand the publics, the whole variety of them. You need to recognize areas of concern, and above all, be objective. Be sympathetic and patient. Develop special strategies for each public. Always be as positive and turn the negative items to positive. That takes a little concentration in the continuing effort. Match personalities. Utilize areas of concern to constructively improve yourselves and to educate others. Do not walk away from them. Learn how to disagree. Set the ground rules to be acceptable to both. And probably most importantly, be responsive. Be responsive, because that is what everyone expects. And with that, I thank you much.

Al Farris: Thank you very much, Gerry. I want to tell you right now that I introduced this panel with a lot of uneasiness and trepidation. I was very unsure that I had done the right thing. They have delighted me. I think they have presented some fantastic ideas from many different points of view and I am sure now they will entertain questions or discussion. Dave, yes, go right ahead.

Dave Kenney: I have a comment and then a question for Mrs. Black. To put your mind at rest about the Illinois parks that were closed because of rowdies, we have no park or conservation area that has been so closed.

Mrs. Black: It was a forest.

Dave Kenney: We have no forest.

Mrs. Black: Good.

Dave Kenney: I knew you were worried deeply about that so I... I also would like to ask you a question and then make a comment on my question, to avoid making a mini-speech, I will put it in the form of a question. Do you not think the time has come to abandon the use of the term "nongame" and for this reason. There are three. First, it is essentially a negative term. Second, it tends to create the "we"- "they" syndrome; we do not need to further. Third, it is biologically unsound. I have tried to stamp it out in my agency in Illinois; I have not succeeded at it yet, but I have succeeded in part and because I have I think we have been able to serve the cause better as the species most commonly not hunted by man, which is a much better way of saying it. I have raised this point often and I have usually been told, "oh, we are used to doing it that way, we cannot quite give it up because it is convenient shorthand". We would all be better served if we could give up that term because of the reasons that I said here.

Gladys Black: I do agree. I do not know how much luck I will have getting the people of Iowa to accept it but I will try.

Al Farris: We have had that internal discussion several times and have been trying to come up with a different term because of those very reasons. Your point is well taken, you know. The robin may not be game for man but it is game for something. Are there other questions or comments, please? Yes.

???: I was wondering what the Des Moines Chapter of the Izaak Walton League's position would be on Secretary Watt's statement in the Des Moines Register this morning regarding off-road vehicles. You say you represent such varied interests.

Ron Sutphin: Did not see the article.

???: Basically, it said that the Secretary wanted to open up public land to off-road vehicles. Which part of your constituency would be served by that?

Ron Sutphin: I am not sure that I can speak on behalf of the Izaak Walton League on that at this point.

Al Farris: Anybody else want to address it? Chuck.

Chuck Mills: One thing if I make it a policy in the private organizations it's usually determined by resolution. In the Wildlife Federation, we do have resolutions bordering on areas like this. I would not be qualified to certainly offer an opinion based on what has already been done. But, to be honest with you, we are not given a license to go out and shoot our mouth off any time we want to. The policy is part of our organization too. These are things that have to be looked into and examined from both sides. Although given the source...

Al Farris: Go ahead, shoot your mouth off.

Ron Sutphin: I would like to say something on that, along the same line. When it was announced that Secretary Watt was going to occupy that position, there were a number of people within the League back in the state of Indiana and back in there that took a very violent opposing stand. We made it very clear at that point that we did not take that stand as part of the Izaak Walton League of America. The reason we did that, it goes along with what we have all been talking about today, it is not us against them. We hope that we are all in this together and rather than constantly be negative and against and things like that, we have found that it is better to try to work positively with these kind of problems and try to make the best out of it. So, as an organization, the Izaak Walton League has tried to stay very neutral in some of the opposition toward Mr. Watt. We have tried to give him the benefit of the doubt in all cases; he was an attorney when he took some of the unpopular positions that some of the outdoor organizations, some of the sportsmen's organizations have been against and I think that is probably where we would be with him at this point in time. I guess that we would presume that he had some reason for what he has done until we see further evidence as to what it is going to cause and take a pretty neutral position. We try to work with the agencies rather than against. I cannot stress that enough.

Al Farris: Are there other questions or comments? Sure, Jack.

Jack Griebe: Seems to me that the involvement and fervor of sportsmen and conservation groups that I noticed in the late 60's and early 70's has cooled off. We just do not seem have that problem any more. I do not know if that is true here, but it is definitely true, I think, in Colorado. We are trying to keep it

going. If that is true here, why, and I am just addressing this to the panel as a whole, if that is true, why, why do you think that is?

Ron Sutphin: I think that sportsmen's groups are trying to learn new ways to accomplish the same end. I think that we are beginning to realize that you have to be a little bit more sophisticated in your approaches, that it is a problem of gentle persuasion now. A big problem is getting the public to accept and be aware and things like this, and I think the activity is there. I think it is just, I think it is just become a lot more sophisticated and I think that is because, that is what our society requires at this point. If you are going to be heard, you have to be somewhat sophisticated, somewhat political about it. I think that is where we are.

Al Farris: Chuck, would like to add on to that, or Gerry?

Gerry Schnepf: I would, I would anyway.

Al Farris: Go ahead.

Gerry Schnepf: We went around the state, in a three-month period we talked to about 1400 Iowans about the concept of the Foundation to see whether Iowans thought there was any interest in pursuing it. I should indicate that three months in the chicken circuit I really put on a lot of weight. However, one of the things I found out is that there is a heck of an interest and I think the interest has switched to broader issues, broader issues now in concern for the state's land, its water, and the resources thereon. I think there is a broader concern now toward issues in that direction. And I just feel that may be a switch that is occurring with the public.

Al Farris: Gladys, do you have anything to add? Or Chuck?

Gladys Black: Yes, I think it may be a quieter, but I think it is a deeper interest. It is there.

Chuck Mills: I think that maybe there has been some polarization that has taken place in the last ten years. The Sierra Club has a very definite role from the public side that we are aware of. The other organizations have lined up too. We have maybe found our niche, so to speak. And that has happened. But here in Iowa, we have some things that are unique that possibly other states might not have. Des Moines is central, we have a central newspaper here. The communication opportunity is fantastic. Any place in this state can get the Des Moines Register the next morning. You have got a very close pulse as to what is happening. This morning, for instance, there was two major issues discussed in the editorial page of the Des Moines Register. And that is not unique. This happens quite often. Iowans make their living through the soil, and this is the state that fostered Aldo Leopold. These are concepts that are very true to the heart and I think that while we might think that they are silent, they are really not. They are there. Things are happening. Things are going to happen.

Al Farris: Follow-up, Jack?

Jack Griebel: (Inaudible.)

Al Farris: I thought so, by the look on your face.

Jack Griebel: Do you think there is going to be a backlash then to the obvious swinging of the pendulum to the right that is going to weaken NEPA, that is going to let our waters be fouled more, that is going to let our air become dirtier just to accommodate development activities? Do you think that there is going to be a swing by conservationists and sportsmen's groups against that, that is going to, you know, line this thing perhaps in its proper place? That is the issue.

Al Farris: Anybody want to tackle that one?

Gerry Schnepf: I see that what is happening is a shift in responsibility to regional or state issues. I do not think a program for a nation, you know, is applicable. A broad-sweep approach. I do not think Iowans are going to stand back and let rules slip. I think they are going to ask if they slip at the federal level, they are going to ask for them to be instated at the state level or local level. You know, in that kind of applicable situation there has been too much groundwork, too much good work done to let it slip just because of a federal situation right now.

Al Farris: Anybody else? Okay, Carl Kays, I think you had your hand up for a question.

Carl Kays: Yes, I would like to ask Chuck here just how you deal with legislation on the state level which you are concerned with. Do you have a lobbyist, suppose a bill was introduced tomorrow, if your legislation was in session, that you either opposed or whether you supported. What would be the mechanism you put into action to either defeat it or pass it?

Chuck Mills: Well, I will tell you right off. The Iowa Wildlife Federation is a growing organization. We have about 2,000 - 2,300 members. We do not have a full-time staff that represents this organization. I will be honest with you. When we need some help, we usually call Lee Dallagher with the Ikes, or I get a call from Al Farris and we start getting on the phones. State legislatures have lousy communication because we do not fund good ways to get back to your constituents like your congressional delegates in the national legislature. We do not know about these things very often. That is one good thing with the Register, at least it does keep us informed. You have got to put your glasses on to read the fine print, but it is there. It is a difficult thing. And, you know, when you have a state organization like the IWF or the Ikes or whatever, you have got to have your main area of trust right here in the center where things can be done. We are located with our state office about 35 miles northwest of Des Moines. That is a difficult thing. So we have to use (inaudible). That is good and that is bad.

Al Farris: Jim Salyer, I think you had a comment or a question.

Jim Salyer: I had a whole bunch of comments going through my mind. But, I picked up on the figure that Mr. Sutphin used, that three out of four people live in urban areas. Turn that around, that is 25 percent of the people that are living off the land. Twenty-five percent of the people represent the conflicts that we talk about in meetings like this. Seventy-five percent of the people have recognized the problem and are not having the influence on resolving those problems that we would like to see. I, and being as careful to walk on eggs as

easy as I possibly can, looking at the current administration, one of the themes seems to be to get the government off the people's back. Yet, it seems like that our resolutions to so many problems is some kind of legislative action. Mandates that are going to be handed down. Rules that will be applied that will prevent certain things from happening. Or rules that insist that certain actions take place; that certain hoops be jumped through by certain groups. I pick up on the kind of thing that I hear Gerry saying as well, that resolutions seem to be that we need to work with is 25 percent of the group, that they are part of the solution. That it is their involvement in letting us know what they will tolerate or how they will be committed, or how they will be involved in resolution of the problem. I keep thinking about that 25 percent and how powerful they are. But they are not really limited to those that just live off the land. We heard that 30,000 people work for John Deere. Many of those are probably living in urban areas, and they are not out on the land but they are dependent on what happens out on those lands. I live in a state, South Dakota, that is also as agriculture-oriented, if not more, than the state of Iowa, and on the weekends I hear five or six times about the wheat commission's success in selling wheat to India or to some other Asian country. And it is being marked up as an accomplishment, and certainly all of South Dakota is interested in selling that grain and when they get it all sold they want to raise more and sell some more to somebody else. I think, as I say, I have trouble being really articulate about this, but it is interesting to think that three out of every four are living in an urban area and turn it all kinds of different ways and realize how we relate to one another, and I still urge that maybe regulation, legislation, mandates, directives, forcing people to jump through hoops that control 25 percent of the land, or 25 percent of the people have control of all the land is not the way to go. Somehow or other we have got to be coordinated and cooperated in, cooperating in the solution of the problem rather than mandating the solutions. I am making an observation and not, I guess, asking a question.

Al Farris: Thank you. No, I think it is a very valid, very interesting observation to turn those figures around and look at it from that perspective. Even in Iowa where our legislature is very rural-conscious and rural-dominated, still you find the majority of the populus does not live in the rural area or on the land. But like you said, there is an extremely strong interconnection between the fertilizer salesman, the feed salesman, the guy that works at John Deere, he may live on the south side of Des Moines, but he understands what the importance of agriculture is in Iowa because if, they will not buy the big tractors, he does not eat. It is very clear, the connection. Would anybody else like to comment on this?

Ron Sutphin: Could I touch on what he said?

Al Farris: Sure.

Ron Sutphin: This, what you just said, I could not agree with anymore and this is what I was trying to convey in the few minutes that I had, that you know, there is too much regulation right now, every time you turn around we sell another stamp to somebody to grow some weeds or save a duck or something like this. And people are really starting to resent this. Sportsmen do not want regulations any more than taxpayers want to pay tax or anything. The reason we have laws, the reason we have legislation, the reason we have mandates and rules and all those things that you mention is because people will not do what they are supposed to do. The way you get people to do what they are supposed to do without making them do it is to

make them aware of it. The way you make people aware of something is to get somebody to say it so they will listen. It is not just the 25 percent of the people that are causing the conflict. A lot of that conflict is coming from the 75 percent, speaking from the quality of recreation standpoint that I mentioned. If the 75 percent or that portion that wants to continue to use the private lands, to go fishing, to go hunting, if they do not do something about it, all the laws, mandates, rules, and regulations in the world are not going to help those people out. Now, because you get the sportsman that tends to gravitate toward the organization like the Ikes, like Ducks Unlimited, those kinds of organizations, being looked up to, those people maybe can go out and make some of these people that are the slob hunters or whatever you want to call them aware of what needs to be done so they will do it without regulations. Some of the leaders in the farm communities can be used to go out and make some of the other people that own the lands know what they are supposed to do so that they use the land responsibly and maybe, through a system of public awareness, we can get away from this problem of regulation. It is extremely important, that is where you can use your sportsmen organizations, to get out and do this public awareness bit. In response to the fervor of the 60's, we do not sue people like we used to on environmental issues. We now try to persuade them. I think that is where your organizations are right now. We are trying to persuade, we are not trying to force. It has got to be done in that way.

Gerry Schnepf: I want to ask some questions. Jim, you said our problem. Can you define that problem very well, and then following what Ron says, do you make people publicly aware of your problems? That is the critical outlook, by the way, you ought to understand what maybe you think your problem is, other people do not see it as a problem. You know, that is another important element. You have to understand from the other side, maybe they do not see it as a problem. For example, some of the trustees of our Foundation have never been exposed to concerns over water, soil, fish and wildlife interests, and so on. Never in their lives, they have been wrapped up around a corporate or a legal structure. I will tell you, if nothing else in the past two years, we have made some converts of people. For example, and I do not think he will be embarrassed if I use his name, Dan Krumm, said "I have never recognized the concern over soil and water management until I have been a trustee of the Foundation." The fact that Iowa leads the nation in pouring 286 million tons of soil down south, that is an economic issue. If you can convert your issues to economic issues, you will get everybody's attention quickly. And I think there is a way to do that.

Al Farris: I will entertain one more, and I, the reason I am hesitant here, I have a dinner reservation for the panelists and for Pat Meade and myself and I hope they will hold the table, but it is such an interesting discussion and a good presentation it is a panel I really hate to shut off. Don, go ahead, one more.

Don ???: Again, I am a little bit like Jim, I am not sure if this is a question or a comment, to see if someone wants to react to that. I am from the Fish and Wildlife Service and I see something happening that gives me some frustration, and it is this. I think a lot of, let us say, wildlife administrators and managers for years were sensitive and trying to reach out to the constituency groups. As they begin to do that, we now reach a place in the evolution of this political and government and social system we are in where a lot of times that is perceived as colluding with special interest groups to lobby against the power structure. You know, this has already existed but it is probably more intense as we go along. As a result, those same people who are supposed to be serving constituency groups,

and I point to a lot of people in this room, and being sensitive to them are neutered and if we do that, it is sometimes perceived as getting involved in the politics and therefore it's not our business and we should be drawn back. At both the federal and state levels with power of the relationships between the professional, let us say wildlife manager and the constituency groups that is understood as a political power structure (inaudible). And you understand that, I guess why I am saying that is that you too need to understand that there are internal politics in government that sometimes holds us back from being as responsive and positive toward the special interest groups as we would like to be. It is more a comment more than a question.

Al Farris: Anybody want to comment on that in return? It is sort of like an analogy of dancing with a partner comes to mind, you know, when you work with constituency groups, be they the coon hunters or the fly fishermen. You have an arm's length relationship, you are trying to both move in the same direction in synchrony but not step on one another's toes. And yet still not kind of mill into one another. George.

George ???: Make a comment on that. Quick question for the panel. What do they think is our number one glaring problem in our relationship with organizations, is there a common one?

Al Farris: He is asking us what is the number one problem.

Gerry Schnepf: I think that is openness and trust and responsiveness. I just cannot emphasize the things, to respond to someone, you know their interest and you may poo-poo it. When a person writes a letter, it may be the most important thing on that person's mind, and you know, we have got to respond to it. That develops an honesty, even if your response is not what they want to hear.

Al Farris: Thank you. Once again, panelists, you did a heck of a fine job. We will reconvene at 1:00. We will start with some committee reports. We will adjourn promptly at 2:00 so that you can prepare yourself for the bus that is coming at 2:30. I have been asked to announce that the bus will not return from the Living History Farms back to the hotel before we go to Walnut Woods. The route is, again, hotel, Living History Farms, Walnut Woods, hotel. That is the way we are going to go and that is the way you should prepare yourself. Thank you once again.

Al Farris: I want to start our business meeting this afternoon and get through part of it before tomorrow and yet break at 2:00 so we will be sure to be out front for the bus. An issue has come up that I would like to reconvene the resolutions committee and get taken care. This is potential change in the resolution concerning the regional director in the Minneapolis region. I would like to call on Ed Hansen to take care of that resolution.

Ed Hansen: Thank you, Al. We had a resolution regarding the retention of Harvey Nelson as regional director and everyone was exposed to. After a conversation with Harvey, he suggested that there be two slight moderations so we thought that we ought to bring it before the Association. The two paragraphs that he suggested we remove included these: "Whereas said transfer reportedly is being made largely because of alleged poor relations with the states", and also "Be it further resolved that this association rejects any allegations of poor relations with the states". He thought those were a little negative.

Jack Grieb: I move those changes.

Ed Hanson: All in favor?

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Thank you. We will now go back to the business meeting. I would like to start off the business meeting by asking Fred Warders, the treasurer for life, to give the treasurer's report.

Fred Warders: I filed a report with Al to be put in the minutes rather than bore you with all the figures that we have to go through. I would just tell you the Association has three sources of revenue, one through annual dues. We have 14 state and 3 province members we are talking about \$1,700 annually in dues. We also have interest off of monies invested through C.D.'s. Although little, it still amounts to \$400 and some dollars a year. Plus we have a small amount that is usually turned back from the host state as a result of your registration fees. All in all, our annual income depending upon interest and how much the host state turns back will run approximately \$2,200 to \$2,250 a year. Now, last year in Ohio, the Ohio conference cost the Association \$2,295. In addition to that, you recall, we donated \$1,000 to the Wildlife Conservation Fund of America. In any case as of this date, the Association has total assets of \$8,558.36. This includes the dues this year, 81 dues, from 12 states and 2 provinces. There are still 2 states and 1 province that still owe 81 dues. Now, your current 81 checking account balance at this particular time is \$2,652.95. Iowa will probably spend in the neighborhood, I do not know how they are going to handle it, but last year I think the proceedings cost about \$1500. I am sure the Association pays for the proceedings at this time and still cost \$1500, so we should go into the next conference with a cash balance of around \$2,000 and it will grow some as we get dues in for next year, for the Illinois conference. Now all the books and everything have been turned over to your audit committee, Larry Gale is chairman. He is a tough man to deal with when it comes to an audit, I will tell you. It costs a few drinks and a little arguing and a little time, but he gets with it. Larry was concerned really that I keep a set of books with all the transactions in it, but also keep a second set of books. He was wondering why I keep these sets of books. That was a reasonable question to ask. They are identical with the exception that this particular set of records goes back to the time that we had the first treasurer in the 40's. And it is real interesting. I very seldom bring it along because it is old and even though I keep it downtown in the bank in a safety deposit box and I just think it is good to have if something should happen to one set. I bring it up to date once a year. It goes back to Walter Scott who was the first treasurer and I know that the first meeting we had \$101 income at that particular meeting and the meeting cost us \$19.95 for the proceedings and all. We made a little money that year. Of course next year it went to Kansas and we made \$538 that year. But we did not spend anything either. I see old Jack grinning back there. We go to Colorado, you know Colorado. They hired a bunch of Indian dancers to come out and they danced all night and Jack's crew in Colorado gave them \$5.

Jack Grieb: When was that?

Fred Warders: 55. He gave them \$5 and they danced all night for them. One other thing here I wanted to point out. I was going back through this and goes back in the 60's. We had a treasurer by the name of C. L. Mosely, Jr. And I was going

through some of his disbursements here. I have got one marked here, the Hi-State Beverage Company, half a barrel of draft beer for the fish fry. But, two items down, we spent \$23.70 for whiskey for a headquarters suite.

Fred Warders: Well, you know it is interesting, somebody sometime wanted to take a look at this and go back through some of the old conference records and what the expenditures and so forth were, they are real interesting as to what we do now. I think everything is up to date, the whole records have been turned over to Larry and his crew and we will have his report later. If there are any questions on any of this, I have got extra copies of the report and give them to you.

Jack Grieb: How can we ask a question when we do not know anything.

Fred: What do you want to know?

Al Farris: I would next like to call on Larry Gale, chairman of the audit committee for the audit committee's report.

Larry Gale: I did have some misgivings about those double entries that our efficient treasurer had recorded. But after about the fourth margarita, I decided everything was in real good shape. Seriously, Fred does an excellent job of keeping records. They are very complete, you can find anything you look for in there. I want to thank Jim Helfrich for helping me audit the books. We found everything to be in order and there is really only one thing that I think should be mentioned with regard to your audit and that is the fact that a province from Manitoba has not paid its dues for either 1980 or 1981. Bear in mind this audit is for the calendar year 1980. I do not know what to do about that. We have been in the practice of merely sending out the statement without any kind of a letter. I am sure nobody wants to write anybody out of the Association, but what I am wondering is if anybody is personally well enough acquainted with Mr. Golden to discuss this with him on a friendly basis and see if we can get them to come forward with the dues. I do not know him that well, and it is something that is obviously going to have to be handled with a good deal of tact. But, perhaps somebody from one of the other provinces would be in the best position to do this, but if none of the members here present is in a position to take that on, I would recommend that the new president make a strong effort through whatever channels he finds appropriate to get Manitoba lined up on the dues. I think we also have a problem, and this is something we have noticed in the International as well as in the Midwest Association, and that is a seeming tendency for the provinces to be less active in all of our doings. We have two, for example, who are paid up on their dues but they are not here. This has been a matter of great concern in the International. I think we need the Canadians, and I think there are many ways that we can help them too. But, we do need to make an effort to have them become more active or to be as active as they once were. We can always remember when people like Ernie Painter and Ken Irazawa and the others were very active in this Midwest as well as in the International, but for some reason or other that seems to have deteriorated and I, for one, think we need to do something about it. So I would suggest that the new president make this a matter of high priority and try to involve them in the program and all the activities of the Association.

Jack Grieb: I was just sitting here trying to think of how the heck we could do something to get the provinces involved. Gene Bossamaier has always been a good friend of ours. Maybe the new chairman could write Gene and find out what is going on.

Larry Gale: That is a good suggestion.

Carl Kays: Maybe we should put them on the program next year.

Larry Gale: Well, we have tried to do that without much success. I think it is a good suggestion, Carl. I remember last year when the time and place committee sent out letters asking for somebody to sponsor this meeting a couple of years hence and there were two Canadian provinces and Kentucky and Missouri that were supposedly more or less in line for it and when I responded, I said that we could handle the meeting but I would prefer to defer to one of the Canadian provinces and neither one of them even bothered to answer the letter.

Jack Grieb: I talked to them on the phone, though.

Larry Gale: I know many of them are like the states are having money problems and travel is a critical item but we do need to have their involvement.

Fred Warders: Jack, do you know anybody up in Manitoba?

Jack Grieb: Yes.

Unknown: Why do you not give them a call? A personal call on the telephone. That might be better than a letter or something, just give them a call and find out what is going on.

Jack Grieb: I will do it.

Al Farris: In fact, I remember that, when was that, in 78 I think when we met in Milwaukee, Ontario was really up for it this year instead of Iowa, and they agreed that they would take 82 if Iowa would take 81. Since then, I do not think there has been a Canadian representative at this meeting. Milwaukee was the last one, I think that was the last year that there has been anybody from the provinces here.

Larry Gale: One thing that has happened, it seems to revolve a lot about the individual and we have had some individuals from Canada who were very active, very interested and seems like when they move out, then nobody comes forward to replace them. Any other questions for the audit committee? Jim's pretty big, if you are really mad talk to him instead of me. I do move acceptance of the audit report.

Jack Grieb: I second it.

Al Farris: Thank you. We have a motion and a second to accept the audit committee's report. All in favor say aye.

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Those opposed. Thank you. Yes.

Dave Kenney: Do we accept the Canadian dues in Canadian currency? The exchange rate now is such that it might help them pay.

Al Farris: I do not know. Fred better answer that.

Fred Warders: We went through that and we were always ending up \$2 or \$3 difference and I always wanted to just throw \$2 in rather than hassle Saskatchewan or somebody for \$2, but that did not look too good with the audit so what they did they just made a telephone call and got the whole thing straightened out. And now, when they send in their check, they send it in in U.S. dollars.

Al Farris: Other questions, comments? I will tell you what, we have yet the States Rights Committee report, the resolutions committee, and the nominations committee, plus the business meeting tomorrow. And because I am going to be making a telephone call plus getting ready to go on this tour, I am going to adjourn the business meeting for this afternoon and take it up tomorrow morning because I have got to do those phone calls and I am not going to be able to get it all done if we do not adjourn. The business meeting is adjourned until tomorrow morning.

Wednesday, July 15
Business Meeting

Al Farris: I would like to call the roll of states. Colorado.

Response: Jack Griebe.

Al Farris: Kansas.

Response: Bill Hanzlick.

Al Farris: Nebraska. Absent. South Dakota.

Response: Jack Merwin.

Al Farris: North Dakota. Absent. Minnesota. Absent. Iowa.

Response: Larry Wilson.

Al Farris: Missouri.

Response: Larry Gale.

Al Farris: Illinois.

Response: Dave Kenney.

Al Farris: Wisconsin. Absent. Michigan.

Response: Here.

Al Farris: Indiana.

Response: Ed Hansen.

Al Farris: Ohio.

Response: Carl Mosely.

Al Farris: Kentucky.

Response: Carl Kays.

Al Farris: Ontario. Absent. Manitoba. Absent. Saskatchewan. Absent. We have a quorum. We have nine people. I would like to begin with some committee reports. I would like to call on Carl Mosely to give the report from the states rights committee. Carl.

Carl Mosely: Thank you, Al. Got this all written down, so it will be real short. The International Association's ad hoc committee on states rights is composed of Chairman Harold Olson of New Mexico; Herb Doig of New York; Joe Herring of Louisiana; Carl Mosely, Ohio; John Phelps, Utah; Ron Summerville, Alaska; _____, Utah; George Windt, Oklahoma. The most recent meeting was at the North American last March. Chairman Olson has been collecting information on states rights issues common to the majority of states. Plans for attacking these problems will be presented at the meeting in September in Albuquerque. Proposed federal legislation will probably be reviewed at the same meeting which deals with our basic issue of states rights. The proposal would declare by an act of Congress the five following points. Number one, the title and ownership of fish and wildlife resides in the states independent of jurisdiction over or ownership of land or water. Item two would be that the authority to regulate, manage, and control fish and wildlife is vested in the states. Item three would provide exceptions to the above and would be species named in the migratory bird treaty act and rights which a state cedes to the United States. Item four would be promulgation or enforcement of federal rules respecting fish and wildlife would require agreement with the states concerned. The fifth aspect would be that acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act would be repealed. That is a short report, but... I move acceptance of the report.

Larry Gale: I second it.

Al Farris: Is there discussion of the report from the states rights committee?
Mr. Gale.

Larry Gale: Do just have a little bit of additional information. Last week I had a call from Jack Berryman and he had been contacted by Ray Arnett concerning whether the International would be receptive to the idea of further discussion of the fish and wildlife policy. I think most of you know that we spent two or three years working with Jay Hair trying to develop the policy and then the last administration rejected it. I told Jack that I thought we ought to be willing to talk to anybody and if they came up with something that was consistent with our position and something had been cleared with their solicitors. We would discuss it but that we were not going to spend two or three more years discussing something that had no chance of being approved by the administration and that further we would go forward with the legislative approach regardless of whether this policy is promulgated or not. So, that is a related issue. Thought you would be interested.

Al Farris: Right. Yes, I am sure we are because I think you are all familiar with the policy development and the steps back and forth and the meetings that went on there. Other comments or questions regarding either the National Policy Development or Carl Mosely's committee report on states rights? Any clarifications necessary? Then there is a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Those opposed. Motion carries. Thank you very much. Next committee report is resolutions committee, Ed Hansen.

Ed Hansen: Normally these resolutions are read, but I think this morning, unless someone wants a particular one read, we do have five resolutions. Resolution number one, expansion of the Dingell-Johnson sport fish restoration act. Resolution number two, resolution to retain Harvey Nelson as regional director. Number three, resolution on maintaining land and water conservation program. Number four, resolution to establish a National Advisory Council to maintain and approve wildlife habitat on private lands. And resolution number five, commending the state of Iowa for this, hosting this meeting. Are there any questions from the floor on any of these resolutions or would you care to have any one of these read? If not, Mr. President, I move that we accept these resolutions.

Al Farris: Seconded by Mosely from Ohio. Thank you very much, Mr. Hansen. I might just at this time add on to resolution number two concerning the resolution to retain Harvey Nelson as regional director. As the group directed me to do, I called Ray Arnett's office yesterday afternoon right at 2:00. I could not get through to him. I asked the secretary how long it would be. She said half hour, 45 minutes. So I got a hold of his executive assistant, I think the term was, read the resolution to her, and said, I will translate the essence of it for you in case you did not get it and that is, we would like to see very much Harvey Nelson retained in Minneapolis and feel that he is doing a fine job with the states. She seemed to be a little bit surprised and a little flustered.

Al Farris: She seemed to be a little bit surprised and flustered and said she would definitely give the message to Mr. Arnett and I told her that would be followed up by a letter containing the resolution. If you want me to, I will again try today to call Mr. Arnett to make sure he gets the message personally, but that is the action that has been taken so far. Any feelings on that?

Larry Gale: I think he gets the message, Al. Most of us have written separate letters anyway, so I think all this does is confirm the fact that the Association is behind the resolution. I would not see any need to try to make a personal call unless he calls back.

Al Farris: Okay, then if it is okay with the Association, what I will do is write a letter to Mr. Arnett enclosing the resolution, making sure he gets a written copy of it. Are there any other questions or comments concerning the resolutions? Then I would ask for your approval. All those in favor say aye.

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Opposed. Thank you. I made a little error, I think, when I asked Carl Kays to serve as chairman of the nominating committee because I got to

looking at the Association officers and we have kind of a succession type situation. It turns out that Carl is currently second vice president. So if it seems a little odd that he is going to be nominating himself, do not worry about it, because that was really done last year and he really does no't have any flexibility this year.

Al Farris: Carl Kays, with the nominating committee report.

Carl Kays: Thank you, Al, for getting me out of that problem there. The nominating committee wishes to place in nomination the following persons for election as officers to serve the Midwest Association during the coming year. The nominations are: treasurer--Fred Warders; second vice president--Larry Gale; first vice president--Carl Kays; president--Dr. David Kenney. Mr. President, I move that the persons placed in nomination by the nomination committee be accepted and voted upon as a whole for their respective offices.

Al Farris: Thank you. Is there a second to Mr. Kays' motion?

Al Farris: Seconded by Mr. Hanson. Is there any discussion? If not, I will ask the group's approval of the motion to accept the nominating committee report. All those in favor say aye.

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Those opposed. Mr. Kenney, would you come forward please? I'm going to pass you the gavel. Congratulations. It is your responsibility for next year. You really do not become effective until 30 days after the annual meeting, but I will give you the opportunity to say a few words now if you want to.

David Kenney: Very good. Thank you. I will immediately put this down because I think that is the first time that I saw our president pick it up in a couple of days, since he uses the soft-handed approach, I will try to do the same. I appreciate the honor that you have given me and the confidence you placed in me in giving me this important position. We will begin when Jim Helfrich and I get back to Springfield, Illinois, we will begin at once in working on our plans for next year. We do plan to have the meeting at approximately this same time. I think it is customary, you have probably reserved a place on your schedule next year for it and I know very well how busy you are and the demands that are placed on your time so we will try to adhere very closely to the date. We will meet in Springfield, Illinois, I hope at a downtown location. That is very close to many interesting places to see. Lincoln's home operated by the U.S. Park Service is just a block or two away. The restored old state capitol which is one of the best restorations of its kind in the country is just a couple of blocks in the other direction. We hope by this time next year to have a new \$15 million fish hatchery in production. About an hour's ride from Springfield, and we hope to be able to take you there and show you through it. Not many minutes from the city is the restored village of New Salem, where Lincoln lived for seven years in his young manhood and some of you have seen New Salem. I think somewhat improved and we hope to get you out there too. We also hope to have a program that is as good as you have here. If we can do that, we will all be happy. We will have a good program and we will have activities for the spouses that I think will be interesting and attractive to them. We will make a special effort during the next 12 months to interest our brothers from Canada in attending. Paying their dues, by the way, perhaps that is more important. We will work on that conscientiously and we will appreciate any

help any of you can give us in doing that. Also, I will try at least quarterly to address letters to you to inform you of progress with the meeting and program so you can work it into your plans and your thinking as the next 12 months go along. We will stay alert to the important national and international events that might be of concern to you and try to keep you informed. I think beyond that I have nothing else to say except to express my pleasure at being able to meet with you this year and look forward to next year. Fred has already briefed me on the finances. Tells me that unless we go completely bananas in spending for next year's meeting, that we are in good shape and that we have an adequate treasury to work with. I especially look forward to seeing that proceedings of this year's meeting because I think they will be just most interesting reading and valuable and we will, of course, prepare proceedings next year. So that is all I have to say and thank you very much.

Al Farris: Since about March, I have been in a little bit of a quandary about one thing. I know that for one of our members this is going to be his last meeting. Although when he told me that, he asked me to keep that in confidence. He did not want it announced. So I did not know what to do about an award. It is usually traditional with this group when one of our members who serves us ably and well retires or quits the business, so to speak, they receive an award from this group. However, I did not know what to do about that. I did not have an award prepared. Monday night, my wife and I took he and his wife out to dinner and had a good time and I again raised the subject. I even got the same kind of an answer. It has not been announced, it is not public yet. So on the way home, I asked my wife, "What the hell am I going to do?" You know, this is this individual's last meeting and what am I going to do with this situation, and so this morning, I drug him off to the side and asked him and I am glad that he has consented to letting me tell you that Carl Mosely will be retiring before too long. The date has not been announced. It is not confirmed, and I would like to ask Carl to come forward at this time, please, and be recognized by the group for the service he has done to the Midwest Association. Carl.

Carl Mosely: Thank you. The reason for sort of screwing around with the announcement is that my plans are that I will probably retire January next year. My vacation time I have accumulated will put me off the job probably the first week of October. But, I have worked under just the best director of Department of Natural Resources that you can imagine. He has had a long time of experience, plus he is well-trained academically and he is just a prince of a person, Bob Peters. So, I told him earlier this year what my plan was but I said that I recognize he has some political aspirations. I think he will be the greatest in any position he would ever want to go into politically. Would be good for the natural resources. So, I told him that I could see that it could be a problem for him or it could be of some benefit and I would work with him in announcing when I was going to leave. Because I know that as soon as I announce it, there is going to be potentially some pressure put on him by various interest groups saying, you know, we want this person put in and that sort of thing. So that is the reason for not announcing it. I have had some news people in Ohio who have picked up on the rumor and they have called me and I just simply said that I have not submitted my resignation yet, but when I do I will give you a ring. I am thinking about it, but it is not firm yet. So that is the reason for the delay. Thank you.

Al Farris: That is a better explanation than I could have given you. There is coffee available. We will take just a couple of minutes now and everybody can get a cup of coffee and then we will go ahead with the remainder of the business meeting.

Al Farris: I have a couple of items of business that I would like to take up and then we need to take up any other business items from the floor before we conclude our meeting. I have been contacted by Senator Max Backus and he is sponsoring a piece of legislation, S.1141, National Forest Investment Act. Anyway, he is sponsoring this piece of legislation and wanting to have our input or our views on this piece of legislation. He did not send the legislation and I was wondering if anybody could shed any light on this piece of legislation. We have no national forest land in Iowa so we usually do not get those kinds of things and if any of the states that do have national forest land have any comments on this legislation, any interest, or any suggestions of what the Association should do with it. Or does no one know anything about it?

Unknown: Who is the sponsor?

Al Farris: Max Baucus.

Unknown: Where is he from?

Al Farris: Well, I am not sure he even tells me. It does not say.

Unknown: I think he is from Montana.

Al Farris: Then really nobody seems to know anything about this piece of legislation.

Unknown: Read the summary of it.

Al Farris: Okay, sure. I can read it here. As landlord of the 190 million acre national forest system, the federal government should subscribe to the same capital investment economic philosophy which it advocates for the private sector. At the same time, management of these 90 million acres of commercial forest and 100 million acres of range land can also address solid long-term conservation practices. Accordingly, I invite you to examine and support S.1141, the National Forest Investment Act. Information about it is enclosed. This legislation's objective is straightforward. It encourages reinvestment of national forest revenues into vital, but too-long deferred resource improvement. The return to the national of all this investment is obvious. (1) Increased forest productivity over the long haul will provide improved timber supplies and thus help control skyrocketing wood costs. (2) Necessary long-term national forest improvements for wood range, water, soil, and mineral production can be met despite temporary economic fluctuation. An additional benefit will be the stabilizing economy in communities with resource-based economies. (3) Increased productivity on high-yield forests and rangeland can reduce in economic conflicts on economically marginal or fragile lands which often have high watershed, recreational or wildlife value. This bill will achieve these goals in a fiscally, sensible way. The measure will work within the appropriation process. It simply assures that funds are available to be appropriated when needed for sound, capital investment. Furthermore, the act will contribute to balance federal spending. Expenditures will relate to revenues generated by the National Forest System. With increased productivity, these revenues will rise accordingly. In short, I believe that Congress should lead the way toward the revitalization of resources critical to our industrial capacity and national well-being, with one-tenth of the nation's total land based on National Forest System, it's historically been one of the great basic resources producing a multitude of forest products, energy and mineral

resources, water, forage, livestock, wildlife, and recreational opportunities. To maintain and improve this capacity requires timely steady investment such as this bill provides. And then he said he would appreciate having our views and support on the legislation. This is from the Congressional record. Now wait, by golly there is a copy of it right here on the back. It says in summary the underlying philosophy of this measure is straight-forward. Business as usual will no longer do. We are securing an adequate, sustained yield of benefits of each feasible kind from our national forests. We must plow back a portion of the revenues derived from the forests and essential capital improvements. Would it be appropriate to have someone look at this piece of legislation if we want to take a position on it, or if we want to, do that. Would you rather have me check with the International to see what kind of a reading they have on the legislation. Would you just prefer that we ignore the letter and not take a position on it? Yes. Larry Gale from Missouri.

Larry Gale: I would recommend that we refer it to the International's legislative committee for analysis. But in the meantime, I would like to have a copy so we could look it over also.

Al Farris: I would be glad to do that. I will send one to each of the states and is Herb Doig still chairman of that committee?

Larry Gale: Ron Summerville.

Al Farris: Okay. I will get a hold of Ron then and see what he has to say about it. Okay, any other comments on that piece of legislation? One other item that I would like to raise that's been suggested to me for this group to discuss and we hit on it peripherally the other day, yesterday, is the area offices of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the potential termination of those area offices. Is there concern, discussion, approval of area offices, worry about their being done away with, where do you feel we are on that? Or maybe we do not have any disagreements. Jack.

Jack Griebel: What we traded off for all the proposed cuts in the Fish and Wildlife Service budget.

Larry Gale: I think there is some concern that is true. We took this up in the Executive Committee and there was some much difference of opinion that we in effect agreed not to take any position on area offices. However, as you know, we had a subcommittee that worked out a funding package and we requested that certain things such as the coop units be restored, at least in part. And we did have a similar package of things that we said could and should be cut so that the total funds of the budget was the same. The area offices were not mentioned specifically in that package, but I think possibly the lack of mention may have some indications that they were not a high priority in the budget although at some point we had not really been told that they were slated to be taken out either. The research units as you know have been.

Al Farris: Well, maybe Don Minnich or someone else from Fish and Wildlife Service here could comment on what the status of the area offices is and what it looks like it is going to be. Would you do that for us, Don?

Don Minnich: Yes, I will try to tell you where we are right now. Get some help from some of the others too. The way it looks right now the area offices are

being considered for termination by the Administration. It is still something that the secretary's office has not chosen to address until a new director's on board because they want that person very much to be involved in that decision. Congress, primarily the House, is taking a position that they should be reduced in size and perhaps moving toward termination by 83. But the Senate obviously has not come down with any position yet. The way it looks right now is at least in terms of the Administration that no decision has been made but a lot of questions are being asked about whether or not any position has been taken. So it is very uncertain.

Al Farris: Okay, Tom Saunders, make an additional comment.

Tom Saunders: I really kind of have a selfish motive on this area office subject. I am kind of the ringleader among area managers because of my age. All the rest of them are younger than I am. The assistant secretary of the Planning and Budgeting Administration sent a letter down to the Fish and Wildlife Service suggesting cuts for 1983. I believe there are about 12 things that the Fish and Wildlife Service are doing. The first one is area offices, they said I could cut those and save seven million and some odd dollars. Seven million dollars...over seven million. And that is simply false. What is going to happen when they abolish area offices. Make even more employees in the regional offices. But what is going to happen when they close the area offices and it does not save seven million? They will say but wait a minute, wait a minute. So somewhere in the service they are going to have to come up with seven million dollars. I thought that I would write the budget officer of the Department of the Interior and caution him that Planning and Budget Administration is following a poor course. That somebody has given them some wrong information on this particular subject. My final comment would be this, that to my knowledge, nobody in the Department of OMB or anybody on the hill has ever talked to any of the area managers about what it is costing us. I have tried on a number of occasions to get them to talk to someone in the area offices. I feel just like Congress should talk to somebody that knows what they are talking about. Now some area offices do quite well, some area offices are run less than well. You get a heck of a lot more done, you get decisions made quicker in a small office than you can in a great big one. That is just the way it is. If you had an opportunity, I would encourage, say, let us talk to some of these area managers. Let us talk to area managers, let us have them testify. Let us see what is really going on.

Al Farris: Thank you, Tom. Yes, Jack Griebe.

Jack Griebe: I do not think it is any secret that I am a proponent of area offices. I have a regional officer right in my own state. When you have that office you do not really need an area office. But, we have worked with the area office concept. I think it puts the decisions and opportunity for contact as close to the state as possible and I am a strong supporter of it. I think that the key to it is the person that is going to be the area manager. If he wants to really work with the states then you are okay. But, if he does not then you have got a problem and I think that this is where some of the problems come from in the past. But damn it, it is the very same form of organization that I use in my own state, trying to put the decision as far out there as possible. Giving them the authority to make those decisions within a policy framework that we establish. I thought it was a smart move from the Service's part from the beginning and I still support it.

Al Farris: Anyone else? Yes, Bill Hanzlick.

Bill Hanzlick: Mr. Chairman, we have gone on record as supporting this concept. Our area office is Pierre which is farther away from us than Denver which is the regional office. It logistically, does not come off well. But I am with Jack, we prefer to deal with the area office where the decisions have been made out there rather than coming out of Denver. It is coming back to money trying to get Fish and Wildlife Service to establish an area office in Kansas. It is a little tough for us to go up here to deal with these folks and sometimes tough for them to come down and deal with us. So, we follow the area office concept. We feel it is sound, the area concept is, should be retained.

Al Farris: Thank you. Don Minnich.

Don Minnich: I just want to reiterate something that I am reluctant to talk because it is always perceived as feathering your own nest, but something that I want to reinforce what Tom Saunders said. That is very true, if I stopped and asked myself right now if we lose area offices, are we going to lose all those people and their operating budgets will no longer exist. The answer is no. Most of those positions will be brought into the regional office because you have to have that operational line control and you have got planning and budgeting evaluation still going on in the regional office but the line control has been out through the area offices. So we are going to have to draw those in. I am not telling you it is going to be fully the same program as it would be with area offices. But it is not a total tradeoff. We are going to have to absorb enough of that organization in the regional office to maintain control for a line operation after the project leaders. So when I hear you are going to save seven million dollars, it is simply not going to be true. But on the other hand, I cannot tell you that it will be, let us say totally the same cost that it would be if we kept all area offices in operation. It is some place in between.

Al Farris: Thank you. Are there any comments.

Dave ?: South Dakota is fortunate enough to have an area office right in the same town as the state fish and game agency is located and I would sure like to say it is extremely important to us that the Fish and Wildlife Service maintain contact directly with us. To begin with, I believe that if we are going to have a strong base of support for the Fish and Wildlife Service as a national fish and wildlife resource management agency, we have got to have those guys out there where they are on the ground doing work with the states. It is very difficult for me to feel much contact with the Fish and Wildlife Service if all their folks are in Denver. They come out to visit us once in a while because the performance standards tell them to. The cost of transportation is terrific. I think it is going to get worse before it gets better. Just to have those people where you can have access to them, get your hands on them easily and they are very conscious of the states' problems. Any bureaucracy that stays away from the location in which they expected to be responsible, it is ludicrous. If the area offices are pulled out, our abilities to maintain the Fish and Wildlife Service as a strong vital agency with all the development people anxious to destroy its credibility, that is going to be hard on all of us. I would like to say that South Dakota is strongly in favor of the maintenance of the area office and in fact, if we can move the federal aid from the regional offices out into the areas again, why we would be on cloud nine. Just died and went to heaven.

Jack Grieb: I would not say that, the rest of the guys do not like that.

Dave ?: I am going to take my lumps on that one, if anybody wants to talk about it.

Al Farris: Okay, thank you, Dave. Yes, Ed Hanson.

Ed Hanson: I would suggest that the Association communicate these feelings to the appropriate people in Washington.

Al Farris: Okay, now. There, is that a motion?

Ed Hanson: I so move.

Al Farris: Ed Hanson has moved that the Association, I assume through a letter from me, communicate these desires, that is, support for the maintenance of the area offices. Now, is there a second for that?

Jack Grieb: Right here.

Al Farris: There is a second by Jack Grieb and I see some discussion from Carl Mosely from Ohio.

Carl Mosely: I have been reluctant to say anything in view of the fact that (inaudible). But our position is in opposition to the others. The reason for it is that we do not have an area office in Ohio. I think if we had one in Ohio our view would be different. Our experience based on particular federal-aid people has been that we still need to go to the regional office. That since the area office people do not, in fact, live in Ohio we find that they are able to come out of Minneapolis as easily as Lansing, Michigan. With air travel the way it is, it is less than a days trip. If there is additional cost in maintaining an office out there, and you cannot afford to have enough area offices to serve every state, then you run into the situation that some states, that the regional office is closer than the area office. If, and I think it is normal to expect, understand that the area office has not been there sufficiently long for them to have developed a confidence in themselves in this regional office that they are willing to make decisions that regional offices have been making all along. So we have run into that at least where area office people defer to the regional office for some of these decisions. So from our viewpoint then, it is simplest to be directed to the regional office to get a decision and get on with business. So, our view is that we like the people to be involved in work. But from a bureaucratic management viewpoint, we think it would be better with some other arrangement than area offices.

Al Farris: I was just going to ask you for it. I knew there had to be, you know, another side to it. Is there anyone else that would like to say anything about this. Yes. Larry Gale from Missouri.

Larry Gale: What Carl says is very typical of what we heard when the International discussed this. Most of the states, if they have an office in the state or close by, they like the idea but if its some distance away, they are much less enthusiastic about it. One other point with regard to this motion and that is if, I do not think it is going to accomplish anything at all to say that we favor the concept. That is really not the issue. The issue is they are looking

for a place to cut the budget by seven million dollars and I think they must be willing to enable to offer some alternative that it just is not going to be enough to say that we like this. The fact is that that budget is going to be cut and there is going to be some trade-offs and if you want to say well, we'll just give up the co-op units instead of the area office that may be where it is going to come down. So, I am not opposed to saying that we like the area office concept, but I really do not think it is going to do a nickel's worth of good unless we offer some alternative where the budgets can be cut, because they are going to be cut.

Al Farris: Thank you. I want to make a comment or two from the state of Iowa and the boss may change my mind, but I will give you my feelings. We have two area offices that we work with. We are split between Kansas City and Minneapolis. I really liked the area offices better when we had the federal aid people in the area office. Basically that is because I was in charge of wildlife research at that time. We had a federal aid person we worked with who was just three hours away in Kansas City, easy for them to get here. Very close hunter safety people there and I think the area office was a better idea when they had those people in them than it is now. I am not saying that I am opposed to them now, but I think it was better then. It is a bit unhandy sometimes for us to be split by two, but that just happens to be a problem of where we are located. One thing that I have pointed out, of course you have to realize the bias that Iowa carries with, one thing that I always look at as a potential place to cut is fish hatcheries. I realize you can start one heck of a fight with the western states when you say that, and maybe even some of the eastern states. But, if you talk about service to the states from our point of view, that is where they can save a lot of money from Iowa's point of view. We would opt for area offices and co-op units before we would opt for fish hatcheries in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Hands down, no questions. We have our own fish hatcheries, we do not get one fish from the Fish and Wildlife Service. If you want a potential place to cut, that is one place where the money could come from as far as we are concerned. I realize that other states depend very heavily upon them for that, but that is an idea I want to throw out. I do not know the position of the other midwestern states about where they stand in regard to fish hatcheries and utilization of fish from those federal hatcheries. Michigan may have a different idea, I do not know where they stand, whether they have their own production or what.

Jack Griebe: I would say that I do not think it would hurt for us to at least let people know how the majority of states in the Midwest Association feel about area offices. I think that the trade-off that Larry's talking about has to be made at the International level, when they sit down and look at the budget and give up this and take that. I thought, Larry, that was really a mean deal when we got that information we went right down the line in support. Even though I did not agree with all the things they said. Dadgummit, we are gonna, this is a deal we did at the national level and we are gonna support the darn thing. We contacted the congressmen and had some nice responses too. Before we got that why the units looked shakey, you know, and I was writing letters to the delegation and they were writing me back that we got to cut someplace and this looks like a good place. But when we were offering them some alternatives, you can keep this and get rid of that, then we started getting back some really interesting letters from them, from those people and they were saying, hey, this is possible, we will consider it. I am speaking in favor of the motion right now that we at least let maybe the people in the International, at the International level know generally we do or maybe the motion will fail. Generally we do not favor the area office concept.

Al Farris: Thank you. That was going to be one of my questions for Ed Hanson is to whom am I to direct this if it does pass? To, there is no director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, would it be to Ray Arnette? Would it be to president of the International Association? Would it be, where do you want me to go with it?

Ed Hanson: The Fish and Wildlife Service ought to know about it.

Al Farris: Okay.

Ed Hanson: The secretary. And the International.

Al Farris: Okay. Is there more discussion concerning this? Yes. Carl Mosely from Ohio.

Carl Mosely: What about getting back to the basic issue which is cutting costs. We provide no alternative in motion as to where the costs might be picked up and you brought up the issue of fish hatcheries. From our viewpoint in Ohio we do agree with Iowa. I would like to hear from some of the other states in which federal hatcheries are more important to the program.

Al Farris: Bill. Kansas.

Bill Hanzlick: May have very little impact on us at this point in time, however, if we do not get our own hatchery built we will not need fish.

Carl Mosely: We have the offer in Ohio to take over a federal hatchery. We are looking seriously at that. As long as the Fed's continue to operate, well, that is great too. But, as an alternative, we will take over the hatchery.

Al Farris: We have done that with two hatcheries here in Iowa.

Jack Griebe: What I was saying was that we should make those trade-offs here. We should let our people with the International know that whenever the budget comes out that we will be in there taking a look at it just like we did this year. What I'm saying is we are telling people we like the area office concept and when you start making these trade-offs consider it. It still might be give-aways, but I think they should know how people feel. Now, it all depends on what fish hatcheries you are talking about. If you are talking about fish to stock those big reservoirs in Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, on down into California and Nevada, why, hell yes, we expect the Fed's to stock those reservoirs. They built them. There are other activities that they are currently cutting off with warm-water fisheries, hatcheries that are very important to our warm-water program. Believe it or not, we can raise warm-water fish in Colorado, but we have a hard time hatching them and bringing them up to the size needed to release them. So there is more than meets the eye.

Al Farris: Okay. Tom Saunders.

Tom Saunders: Mr. Chairman, I will just say that the list of things that the department wants us to look at fish hatcheries rank about third or fourth to look at. But, I would urge you gentlemen to do this. I think if my area were three states, three fine states. Then I think a regional office were four states, this is a place we can look at for budget cuts and I think of Albuquerque; all of you know about the fuss that has gone on about Albuquerque. I think of heavy staffing

in our Washington office. I think of some of our biological services staffing that we have. I think there are places to take cuts without putting the knife to the field of operations overheads. I would urge us to look at the overhead at the regional level. Do we need that in the regional offices, for example. Sure, we need something, no question about it.

Al Farris: Okay. I think Carl Mosely had his hand up a couple of people ago.

Carl Mosely: You know, getting back to the hatchery points, I feel that we often have an attitude of where a priority lie if we are going to move at all, I think it is nice to say we strongly support this or we strongly support that. But if we as an organization have a feeling that one thing is more important than another, because undoubtedly there are going to be budget cuts, we obviously say where our priorities lie. That we have a similar problem with warm-water fisheries, not the same problems, but, as Colorado, we have lost the production of federal fish, warm-water fish, for the waters to be stocked in the state. We feel that that is our obligation, it is a resident wildlife resource and if we are selling licenses to utilize the fish even though they may be impoundments that were built by federal tax money which most of them in Ohio have been, Ohio had very little impounded water traditionally so most of them are Corps reservoirs. I think we are going to have to say our priorities.

Al Farris: Jack Griebbe calls for the question. The motion stated is that the Midwest Association relay to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the assistant secretary of Interior, and the International Association their support for the concept of area offices. That has been moved and seconded and the question has been called for. All those in favor say aye.

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Those opposed.

Al Farris: That is Mosely from Ohio. I just want to get it on the record.

Al Farris: Thank you. The motion has carried and I will take care of that. It will be a letter. Now, I had made some other notes about other things, but I think we have already taken care of, such as moving regional directors and director of Fish and Wildlife Service and I do not know whether there's any need for any further discussion on those issues. Would anyone care to take any of those issues up, if not I think we will leave them lie with what we have already done. Is there any feeling that we need to do anything more or can do anything more? Then I will call for general items of business from the floor. Does anyone have any business items they would like to have the Association take up at this time? This is going to be your last opportunity until next year in Illinois. Do you have one?

Jack Griebbe: I do not know whether this is a business item or not, but I would like to have a little discussion on a problem that I have. That is the proliferation of obviously not meetings like this because it is very necessary and important, but all the other type meetings that are going on that I am constantly being asked by my people to go to and a need to put some type of control on these darn things. I do not know how these people dream up all these things. You know, they are all good, you can always find something good in them, but there has got to be some way in the face of serious budget cuts that obviously members of this

association have taken this year. My out-of-state travel was cut by half and you cannot still believe it. But nevertheless, there has got to be some reason put into this thing. Maybe the outcome is you just do not anybody. But there has got to be a better way of doing things than the intense proliferation of all these meetings.

Al Farris: No, I agree with you. I think our director agrees with you and he has been called before the State Executive Council. Our travel has to be approved by the Governor and his cabinet. Every once and a while the phone rings and they say Larry Wilson, we want you over here to explain to us why you are sending two people to West Overshoe, Wisconsin, to do something or other, and he gets a little tired of it. He can put the clamps on it, and that is how he handles it. He just says at his level, you are not going or only one person is going.

Jack Grieb: Yes but, there is more to it than that, you see. Our guys are out there being subjected to these things and all. This is a neat symposium, why cannot I go to this one, and I want to go, it will really benefit the state. They would. A lot of them, you know, a lot of the big decisions, a lot of the advancements that we have made in wildlife management have come about because of these types of activities. If there is any way we can consolidate them, then we can do something about at least holding the number down and making sure that they are the most important things that we need to be addressing at that point in time, something like that.

Al Farris: I guess I do not know how we as a group can convince the University of Minnesota not to have a symposium on radio telemetry or some other such topic. I do not know how we do that. I guess what we have done is shrunk back to what we consider kind of the hard-core technical meetings that those people should go to. We just pretty well sit down and said this is the list of meetings we think are the most important and sorry, guys, but that is the way the budget is. I do not know how you control that in any other way than on an individual basis. Maybe somebody else here has a few comments.

Bill Hanzlick: I suppose that a recommendation we as a group could make would be to encourage those who may have wanted to have these seminars and whatever to consolidate with other meetings in the same general vicinity have the same general context. It appears to me that would be a help to some, tying two or three meetings together. But it is a shotgun operation now that I do not know how much could be accomplished. I guess it is coming right back to the director's responsibility. I guess you just have to say no more. It appears to me that there is not any kind of an organizational system to deal with this.

Al Farris: Ray Evans.

Ray Evans: There are real dangers when people from the profession that we are in do not participate in these meetings and a good example of that was the time of that land symposium held in Milwaukee. It was basically from my viewpoint a symposium of University faculty and federal bureaucrats, neither of whom have ever made their living working on private land. And yet, we as a group, we are going to be stuck with some of the recommendations that come out of that group. I do not feel that the working stiffs were involved as they should have been in that meeting in Milwaukee. So if we do not attend, we are going to still be stuck in some fashion with the recommendations that come from those groups.

Unknown: I want to talk about things like hunter safety. You know, they have about three or four meetings a year going for them and why could not they have one meeting for example. Hunter safety is very important and I do not deny that. But; you belong to the western, you belong to the midwest, then you belong to the national. That is three meetings right there. Then you have a workshop, that is four.

Al Farris: I think that is the Administrator's responsibility.

Jack Grieb: Well, that is right. But that does not lessen the frustration on the part of my guys.

Al Farris: Are there any other comments on this topic? Any other subjects of discussion, subjects of business? Ed Hanson.

Ed Hanson: Mr. President, could you report on the status of farm wildlife habitat council. I noticed, I have not read this whole last year's report, but there was a report given last year and I am wondering if you did appoint any chairman of that committee.

Al Farris: Yes I did. I reappointed Steve Cole from Ohio to be the chairman of that committee. They basically finished up their work early last fall by providing those specific recommendations that I alluded to yesterday when a number of the members of this association got together in Louisville at the International to discuss those and approve those recommendations and give the green light to us to contact the people in Washington in March. I have not asked the habitat committee to do anything in the meantime because I really feel that their work at this point is done and the ball is in our court. They have provided us everything we have asked for. They provided us with the recommendations and like I said yesterday, a group of us did go in, we met with the ag committee, staff people, and, my checking back with Wes Hayden is that there is really not anything going on on agricultural legislation at the present time. It keeps getting delayed because of these other things that Congress is dealing with, especially budgets. That is the reason I have not asked them to do anything. They still are an active committee of this body and if Dr. Kenney wants to use them in some way, it will be up to him to appoint a new chairman if he chooses to replace Steve Cole from Ohio. But I felt that they had done everything we had asked them for, they have given us the information and there was really nothing more for them to do at that time. Steve was with us, by the way, in Washington, D.C. and Ohio. I am glad that Ohio saw that he was there because he provided a lot of expertise in our meeting with them and a lot of the background of what they had done. Other items? I would like to thank you all for coming and suffering in the hot weather of Iowa. It makes the corn grow, that is the only thing you can say for it. I am glad you were here, I hope you have enjoyed your visit and please come back. Is there a motion for adjournment? Bill Hanzlick from Kansas. A second? Carl Mosely. All in favor say aye.

Response: Aye.

Al Farris: Those opposed. Thank you.

TREASURER'S
REPORT

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

Des Moines, Iowa

July 13-15, 1981

The status of the Association's funds at the close of business for the year 1980 relate total assets of \$7,158.36.

Total receipts for this period, including annual dues, balance of Association cash advance to Ohio, balance of Ohio registration fee fund, and interest on Certificates of Deposit -- \$2,251.75. Balance of assets brought forward from 1979 -- \$8,441.84. Total expenditures for the Columbus conference -- \$2,295.45. A donation of \$1,000.00 was made to the Wildlife Conservation Fund of America.

Certificate of Deposit #101576 in the amount of \$1,200.00 was renewed with the First National Bank of Pratt, Kansas at 6% interest. A Savings Certificate #6235 in the amount of \$4,705.41 with Western Savings Association of Pratt, Kansas remains in effect at 7.5% interest.

Balance of 1980 checking account forwarded to the 1981 account -- \$1,252.95.

IRS income tax form 990 was prepared and submitted.

The status of Association funds as of this date (July 15, 1981) relate total assets of \$8,558.36, which includes the 1981 dues from twelve (12) states and two (2) provinces. The current 1981 checking account balance is \$2,652.95.

The official Association financial ledger showing receipts and expenditures has been made available to the Auditing Committee.

Fred Warders, Treasurer
Association of Midwest Fish and
Wildlife Agencies

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES

REPORT OF THE TREASURER January 1, 1980

TOTAL ASSETS BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 1980:

Bal. of 1979 checking acct. brought forward	\$2,876.40
Certificate of deposit, 1st Nat'l Bank, Pratt, KS	1,200.00
Savings certificate, Western Savings & Loan, Pratt, KS	4,365.44
	<u>\$8,441.84</u>

\$8,441.84

1980 RECEIPTS:

Annual dues	\$1,600.00
Conf. loan to Ohio repaid in part	239.78
Interest on certificate of deposit #101576	72.00
Interest on savings certificate #6235	339.97
	<u>\$2,251.75</u>

\$2,251.75

TOTAL AVAILABLE ASSETS

\$10,693.59

DISBURSEMENTS:

Loan for 1980 conference to Ohio	\$ 500.00
Engraving for award plaques	6.60
Donation-Wildlife Conservation Fund of America	1,000.00
John Gottschalk--Travel and Subsistance	294.90
Ohio State University-Bus Rental.	293.73
Conference Proceedings-Printing	1,440.00
	<u>\$3,535.23</u>

\$ 3,535.23

TOTAL ASSETS ENDING ~~JANUARY~~ JANUARY 31, 1980

\$ 7,158.36

ACCOUNTING OF ASSETS, DECEMBER 31, 1980:

Cash in checking account, 1st Nat'l Bank, Pratt, KS	\$ 1,252.95
Certificate of deposit, 1st Nat'l Bank, Pratt, KS #101576	1,200.00
Savings certificate, Western Savings Assoc., Pratt, KS #6235	4,705.44

\$ 1,252.95

1,200.00

4,705.44

TOTAL ASSETS DECEMBER 31, 1980

\$ 7,158.39

Balance of 1980 checking account on hand December 31, 1980 and forwarded to 1981 account \$1,252.95

1980 ACCOUNT CLOSED

Fred Warders
Treasurer

cc: Chairman 1981 Audit Committee

ATTENDEE'S

MEMBERS WHICH ATTENDED THE
1981 ASSOC. OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES CONFERENCE

Larry R. Gale
Dept. of Conservation
Box 180
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Carl E. Kays
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife Resources
#1 Game Farm Road
Frankfort, KY 40601

Don R. McCormick
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife Resources
#1 Game Farm Road
Frankfort, KY 40601

Carl L. Mosley, Jr.
Division of Wildlife
Fountain Square, C-4
Columbus, Ohio 43224

Henry J. Vondett
Dept. of Natural Resources
Fisheries Division, Box 30028
Lansing, MI 48909

Jack P. Grieb
Division of Wildlife
6849 Xenon
Arvada, CO 80004

Richard Elden
Dept. of Natural Resources
Wildlife Division, Box 30028
Lansing, MI 48909

Bill Hanzlick
Fish and Game Commission
R. # 2, Box 54A
Pratt, KS 67124

Fred Warders
Fish and Game Commission
422 S. High
Pratt, KS 67124

John W. Urbain, Jr.
Dept. of Natural Resources
Wildlife Division, Box 30028
Lansing, MI 48909

James C. Helfrich
Dept. of Conservation
Stratton Office Bldg., Room 602
Springfield, IL 62706

David Kenney
Dept. of Conservation
Stratton Office Bldg., Room 602
Springfield, IL 62706

George G. P. Bekeris
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
530 Federal Bldg. & U.S. Ct. House
316 N. Robert Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

Gilbert E. Key
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1500 Capitol Ave.
Bismarck, ND 58501

Don W. Minnich
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Box 25486, DFC
Denver, CO 80225

James C. Gritman
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Federal Bldg, Ft. Snelling
Twin Cities, MN 55111

Tom A. Saunders
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4705 N.W. 80th Terrace
Kansas City, MO 64151

Ray Evans
Dept. of Conservation
R. # 2
Holt Summit, MO 65043

Dean A. Murphy
Dept. of Conservation
Box 180
Jefferson City, MO 65102

John Papowski
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Rm 202, 1405 S. Harrison Rd.
E. Lansing, MI 48823

C. H. Wilson
Dept. of Conservation
Box 180
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Philip Chiles
Dept. of Conservation
621 W. G. Stratton Bldg.
Springfield, IL 62706

Dan Bumgarner
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Robert Welford
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

James W. Salyer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
903 N. Monroe
Pierre, SD 57501

Dave Hamm
Game, Fish, and Parks Department
Wildlife Division
Anderson Building
Pierre, SD 57501

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 - EXPANSION OF THE DINGELL JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT

WHEREAS, approximately 60 million Americans participate in some form of recreational fishing and this number is steadily increasing; and

WHEREAS, these additional fishermen have placed additional demands on the state resource agencies who have experienced revenue deficiencies due to inflation; and

WHEREAS, the state resource agencies have been assigned new and expanded roles without increasing revenue;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies assembled at its annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on July 13-15, 1981, strongly supports the expansion of the Dingell Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act as contained in S546 and HR2250; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies respectfully urge all members of Congress from Midwest Association states to vote in favor of the expansion measure.

RESOLUTION NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO RETAIN HARVEY NELSON AS REGIONAL DIRECTOR

WHEREAS, Harvey Nelson has had a distinguished career in many capacities with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and

WHEREAS, throughout his career Harvey Nelson always has demonstrated the highest professional standards; and

WHEREAS, Harvey Nelson has been fair, even-handed and cooperative in all his dealings with the state wildlife agencies; and

WHEREAS, it is reported that Harvey Nelson is being transferred from his position as Region 3 Director to the Washington office; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies assembled at its annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on July 13-15, 1981, asserts that Regional Director Harvey Nelson has excellent relations with the state wildlife agencies and that these agencies applaud his spirit of cooperation and his professional integrity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Association urges Secretary of the Interior James Watts and Assistant Secretary Ray Arnett to retain Harvey Nelson as Region 3 Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 - RESOLUTION ON MAINTAINING LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Land and Water Conservation Program, since 1965, has provided many hundreds of millions of dollars to federal, state, and local governments for the acquisition and development of open lands; and

WHEREAS, much of the land and water so acquired and developed has provided excellent habitat for wildlife and fish; and

WHEREAS, the principal source of funding for the program has been the royalties from offshore oil and gas, with the result that the depletion of these natural resources has funded the perpetuation of other natural resources;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies assembled at its annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on July 13-15, 1981, go on record as strongly favoring the continuation of this Land and Water Conservation Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it address the President and the Secretary of Interior with a statement of this resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL TO
MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE WILDLIFE HABITAT ON PRIVATE LANDS

WHEREAS, protection of wildlife habitats on private lands in the United States results in preservation of the wildlife resource, provides recreational opportunities and enhances the quality of life, and is complimentary to other natural resource management; and

WHEREAS, such habitats are decreasing in quantity and quality; and

WHEREAS, the interests and needs of landowners must be more fully understood, and ways developed to adequately assist landowners for wildlife habitat preservation and improvement; and

WHEREAS, a strong coalition between farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural interests, wildlife professionals, recreationists, and others is absolutely necessary if progress is to be made in preservation of wildlife habitat.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies assembled at its annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on July 13-15, 1981, requests and supports:

1. The establishment of a National Advisory Council jointly appointed by the Secretary, Department of the Interior, and the Secretary, Department of Agriculture with representation by landowners, wildlife professionals, recreationists, and other natural resource professionals with the charge of "determining ways and means of providing proper consideration to landowners so that they will have substantial incentives to maintain and improve wildlife habitats on private lands."
2. Request International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies to add staff to actively pursue and coordinate actions and recommendations of the National Advisory Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 - RESOLUTION COMMENDING STATE OF IOWA

WHEREAS, the State of Iowa has exhibited exemplary characteristics as the host agency of the 1981 meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, assembled at its 48th annual meeting held on July 13-15, 1981, in Des Moines, Iowa, expresses to Director Larry Wilson, Chief Al Farris, and the staff of the Iowa Conservation Commission their appreciation and gratitude for the excellent arrangements and hospitality in hosting this annual meeting. I move acceptance of this resolution by acclamation.