58th Annual Director’s Meeting Proceedings (no minutes)

July 8 – 10, 1991

Rapid City, South Dakota

Hosted by:

South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks
June 12, 1991

Dear Association Members and Guests:

This is a final announcement for the 58th annual meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies. We'll be meeting July 8 - 10 in Rapid City, SD.

A final agenda is enclosed. The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks is ready to host a productive and enjoyable meeting. All we need is your participation. Registration fee has been set at $100, which will include most of your meals during the meeting.

The agenda is designed to encourage dialogue and sharing of information from member states and provinces. I think topics of the invited presentations will be of interest to most everybody. I will also be asking delegates of each state and province to address specific topics during their reports. The Back to the Future exercise will focus on the direction of the Association.

By now you should have made your reservations at the Hotel Alex Johnson. In case you haven't, you must do so immediately. The block of rooms being held for our meeting will be held until June 21. Call now! (1-800-843-8800, Ext. 25)

The Hotel Alex Johnson is located in downtown Rapid City. It is relatively small, so just check the announcement board as you arrive to find out our meeting rooms.

Rapid City Regional Airport does have shuttle service into town. We will also have some transportation available if the need arises.

If possible, I would encourage you to bring your spouse or families so they can enjoy the Black Hills. We will have some activities planned for them during the meeting.

Please call me at 605-773-3381 if you have any questions regarding the meeting. I am being assisted by George Vandel and Lorraine Doran and you can ask for them if I am not available.

I hope you can join us on the Earlybird Tour of the Badlands too!

Sincerely,

Doug Hansen, President
March 15, 1991

ATTENTION:

The enclosed Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies 1991 Agenda was inadvertently left out of your mailing dated March 8, 1991.

Sorry for the inconvenience.
58th ANNUAL MEETING
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
HOTEL ALEX JOHNSON, RAPID CITY, SD
July 8-11, 1991

Tentative Agenda

Monday, July 8
9:00 – 6:00 Registration at the Alex Johnson Hotel
1:00 – 5:00 Earlybird Badlands Ecology and Indian Country Tour
6:00 – 9:00 President's Reception at the Alex Johnson

Tuesday, July 9
8:00 – 12:00 INVITED PRESENTATIONS AND INTERACTION
Topics being considered:
1. Native American Hunting and Fishing Issues
2. Marketing and Responsive Management
3. Captive and Exotic Wildlife Problems
4. Private Lands Habitat Programs
5. Send us your suggestions:

12:00 NOON ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON

1:00 – 3:00 MEMBERSHIP ROUND ROBIN PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ON SELECTED TOPICS
Topics being considered:
1. Agency Structure and Administrative Challenges (FLSA, management systems, political process, etc.)
2. News on Innovative Funding Ideas
3. Animal Rights and Anti-Management Issues
4. IAFWA Priority Issues - Midwest's Role

3:00 – 10:00 FIELD TOUR AND SOCIAL INTERACTION
- Visit Custer State Park, wild fire sites, stream improvements, and area forest management practices
- Dining at Sylvan Lake Lodge
- Visit Mt. Rushmore and attend lighting ceremony

Wednesday, July 10
8:00 – 12:00 ASSOCIATION BUSINESS MEETING, (will include discussion of priority issues from previous day)

12:00 NOON ASSOCIATION AWARDS LUNCHEON

1:00 – 11:00 AFTERGLOW TOUR AND ENTERTAINMENT
Tentative sites and events include Cleghorn Springs Fish Hatchery, stream improvements, and mining activities
DINING AT LATCHSTRING INN AND MINING VISITOR CENTER DEADWOOD, A NIGHT ON THE TOWN

Thursday, July 11
9:00 – 11:00 BRUNCH & COOL DOWN SESSION WITH IAFWA & LEADERSHIP

PS: This schedule allows travel in and out of Rapid City at various times. We will accommodate you on the optional Earlybird and Afterglow Tours.
March 8, 1991

Mr. Joe Kramer, Chief
Fisheries & Wildlife Division
Dept. of Wildlife & Parks
Box 54A, Route 2
Pratt, KS 67124-9599

Dear Mr. Kramer:

Rapid City, South Dakota is the site of our 58th Annual Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies on July 8-11, 1991. We are looking forward to hosting a productive meeting and showing you some of the beauty of the Black Hills. Please mark your calendars for this date and come enjoy some of the outdoor resources that the Association has worked hard to protect and enhance.

At our past two meetings in Michigan and Minnesota we have discussed ways the Association could have a greater influence on international fish and wildlife issues and be even more responsive to individual needs of the member states and provinces. Last year in Grand Rapids, I felt there was an informal but definite mandate for a change in our meeting format. Consequently, we have designed a tentative agenda and meeting format for your review which will hopefully be effective, efficient and enjoyable for all. To this end we encourage your continued involvement and welcome your suggestions on the attached tentative agenda.

You will note that we propose a more streamlined and participatory meeting format. Tours are arranged both preceding and following the meeting. We would love to have you and your families come and enjoy all the events. However, if your schedules do not allow, the meeting is designed for your alternative travel plans.

The Alex Johnson is a great place to relax and is central to all activities in the Black Hills. I look forward to visiting with you about the meeting at the North American and I'm confident we will have a good meeting in July. Please share this information with appropriate members of your staff and feel free to contact me or Art Talsma, our conference coordinator, at 605-773-5914, if we can assist you in any way.

Sincerely,

Douglas R. Hansen, Director
Wildlife Division
April 2, 1991

Mr. Douglas R. Hansen, Director
Wildlife Division
Department of Game, Fish, and Parks
Foss Building
523 East Capitol
Pierre SD 57501-3182

Dear Doug,

We were able to visit just a short while at the North American, but we did not discuss the July Midwest meeting at Rapid City.

I would be more than happy to give the Association presentations on:

1) Private Lands Habitat Programs,
2) Marketing and Responsive Management, and
3) Captive and Exotic Wildlife Problems.

Other topics for July 9th 8:00 to 12:00 could be 1990 Farm Bill and State and Province Joint Venture Status and Progress.

I also think that the July 9th p.m. session should be heavy with IAFWA priority issues. Your tentative agenda looks good. I would echo the feelings that Ken Babcock from Missouri had last year at Grand Rapids about more influence on IAFWA issues at our meetings, and that more business work should be required at our Midwest annual meetings.

Good luck with the meeting, and please do not hesitate to call on me for any assistance.

Sincerely,

Joe D. Kramer, Chief
Fisheries and Wildlife Division

JDK:bjj

JDK-070-91

KANSAS OUTDOORS 'America's Best Kept Secret'
PREAMBLE
TO ASSOCIATION’S CONSTITUTION

The name of this organization shall be the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies. The objectives of the Association shall be to protect the right of jurisdiction of the Midwestern states over their wildlife resources on public and private lands; to scrutinize carefully state and federal wildlife legislation and regulations and to offer support or opposition to legislative proposals or federal regulations in accordance with the best interests of the Midwestern states; to serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of ideas concerning wildlife and fisheries management, research techniques, wildlife law enforcement, hunting and outdoor safety, and information and education; and to encourage and assist sportsmen's and conservationists' organizations so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured from our citizenry in the protection, preservation, restoration and management of our fish and wildlife resources.
58th Annual Meeting  
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES  
July 8-10, 1991

**OFFICERS**  
President—Douglas R. Hansen, South Dakota  
First Vice President—Steve Wilson, Arkansas  
Secretary/Treasurer—John Urbain, Minnesota

*Spouse activities will be arranged for Tuesday and Wednesday morning. Inquire at registration table.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MONDAY, JULY 8</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am-6:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-5:00 pm</td>
<td>Early Bird Tour—Badlands National Park (details at registration table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>President’s Reception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TUESDAY, JULY 9</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30 am | Call to Order—Doug Hansen, President, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies  
Welcome—Richard Beringson, Secretary, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks |
| 9:00 am | Marketing and Responsive Management in Wildlife Agencies—Mark Duda, Executive Director, Responsive Management |
| 2:45 pm | The Best of Partners—Art Talsma, Regional Director, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation |
| 3:00 pm | Preparatory Comments for Tomorrow’s Session (and other announcements)—President Hansen |
| 3:30 pm | Board bus for Custer State Park tour, Sylvan Lake Lodge dinner, and Mount Rushmore Lighting Ceremony. (Will return approximately 11:00 pm—spouses welcome.) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WEDNESDAY, JULY 10</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Delegate reports and round table dialogue on matters of administrative importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Continue reports and dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Facilitated Exercise: Back to the Future, Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Noon</td>
<td>Business Meeting and Awards Luncheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>Afterglow Activities (a menu of possibilities will be presented at beginning of meeting. Hosts will accommodate you at your expense, especially gambling in Deadwood! )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 3
Federal Aid Renovation

UPDATE

to FA Coordinators and Staff

NUMBER 19
JUNE 26, 1991 (Please distribute copies to your Renovation participants.)

[In the past we have used the "Update" sheets primarily to prepare for upcoming Renovation events (e.g. the McCormick's Creek meeting) and to share Renovation accomplishments. The time has come to enlarge the purpose of the "Update" to be a more instigative tool. Update 19 begins this approach.]

RESOURCE TEAM CONFERENCE CALL MEETINGS: are now scheduled monthly. The 8 FA Coordinators, the FA "Chief", and the 3 FA Staff Team Leaders all like the 1-hour conference calls as an opportunity to deal with common issues, jointly clarify status and schedules of events of mutual interest, and be briefed on the results of meetings. Increasingly the conversations are multilateral, and less and less one-way communication. At about $230 per call I consider them a real bargain.

HANDICAPPED ACCESS WORKSHOP: is being offered July 8-12 in the Twin Cities. Developed by the Fish & Wildlife Service, Office of Human Resources, the workshop is designed to help us all better understand how to comply with accessibility standards (Section 504). Two representatives from each state are scheduled to attend.

Note: Ohio DOW has begun implementing their Section 504 Transition Plan which resulted from their self evaluation process (contact Al Cannon). The Plan identifies over 30 boating and shore-fishing sites to be upgraded for accessibility. Implementation will include replacing/modifying docks, adding wheelchair "stops" and walkways at piers, replacing latrines, and resurfacing and/or re-striping parking lots.

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 10 (FEDERAL AID REVIEW): As I watch it evolve I've come to regard this Improvement Project as "Son of Renovation". The Improvement Project #10 Team is trying some pilot improvement processes that show how the Project can be used regularly to re-design and fine tune the FA grants machinery. Their initial effort is focused on determining whether FA's practice of issuing news releases on "FONSI's" is productive enough to continue doing. I encourage your active support of this Renovation "maintenance worker" Improvement Project. [A 2 or 3 hour workshop on the Improvement Project #10 opportunities and process is tentatively scheduled for the FA Coordinators' meeting this autumn.]
RECOMMENDATION 19b (ROLES IN OPTION PROJECTS): (in the form of "Attachment B") has been incorporated directly into the AFAs for Wisconsin’s two projects to implement a comprehensive management system (renewal of "Fish Management in Wisconsin", F-95-P; and the new "Wildlife Management in Wisconsin", W-160-P). The definition of roles is used to help describe how the FA projects mesh with the DNR’s comprehensive management system.

APPROVAL OF ALTERNATE APPRAISAL METHOD BEING SOUGHT: At the request of Iowa DNR, FA staff are requesting approval from the Service Director to allow for alternate appraisal methods to be accepted to establish value for special use properties. Currently, OMB regulations state that appraisals for in-kind properties must meet market value. In the case of special use properties, such as Rathbun Fish Hatchery, meeting market value may result in a negative or unfairly low value. Approval of an alternate method would mean that a substantial amount of additional "state match" would be available.

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 8/18 (USER-FRIENDLY FAM) DUE FOR ACTION: The FA Manual final review draft is due out mid-June for a 60-day comment period. As the Renovation Project Leader, I am encouraging Ken Fritz (OH) and Tim Trasky (MI) to get the 8/18 Improvement Project Team directly involved in coordinating the review of the manual by the Region 3 states. This would produce both constructive input to the FAM Task Force in drafting the final version of the FAM, but also set the stage for our follow up to the FAM. We have purposely postponed action on this Improvement Project pending the issue of the final FAM. It is time to prepare for action.

Note: The Federal Aid Manual Task Force has prepared a final review draft of the Federal Aid Manual. However, the Federal Aid Washington Office is holding off issuing the final review draft pending the issue of the final FA Program Rules (50 CFR 80). The primary objective of the new FAM is to provide guidance on how to implement the new Rules. Currently the draft final Program Rules are being held at the Office of Management and Budget, due to controversy over the provision that interest on hunting and fishing licenses be earmarked in the same way the actual hunting and fishing revenues are. The date that the Rules will be issued is unknown. How soon the Rules are issued may depend on how much interest is shown by the States.

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 6/17 (PROGRAM RECOGNITION): has begun with a letter from Ken Nettles on IN DNR letterhead to agencies and industry. The letter, sent May 10, 1991, explains how it is in the best interest of both the agencies and the industry to help anglers and hunters understand the connection between the excise taxes they pay and the benefits they get. Emphasis is placed on getting the logo(s) on product packages and posted at project sites. Letters were sent to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, the National Marine Manufacturers Association, and all state fish & wildlife agencies.
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 9 (INTER-Agency COMPUTER SYSTEM): A survey of states and FA staff is underway regarding interest, potential uses, and existing equipment for developing an inter-agency, electronic communication system. Such a system would link FA staff in the eight states and the Regional Office, with the potential for expansion to a much broader range of personnel. Most of the surveys have been returned. Initial responses are generally favorable to such a system. Once the surveys are all in and analyzed, the Improvement Project 9 Team will develop recommendations for system implementation.

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 11 (SECTION 106 COMPLIANCE): is proceeding on three independent fronts to "delegate" some of the more rudimentary, cultural resource requirements. Iowa DNR is pursuing a Memorandum of Understanding with their SHPO. Illinois DOC and Wisconsin DNR are pursuing "programmatic agreements" with their SHPOs. Though these efforts are not being coordinated, the products of the three efforts may provide very useful alternatives for other states to reduce the administrative burden of complying with Section 106 requirements.

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 7/15 (STATE/FEDERAL TRAINING): Three things to note - 1st/ as noted below, Tom Niebauer is pursuing a half-day to 1-day training session at the 1991 FA Coordinators' Meeting. 2nd/ as noted above, on July 8-12, 1991, a workshop on handicapped access is being offered in the Twin Cities. 3rd/ I also have to brag some on the soon-to-be-released video on Section 504 compliance. Rick Julian has been a primary mover and shaker in the process and content of the video, consistently working to keep the States needs at the forefront of the process.

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 13 (PREPARING GENERIC EAs): A proposed pilot, "generic" environmental assessment for lake renovations (rotenone application) has stalled due to the loss of a "lead writer". Project Leader Lucinda Corcoran will soon be calling on the Resource Team members to ask for state representatives for this Improvement Project Team. Lucinda has identified that the first items of business for this Team will be to select several broadly applicable subjects for generic EA's and finding a lead writer for each.

RECOMMENDATIONS 16, 19, & 22: A year ago Regional Director Jim Gritman sent letters to the 8 State Directors committing the Service, a/ to delegating external compliance procedures wherever possible (Recommendation 16), b/ to the State and Federal roles in traditional and option projects defined at the McCormick's Creek meeting (Recommendation 19), c/ and to a working definition of "substantiability of character and design" (Recommendation 22). These are tools that can be used to improve our grant machinery. Have you used any of them? Take a moment and re-read these recommendations and Jim Gritman's endorsement.

SUGGESTIONS FOR TRAINING SUBJECT: at the next FA Coordinators' meeting are being solicited by Tom Niebauer. He will be sending out a questionnaire in June. The Resource Team is very supportive of continuing the precedent set in Missouri last year, noting that such half-day or 1-day training is very productive.
REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Lynn Lewis has changed jobs to become the Supervisor of the Ecological Field Office for Minnesota. Lynn has been a key player in the development of Renovation improvement recommendations and projects dealing with external compliance issues. Special effort will be made to bring Lynn’s replacement quickly into the Renovation process when he/she is on board.

FA ADMIN & TO MEET STATE TRAINING NEEDS: a/ The American Fisheries Society’s Urban Stream Management Workshop organized by Don Roseboom was held in May near Chicago. Responding to a request from the Illinois DOC, $10,000 of FA Administrative funds helped to sponsor the workshop and symposium. b/ In mid-May the Organization of Wildlife Planners’ (OWP) Facilitative Behavior Course was provided to Missouri DOC staff in Jefferson City. FA administrative funds covered the travel cost of instructors Jack Hicks, Dale Burkett, and myself. I was very pleased to teach in this course. The opportunity to interact with FA project leaders in an informal setting and listening mode was valuable. I’d like to do it some more in other states. c/ We are also cleaning up the last bit of sponsorship business with Randy Sauer (IL DOC) for the APS’s "Restoration of Midwestern Stream Habitat" Symposium held last December. FA administrative funds covered costs of getting speaker David Rosgen to the symposium and paying for production of the training manual (approximately $2,500 total).

PROJECTS TO IMPLEMENT COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS: are vehicles to realize FA Renovation goals. Early in June Brian Stenquist, in his new role as Minnesota’s Division of Fish & Wildlife "primary planner", met with my staff planning specialist to evaluate the pros and cons of the Division pursuing a FA ("Program Funding Option") project to implement their comprehensive management system (CMS). Brian observed that we seemed to be fostering FA projects to implement state CMSs as a way to achieve Renovation objectives. Brian’s observation is absolutely correct. The changes in the way we do business under a project to implement a CMS are very much the kind of changes the Renovation is intended to effect.

The Wisconsin Bureau of Wildlife Management, under the leadership of Harry Libby, committed this winter to shifting his Bureau’s FA work to a FA project to implement a CMS for the Bureau. While working with my staff on developing the needed documentation, Harry made it clear that, in part, his decision to make the shift to a CMS was to support and enhance the FA Renovation. By making the shift to a CMS project, Harry and the whole of the Wisconsin DNR is helping to make the Region 3 FA Renovation a reality.

I encourage you to investigate the two CMS projects being implemented by Wisconsin in July (WI F-95-P, renewal; and WI W-160-P, new) to determine the benefits. A CMS is certainly a benefit to a State agency’s internal business operation. But there are also clear benefits in streamlining the way FA business is transacted. Sound like Renovation?

[Signature]
58th ANNUAL MEETING
July 10, 1991
Business Meeting Agenda

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

II. President's Remarks

III. Approval of Minutes from 1990 Meeting

IV. Treasurer's Report

V. Committee Reports
   A. Audit
   B. Legislative Joe Kramer
   C. Resolutions (3) Lloyd Jones
   D. Nominations Bill Bailey
   E. Awards Art Talsma

VI. Old Business Topics of Discussion

VII. New Business Weekend Meeting
   A. Withdrawal of Arkansas from AMFWA
   B. Other

VIII. Passing of Gavel

IX. Adjourn
Colorado
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Manitoba
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
North Dakota
Ohio
Ontario
Saskatchewan
South Dakota
Wisconsin
CONSTITUTION

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES

PREAMBLE

The name of this organization shall be the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies. The objectives of the Association shall be to gather and disseminate information, exchange ideas and lend helpful cooperation in all matters of administration, management, research and investigation pertinent to the conservation of fisheries, wildlife and general outdoor recreation; to lend its support to the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and Canadian Wildlife Service, and to other agencies of the federal government of both countries, in programs beneficial to fisheries and wildlife; to cooperate in the establishment and creation of migratory bird sanctuaries, refuges and shooting areas, and to submit factual information upon which the Fish and Wildlife Service may base conclusions in prescribing waterfowl regulations; and to encourage and assist sportsmen's and conservationists' organizations so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured from our citizenry in the protection, preservation, restoration and management of our fish and wildlife resources.
ARTICLE I

OFFICERS

Section 1

The officers of the Association shall be President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer. The President, First Vice-President and Second Vice-President shall be elected by the members of the Association for a term of one year. The Secretary shall be appointed by the President for a term concurrent with the President's. The Treasurer shall be elected by the members and serve until replaced.

Section 2

The Board of Directors shall be composed of the elected officers, and one representative from each state and province except those represented by the elected officers. Such state or provincial Board member shall be the chief executive officer of the fish and wildlife agency of his state or province, or his designee.

ARTICLE II

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1

Membership shall be by states and provinces and representation of each state and province meetings shall be by its duly authorized representative or representatives.
Section 2

The area of membership in the Association shall be the states of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin, and the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario and such additional states and provinces as may request membership and be elected by majority vote of the member states and provinces in annual meeting.
BY-LAWS

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES

ARTICLE I

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1

The President shall provide at all meetings of the Association, appoint all special committees, preside at meetings of the Board of Directors and perform such other duties as are naturally incumbent upon the office.

Section 2

The First Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in the latter's absence.

Section 3

The Secretary shall keep a record of all transactions of the meetings of the Association, as well as meetings of the Board of Directors, shall notify members of the time and place of meetings and perform such other duties as are naturally incumbent upon the office. The incumbent Secretary of each year shall record and compile three hundred copies of the proceedings of that year. He shall forward ten copies to each member in good standing, with the cost of preparation and handling to be paid out of the Association's fund. All other copies are for distribution at the discretion of the host state.

Section 4

The Treasurer shall be custodian of all funds of the Association and draw all warrants for the payment of claims properly presented. He shall bill the several members and collect the annual dues. The annual dues, and earnings therefrom, shall
constitute the funds of the Association. It is the intent of the Association that the costs of the annual meeting and related business functions, not to exceed $500, may be paid by the Association.

Section 5

The Board of Directors shall constitute an Interim Committee to conduct the usual business of the Association.

Section 6

The tenure of the succeeding officers of the Association will be from thirty (30) days following adjournment of the annual Association meeting through thirty (30) days following adjournment of the succeeding annual Association meeting.

ARTICLE II

MEETINGS

Our regular meeting shall be held annually; the place and date of such meeting to be determined by the Association. When necessary, special meetings may be called by the President. Members shall be given thirty days notice of regular annual meetings and special meetings may be called on ten days notice.

ARTICLE III

VOTING

Voting shall be by states and provinces, as units. Each state and province shall have one vote. All voting shall be by voice vote, except that a request by any member state or province
for a secret ballot shall be honored. Any matters of Association business requiring action in the interim between meetings may be handled by the Board of Directors, by majority vote by mail ballot.

**ARTICLE IV**

**DUES**

Annual Dues shall be $100 per member state and province, payable in advance, at, or before each annual meeting; provided, that annual dues may be suspended for any given year by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the membership.

**ARTICLE V**

**QUORUM**

A simple majority of all members states and provinces in good standing constitute a quorum.

**ARTICLE VI**

**AMENDMENT**

The Constitution and By-Laws of the Association may be amended at any regular meeting by affirmative vote of two-thirds of members in good standing; provided, however, a written copy of such proposed amendment shall have been received by the President and sent by him to the Secretary and to the members at least thirty days before the regular annual meeting or special meeting called for that purpose. With approval of the First and Second
Vice-Presidents, the President may call for voting by mail in lieu of a meeting. In this event, the thirty day notice shall still apply, the date of opening ballots shall be previously announced, written notice sent to each member within forty-eight hours of vote tabulation by Secretary, and the Secretary shall keep all ballots for one year following the vote.
LAST MINUTE MEMO

TO: Midwest Association Delegates
FROM: Doug Hansen, Association President
SUBJECT: Agency Organizational Structure
DATE: 6/25/91

I would like your last minute cooperation on a small matter that I think will be very useful at our upcoming annual meeting.

Several people have mentioned that it would help to know who the leaders are in each agency and where the meeting attendees are located in their agency’s organizational structure. We probably won’t take too much time to discuss this at the meeting. However, I would like to have a packet of organizational charts to hand out at the meeting. Then we can make quick reference to them as necessary.

You are the only one I am sending this to in your agency. Please take a few minutes now and either create a simplified organizational chart for your agency, send me one that you have available, or pass it on to the right person.

The important things to keep in mind are: 1) keep it as simple as possible; 2) include only the names of your top level administrators; 3) if I am to get it back in time for the meeting, you need to send it back to me almost the day you receive it; 4) if all else fails, bring or send it along to the meeting.

I have enclosed a sample of what South Dakota’s contribution will look like (yours can even be handwritten).

Thank you very much. Looking forward to seeing you all in Rapid City.
WILDLIFE DIVISION

- Director: Doug Hansen

- Assistant Director: Emmett Kaysor
  - Operations

- Wildlife Administration
  - Fed. Aid
  - Environ. Review & Mgmt.
  - Resource Analysis

- Assistant Director for Technical Services and Research: George Vandel

- Management Regions
  1. Animal Damage Control
     - Supervisor
     - 2 Assistants
     - 7 Trappers
     - 3 pilots
  2. Each Region has:
     - Regional Supervisor
     - Asst. Reg. Sup. - Fisheries
     - Asst. Reg. Sup. - Game
     - Asst. Reg. Sup. - Land
     - Conservation Officers
       (approx. 14 per region)
  3. Foremen, technicians, secretaries, etc.

- Staff Specialists
  - Fisheries (Bob Hauen)
  - Game (Ron Fowler)
  - Habitat (Dave McGuigan)
  - Law Enforcement (Ron Catlin)
  - Missouri River Reservoir Fisheries (Dennis Unkenholz)

(Research biologists, hatcheries, technicians work under direction of staff specialists.)

Approximately 200 permanent FTE's in Wildlife Division
KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND PARKS

GOVERNOR

COMMISSION

SECRETARY

EXECUTIVE MANAGER *

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OPERATIONS

SPECIALIST MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL

ATTORNEY

SPECIAL ASSISTANT

FISHERSIONS & WILDLIFE

PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDS

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

LAW ENFORCEMENT

EDUCATION & PUBLIC AFFAIRS

FISHERIES MGMT AND CULTURE

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

REGIONAL SERVICES

HATCHERIES

DISTRICT BIOLOGISTS

WILDLIFE MGMT STAFF

INVESTIGATIONS AND INVENTORY

FINANCE & ACCOUNTING

DATA PROCESSING

ENGINEERING & DEVELOPMENT

LICENSE & REVENUE

STAFF REGIONS TRAINING SPECIAL OPERATIONS CONSERVATION OFFICERS

* RELATES TO ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND BUDGET DEVELOPMENT FOR AGENCY.
The Department of Natural Resources Flow Chart

The Bureau of Land, Forest and Wildlife Resources will oversee the divisions of Forestry, Reservoir Management, State Parks, Nature Preserves, Land Acquisition, Historic Preservation and Archaeology and State Museum and Historic Sites.

Included in the Bureau of Water and Mineral Resources are the divisions of Water, Entomology and Plant Pathology, Soil Conservation, Outdoor Recreation and Fish and Wildlife.

The Bureau of Mine Reclamation has three divisions: Reclamation, Oil and Gas and Geological Survey.

The Deputy Director for Law Enforcement and Administration will oversee Law Enforcement, Personnel, Engineering, Public Information and Education, and Administrative Support Services. Administrative Support Services includes Purchasing, Safety and Risk Management, Printing, Aviation and Training.

The DRR Controller will oversee the divisions of Accounting, Budget, Internal Audit and Management Information Systems.
DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

DIRECTOR

- Public Affairs Unit
  - Information Specialists

Admin. Services
  - Chief
    - Fiscal Specialist
      - Admin. Asst.
    - Mgt. Information Systems
      - Admin. Analyst
    - Training Officer
      - Admin. Asst.
    - License Unit
      - Supervisor
        - Account Clerks
      - Non-Game
        - Supervisor
          - Biologists
    - Planning/Environmental/Non-Game
      - Chief
        - Environmental Concerns
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District Supervisors
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Research Bio's & Tech's

Fish & Wildlife Division 335 FTE's in FY-92

Iowa DNR
* Denotes Acting

Note: There are, in addition to the commissions, several boards, committees and councils established by law to perform activities related to Department programs.
Nebraska Game and Parks Commission

**COMMISSION**

**DIRECTOR** Rex Amack

**Budget & Fiscal** Larry Witt

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR**

Vacant

- Administration Larry Morris
- Information & Education Bill Horak
- Outdoor Education Bette Irons
- Ft. Robinson - Special Programs

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR**

Dale Breen

- State Parks C. Duncan
- Recreation Areas Jim Carney
- Visitor Services Jim MacMillan
- Historical Parks
- Engineering Jim Sheffield
- Operations & Construction Earl Johnson
- Land and Water Conservation Fund

160 FTE's

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR**

Bill Bailey

- Wildlife Jerry Johnson
- Fisheries Don Schapka
- Law Enforcement Don Schapka
- Resource Services Harold Edvardsen
- Federal Aid and Environmental Review Kirk Nebel
- Realty Bruce Sickel

1991 FTE's

Total Agency FTE 440.4
NORTH DAKOTA
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Lloyd Jones
Director

Keith Trego
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Michael McKenna
Division Chief
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Paul Schade
Division Chief

Administrative Staff

Terry Steinwend
Division Chief

Fisheries Staff

Ray Goetz
Chief Game Warden

Enforcement Staff

Ted Upgren
Division Chief

I&E Staff

Ron Stromstad
Division Chief

Wildlife Staff
STATE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF WILDLIFE

Table of Organization
Richard B. Pierce

KENNETH R. FRITZ

DEPUTY CHIEF

PERSONNEL
PLANNING
FEDERAL AID

BUSINESS OPERATIONS
SECTION ADMINISTRATION

SURVEY & INVENTORY
PURCHASING & FISCAL SECTION
LICENSE SECTION

WILDLIFE DISTRICT ONE MANAGER
WILDLIFE DISTRICT TWO MANAGER
WILDLIFE DISTRICT THREE MANAGER
WILDLIFE DISTRICT FOUR MANAGER
WILDLIFE DISTRICT FIVE MANAGER

FISH MANAGEMENT & RESEARCH GROUP ADMINISTRATOR

FISH MANAGEMENT & RESEARCH GROUP

LAKES ERIE FISHERIES UNIT SANDUSKY
LAKES ERIE FISHERIES UNIT FAIRPORT

WILDLIFE PROPAGATION SECTION

FLIGHT SERVICES
CONSTRUCTION CHEF
TRAINING

ENFORCEMENT GROUP ADMINISTRATOR

FOREST WILDLIFE RESEARCH UNIT
WETLAND WILDLIFE RESEARCH UNIT
FARM WILDLIFE RESEARCH UNIT
TIP SECTION
ENVIRONMENTAL SECTION

EDUCATION SECTION ADMINISTRATOR

GRAPHICS SECTION

EDUCATION SECTION

ANIMAL SKILLS SECTION

STEVEN A. GRAY

DEPUTY CHIEF

WILDLIFE COUNCIL

(Approximately 480 FTE's in Division of Wildlife)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Resource Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Addis, Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266-0837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Karr, Asst. Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266-5782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bureau of Research            |
| R. Dumke, Director 266-8170  |
| Natural resources sociology   |
| Resource information and      |
| publications                 |
| Research surveys              |
| Coldwater fishery research    |
| Warmwater fishery research    |
| Water resources research      |
| Management of Little Rock Lake|
| Inland lake renewal limnology |
| Water quality monitoring      |
| Wildlife research             |

| Bureau of Fisheries Management|
| L. Kernen, Director 266-7025  |
| Statewide fisheries program   |
| Investigative planning on lakes|
| and streams                   |
| Great Lakes surveys and creel|
| census                        |
| Species management            |
| Habitat management            |
| Cooperative services, includingACP and SCS fish ponds and|
| cooperative fish rearing facilities|
| Chemical fish control         |
| Fish control, including detrimental|
| and rough fish                |
| Hatchery operations           |
| Fish health                   |

| Bureau of Forestry            |
| C. Higgs, Director 266-0842  |
| Statewide forestry program    |
| Statewide fire protection program|
| Forest fire command center    |
| Federal ASCS liaison          |
| Insect and disease programs   |
| County forestry               |
| Tree nurseries                |
| Statewide forest inventories  |
| Menominee County liaison      |
| Timber management             |
| State-owned islands           |
| Forest tax laws               |
| Private forestry              |
| Utilization and marketing     |
| Equipment development         |

| Bureau of Property Management|
| H. S. Druckenmilller, Director 266-2136|
| DNR construction projects     |
| Engineering services          |
| Capital budgeting             |
| Administrative facilities     |
| Mississippi River work unit   |
| Master planning coordination  |
| Wild rivers program           |
| DNR facilities and road        |
| maintenance                   |
| DNR land acquisition          |
| Real estate matters           |
| Land ownership records        |
| Relocation payments           |
| Management of integrated      |
| properties                    |
| Division data management      |
| Historic preservation         |

| Bureau of Parks and Recreation|
| D. Weizenicker, Director 266-2185|
| Development and operation of  |
| statewide parks and southern   |
| recreation forest program      |
| Ice age program                |
| Statewide naturalists/interpretive|
| program                        |
| Trails                         |
| Canoe campsite designation and|
| maintenance                    |

| Bureau of Endangered Resources|
| R. Nicotera, Director 266-2625|
| Endangered and threatened species|
| list development                |
| Issuance of endangered and      |
| threatened species permits      |
| Acquisition and management of   |
| natural areas                   |
| Natural areas designations      |
| Heritage inventory program      |
| Non-game program                |

| Bureau of Wildlife Management  |
| S. Miller, Director 266-2193  |
| Farm wildlife resources        |
| Wetland wildlife resources     |
| Forest wildlife resources      |
| Fur resources                  |
| Wildlife disease               |
| Animal damage                  |
| PHG program                    |
| Private lands technical assistance |
MEMORANDUM

TO:       JOHN HERRON
FROM:     JOE KRAMER
DATE:     August 7, 1991
SUBJECT: ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
          AND CENTRAL FLYWAY COUNCIL MEETINGS

The Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies held their
58th meeting at Rapid City, South Dakota on July 8-10th. All
fifteen states were in attendance except Arkansas. Arkansas has
officially withdrawn from the Midwest Association, mainly because
their state has been members of both the Midwest and Southeast
associations and they have elected to drop the Midwest and stay
with the Southeast Association. Colorado may also drop from the
Midwest because of their Western Association activity.

The major guest speakers' topics at Rapid City were Responsive
Management and Marketing, Law Enforcement Covert Operations, Indian
Affairs, Laws, and Regulations, and Non-profit Partnerships; agenda
enclosed.

Workshop topics were: FLSA and labor representation in state
government, wetland planning in states, legal council
representation with states, and many more; agenda enclosed.

The meeting was productive and the atmosphere was outstanding. Max
Peterson from IAFWA gave a luncheon report on the IAFWA activities
which included the hiring of the new legislative action employee.
Update enclosed.

Doug Hansen from the host state, South Dakota, asked for an open
discussion on the format of this Midwest meeting and for future
meetings. The other states felt that the meetings should start on
Saturday instead of Sunday for cheaper flight tickets and less time
away from office on weekdays.

The workshop session seemed to be the most productive part of the
meeting so the states want more workshop time and less formal paper
presentations. Also, the business meeting should be held the first
or second day instead of the third day in case states can only stay two days.

The Central Flyway Council Meeting was held in Corpus Christi, Texas, on July 27 through 30. The major topic of discussion was the eastern teer dark geese season and bag limit. The population of eastern teer Canada geese has grown considerably to allow for more Canada geese in the bag over a longer period of time. Kansas will get extra days and more opportunity to bag two Canada geese. This passed by USFWS 8/2/91.

Again this year, the Central Flyway Council will ask the USFWS to implement a three mallard drake option for Central Flyway states. We are uncertain as to whether this recommendation will pass. It did not pass by USFWS. Two mallard drakes will be allowed in Central Flyway.

The blue-wing teal season should be re-introduced next year unless there is a disaster on the breeding grounds next year.

Much of my time at the Flyway Council meeting was spent on Playa Lake Joint Venture activity. Playa Lakes was a topic on everyone’s agenda. I had four separate meetings alone on playa lakes. Topics included: next meeting, full time coordinator (Harvey Miller), coordinator office location, five state involvement, and much more. The five PLJV states had concern over PLJV direction, Region 2 USFWS direction with PLJV, Texas Tech direction with PLJV, NAWCAC relations with PLJV, and much more.

The meeting was very productive and Marvin Kraft represents Kansas well on the technical committee. Marvin is well respected and makes good flyway recommendations in the heat of battle over duck pies and goose pies.

cc: Jack Lacey
Division Directors
Darrell Montei
To: Joe Kremer  
From: Eric Schmick  
Date: July 3, 1991  
Re: Midwest F&W  
Dept. Administrators Mtg.

To:

Regarding legislative issues, I suggest that you inquire of The Status of the International's legislative counsel position. We have taken it in the shorts in Farm Bill regulations because of lack of representation in D.C.

Also, a lot is happening on the legislative front. New changes in proposed changes to 404 of the Clean Water Act are circulating with numerous co-sponsors. Legislative bills you should hear about are HR 1336, HR 407 and 550 among others.

One problem I see is that while people are concentrating on legislative proposals, wetland policy changes are happening through administrative action (eg BG Corps' regulatory guidance letter 90-7 exempting SCS prior converted wetlands from 404 expansion of Corps' nationwide general permits and changes to the interjurisdictional wetland delineation).
manual.) Such changes may make legislative issues mute or put us in the position of not defending or expanding existing regulatory protection but on the offensive of trying to get back our old tax protection measures.

You also might "lobby" for our Federal Aid Stream Grant proposal with surrounding States (IA, MO, NE, OK etc.) This proposal in a nutshell will develop guidelines and procedures for conducting a Stream Fisheries Survey using volunteers assistance. The completed survey will be used to incorporate into state water quality standards, minimum flow designations, and other regulatory programs, as well as to target technical and financial assistance. The Izaak Walton League will be a partner in the project. The Izaak's job is to transfer guidelines, volunteer workshop materials, etc. to other states to use in organizing their own volunteers.

Most states' administrators first reaction will probably be "what's good in it for our state?" If the project makes it through the first FWS cut we will need other states' support in Grants-in-Aid.
July 3, 1991

Members of Midwest Assoc.
of Fish and Wildlife Officers

Dear Sir/Madam:

An organizational meeting for an attorneys section in the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Officers was held on June 17, 1991, as part of the Midwest meeting in Green Bay, Wisconsin. Representatives from the States of Wisconsin and Missouri and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service attended.

Participants discussed the desirability of an attorneys section within the Midwest Association. It was agreed that we should continue to discuss the issue with the Midwest Directors and contact the Province of Ontario which will host the 1992 Midwest meeting. Participants also discussed the possibility of delaying the next attorneys meeting until the 1993 Midwest meeting to allow more time for organizing the attorneys section.

The remainder of the meeting was spent on discussion of conservation law areas of common interest. A summary of discussion topics follows:

Anti-hunting and Harassment

Anti-hunting groups are of concern to the legal staff for fish and game agencies as well as to management staff. Department attorneys must become involved in the drafting of any laws prohibiting the harassment of hunters or fishers. Due to the litigation in Connecticut which found portions of the Connecticut law unconstitutionally overbroad, other states must take great efforts to distinguish their laws from the Connecticut example. Wisconsin has done so by attempting to limit those acts which constitute harassment to physical conduct. However, Wisconsin is currently involved in litigation in which the claim of constitutionally overbroad is being raised. Wisconsin is also faced with the claim that its prohibition on harassing those preparing to hunt or fish is unconstitutionally vague. Attorneys in the group agreed that the harassment provisions should be drafted as conduct specific as possible. There is also a need to exchange materials regarding litigation in each of the states as these materials seem to be circulated among anti-hunting groups faster than among government agencies.

Another tactic used by anti-hunting groups is the claim that the environmental review process should be used to evaluate the continued existence of various...
hunting seasons. This has caused California to prepare environmental documents regarding a number of its hunting seasons. These materials were circulated among the attorneys in attendance.

Forest Management

For those attorneys involved in management of forest properties, a continuing concern exists with those groups using the environmental review process to influence the agency's management decisions. Examples include the litigation in Oregon and Washington regarding the spotted owl and a suit in Wisconsin regarding management of the National Forests. The Wisconsin litigation and tactics used by those second-guessing agency management decisions were discussed.

Indian Treaty Rights

Wisconsin has been involved in a great deal of litigation regarding off-reservation treaty rights. It is unlikely that any other state has been faced with such an extensive off-reservation treaty right. Potentially, all species of fish, game and plants were subject to the treaty right. While the cutting of commercial timber has been excluded from the treaty right, very few other plants or animals are free from at least the claim that they are subject to a treaty right. The participants discussed the precedential nature of a number of the decisions issued by the federal court in Wisconsin. Attorneys should be aware that when dealing with off-reservation treaty rights a great deal of assistance is now available not only from the reported decisions arising from Wisconsin and other states but also from those attorneys who have been involved in the issues from their beginnings.

Deer Shining

As attorneys who deal directly with field enforcement staff, the group discussed the lack of reported decisions dealing with issues such as deer shining. It is often difficult to find case law which can be of assistance in common situations as the ability to stop a vehicle involved in shining activities. A situation which was discussed was whether shining during a time period in which shining is legal can alone constitute a reasonable suspicion of a violation. While some states have laws authorizing an inspection-type stop for individuals engaged in shining, the more likely approach is to argue to the courts that shining, even apparently legal shining, can constitute a reasonable suspicion of a violation, at least depending on the circumstances under which it is being done. Again, the circulation among various state attorneys of cases dealing with this type of issue will continue to be important.

Commercialization

All states have laws regarding the importation of wildlife. However, there is a wide variation in the standards under which an item which is legal in one state can be legally possessed in another. A discussion was held regarding
the need for some standardization among the various states for when imported items will be recognized as legally possessed. A great deal of discussion is still needed on this issue.

Ethics and Fair Chase

A new issue in Wisconsin, although not so new in other states, is the regulation of ethics especially as it relates to contests. Some states are already heavily involved in this type of regulation and a sharing of information can assist those other states just beginning to enter the fray of contest regulation. Issues recently raised in Wisconsin, such as baiting and tree stands, were discussed.

Recreational Liability

The final point of discussion, again primarily applicable to those who are property managers, was the area of recreational liability. Wisconsin has a recreational liability law which exempts the state from liability arising from recreational activities on its lands unless some malice is shown on the part of employees or agents of the State of Wisconsin. This is a very difficult burden to overcome and has substantially limited litigation against the State of Wisconsin for injuries occurring on its properties. The wording of this statute and the accompanying case law is available to other agencies wishing to examine its applicability to their own situation.

It is hoped by all in attendance that a discussion on these items and others could continue at future attorneys’ meetings. Although many could not attend due to budget constraints, the meeting was still felt very useful for those of us who were lucky enough to be able to attend.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Lutz  Jim S. Christenson
Attorney at Law  Attorney at Law
Bureau of Legal Services Bureau of Legal Services

MAL:JSC:rh
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MEMORANDUM

TO: State Governmental Members
FROM: R. Max Peterson, Executive Vice President
DATE: June 12, 1991

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 1992 House Appropriations Subcommittee Marks

The House Appropriations has Subcommittee completed its action on the Fiscal Year 1992 appropriation for agencies under its jurisdiction which includes the Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which are of primary interest to us.

The Subcommittee was faced with a difficult task because last year's budget agreement resulted in the Subcommittee having to reduce Fiscal 1992 outlays by about $800 million.

The information we have on the Subcommittee action is still incomplete because the report is not available at this time. From the information that is available to us, it is clear that the Subcommittee made a number of reductions as well as a few additions to the President's Fiscal 1992 budget. Generally speaking, the Subcommittee stayed rather close to the actual Fiscal Year 1991 appropriation levels except for two items of great importance to us. These are:

1. The Subcommittee action would reduce the Sport Fish Restoration Account by $16 million. That would be done by placing a limitation on the permanent appropriation. Whether that money would be available sometime in the future is not known.

2. The Subcommittee would not appropriate the $15 million requested in the President's budget to fund the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. The $14 million from the permanent appropriation (interest on Pittman-Robertson funds) would remain.

We have been advised that the full House Appropriations Committee will take up the Subcommittee recommendations next week, June 19. It is important that the members of the House Appropriations Committee as well as the Senate Appropriations Committee know of our concern about these two actions which are very detrimental to fish and wildlife programs. For your ready reference, enclosed is a list of the House and Senate Appropriations Committee members.

We are also enclosing some points you might wish to make in either letters or phone calls to members of the committees. Because of the short time frame, it would be wise to contact members by phone and follow up by letter.

Enclosures
The Sport Fish Restoration Account is entirely funded by user fees. These user fees include excise taxes on fishing tackle and equipment, as well as federal tax on gasoline used by boats.

Placing a limitation on the Sport Fish Restoration Account would be unprecedented action by the Congress and undermines the whole concept of user fees.

The limitation on the Sport Fish Restoration Account, coupled with the serious financial condition of many states, would combine to seriously reduce the capability of the states to sustain and enhance important fishery resources.

Users who pay the tax will undoubtedly question why they should pay a tax which is not going for its intended purpose. This could result in loss of long-term support for this and other user fees.

The proposed action to reduce funds available to the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund by $15 million would be more than a 50% reduction in funding for that important program which is a cooperative program between the United States, Canada and Mexico to reverse the decline in waterfowl and other water-dependent migratory birds.

The $15 million in federal funds will levy $30-50 million in matching funds. A long-term public/private partnership program is absolutely essential to the success of this cooperative program.

The more than 50% reduction in the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund constitutes a major slashing of funds available for that program and is inconsistent with the Subcommittee's general approach to retain at least the Fiscal 1991 funding for other activities.

Enclosed is an information sheet that shows each state's Wallop-Breaux apportionment and the current status of North American wetlands projects.
FACT SHEET

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

- Fund was established by the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, December 13, 1989 (P.L. 101-233).

- FY 1991 - Appropriated funding - $15,000,000.
  - Carryover and FY 1991 interest - $21,000,000

- First call for proposals - 182 Canadian, Mexican and U.S. sponsors requested $47 Million.

- North American Wetlands Conservation Council recommended 103 wetlands conservation projects to Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Act Funds</th>
<th>Partner Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$15,897,620</td>
<td>$24,357,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$15,951,789</td>
<td>$27,806,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$160,593</td>
<td>$347,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Successful U.S. sponsors represented projects from 24 states.

- FY 1992: - President requested general appropriation of $15,000,000.
  - Interest projected at $14,000,000.
  - FY 1992 receipts from the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act for use by the NAWCA are projected at $7,000,000 (can only be spent in U.S. coastal states).

- FY 1992 projected opportunities (Act funds to be matched by U.S. non-Federal funds and by in-country funds in Canada and Mexico.):

  - Canada $16,000,000
  - Mexico $1,000,000
  - U.S. $45,000,000

(call for proposals issued Feb. 1991:
  - 25 U.S. sponsors already requested $10,296,887 they will match with $14,414,251. Additional projects currently being reviewed.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing Tackle &amp; Exeat</strong></td>
<td>38,086</td>
<td>43,842</td>
<td>65,684</td>
<td>74,884</td>
<td>77,044</td>
<td>74,037</td>
<td>74,754</td>
<td>89,500</td>
<td>81,900</td>
<td>86,200</td>
<td>90,600</td>
<td>95,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trolling Motors &amp; Fish Finders</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gasol. Used in Mtrblts</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50,362</td>
<td>28,165</td>
<td>50,775</td>
<td>60,451</td>
<td>50,917</td>
<td>52,004</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gasoline Used in Small Engines</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41,003</td>
<td>49,910</td>
<td>50,470</td>
<td>51,029</td>
<td>51,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Import Duties on Fishing Exeat &amp; Pleasure Boats</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22,495</td>
<td>31,294</td>
<td>20,688</td>
<td>24,464</td>
<td>46,722</td>
<td>28,711</td>
<td>30,130</td>
<td>32,064</td>
<td>35,286</td>
<td>36,417</td>
<td>37,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Investments</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>14,578</td>
<td>24,148</td>
<td>31,812</td>
<td>35,431</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39,086</td>
<td>122,167</td>
<td>141,016</td>
<td>161,073</td>
<td>186,663</td>
<td>205,639</td>
<td>209,833</td>
<td>269,933</td>
<td>284,274</td>
<td>298,556</td>
<td>310,746</td>
<td>323,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequestered</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-4,941</td>
<td>-4,941</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-14,400</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117,226</td>
<td>148,957</td>
<td>161,073</td>
<td>186,663</td>
<td>190,230</td>
<td>209,003</td>
<td>269,933</td>
<td>284,274</td>
<td>298,556</td>
<td>310,746</td>
<td>323,282</td>
<td>323,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boating Safety Acct.</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>269,933</td>
<td>274,274</td>
<td>283,556</td>
<td>295,746</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
<td>303,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildland Grants (18%)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>48,588</td>
<td>49,369</td>
<td>51,040</td>
<td>53,234</td>
<td>54,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39,086</td>
<td>122,167</td>
<td>141,016</td>
<td>161,073</td>
<td>186,663</td>
<td>190,230</td>
<td>209,003</td>
<td>221,345</td>
<td>224,905</td>
<td>232,516</td>
<td>242,512</td>
<td>248,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin. Cost (5.0%)</strong></td>
<td>-3,026</td>
<td>-7,267</td>
<td>-6,866</td>
<td>-5,373</td>
<td>-7,162</td>
<td>-10,390</td>
<td>-12,493</td>
<td>-13,281</td>
<td>-13,494</td>
<td>-13,951</td>
<td>-14,551</td>
<td>-14,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apportion to States</strong></td>
<td>35,606</td>
<td>109,959</td>
<td>140,101</td>
<td>155,700</td>
<td>179,501</td>
<td>179,840</td>
<td>[196,510]</td>
<td>[200,064]</td>
<td>[201,411]</td>
<td>[218,565]</td>
<td>[227,961]</td>
<td>[233,770]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Access (12.5%)</strong></td>
<td>-3,610</td>
<td>-11,080</td>
<td>-14,010</td>
<td>-15,570</td>
<td>-17,950</td>
<td>-17,904</td>
<td>-19,651</td>
<td>-27,668</td>
<td>-26,426</td>
<td>-27,312</td>
<td>-28,495</td>
<td>-29,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Bal. Unemarked</strong></td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td>90,959</td>
<td>126,091</td>
<td>140,130</td>
<td>161,551</td>
<td>161,856</td>
<td>176,859</td>
<td>180,396</td>
<td>184,985</td>
<td>191,244</td>
<td>199,466</td>
<td>204,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Includes $9,8 million adjustment for previously unreported import duties.
2. Includes $10.6 million adjustment for previously undeposited excise taxes.
3. Includes $4,94 million withheld in 1986 sequester.
4. Receipts collected in previous fiscal year available for program in the next year.
*Estimate
KEY MEMBERS FROM HOUSE AND SENATE APPROPRIATIONS.

HOUSE FULL APPROPS. COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION 6/20/91

SENATE APPROP. FINAL ALLOCATIONS BY COMMITTEE STAFF 6/14/91

Committee Action expected before 6/30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Key Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Congressman: Bill Lowery, Ed Roybal, Julian Dixon, Vic Fazio, Jerry Lewis, Nancy Pelosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Senator: Mark Hatfield, Cong. Les AuCoin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Senator: Arlen Specter, John Murtha, William Gray III, Joseph McDade, Lawrence Coughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Congressman: Arlen Specter, John Murtha, William Gray III, Joseph McDade, Lawrence Coughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Senator: Robert Byrd, Cong. Alan Mollohan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Congressman: Louis Stokes, Marcy Kaptur, Ralph Regula, Clarence E. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Senator: Thad Cochran, Cong. Jamie Whitten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Congressman: Bob Traxler, Bob Carr, Carl Pursell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Senator: Brock Adams, Cong. Norm Dicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Congressman: William Lehman, C.W. &quot;Bill&quot; Young, Lawrence Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Cong. William Natcher, Harold Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Senator: Phil Gramm, Charlie Wilson, Ronald Coleman, Jim Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>Cong. Bill Hefner, David Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Congressman: Sidney Yates, Richard Durbin, John Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Cong. Martin Sabo, Vin Weber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New York:
Senator
Congressman

Massachusetts:
Cong. Joseph Early

" Chester Atkins

New Jersey:
Senator Frank Lautenberg
Congressman Bernard Dwyer

" Dean Gallo

Iowa
Senator Tom Harkin
Congressman Neal Smith

" Jim Lightfoot

Louisiana:
Senator J. Bennett Johnston
Congressman Bob Livingston

Arizona:
Senator Dennis DeConcini
Congressman Jim Kolbe

Arkansas:
Senator Dale Bumpers
Congressman Jim Kolbe

Maryland:
Senator Barbara Mikulski
Congressman Steny Hoyer

Nevada:
Senator Harry Reid
Congresswoman Barbara Vucanovich

Georgia:
Senator Wyche Fowler
Congressman Lindsay Thomas

New Mexico:
Senator Pete Domenici
Congressman Joe Skeen

Oklahoma:
Senator Don Nickles
Congressman Mickey Edwards
Report Language.

1. $250,000 from acquisition management for Afognak study and study of lands in Prince William Sound area for possible acquisition once an oil spill settlement is reached.

2. Sacramento River NWR, CA includes Parrott Ranch.

3. E.B. Forsythe NWR, NJ is for Reedy Creek area.

4. Rainwater Basin acquisition dependent on contributions from others.

National Wildlife Refuge Fund

-3,066,000 Maintains FY 1991 level.

Cooperative Endangered Species Fund

+1,000,000 Restores FY 1991 level. Spotted owl states receive emphasis in grants to States.

North American Wetlands Conservation Fund

/ -15,021,000 $14,000,000 program from permanent appropriation remains.

Sport Fish Restoration Account

(Limitation on Permanent Appropriation)

/ -16,000,000 Allows 4% increase over FY 1991 for State programs
SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACCOUNT
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

The Committee recommends a limitation on the amount available for Payments to States in the Sport Fish Restoration Account. The limitation on obligations is set at $190,000,000. This amount will still allow the States to receive $8,013,000 more than the estimate for fiscal year 1991, an increase of 4.4 percent.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends the redesignation of the Tinicum National Environmental Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum. Senator Heinz earned a national reputation for his tireless efforts in environmental protection. In particular, he worked to include Tinicum in the national system and drafted the law that established the Tinicum Marsh Wildlife Center. The Committee, in recognition of his work on behalf of the environment, believes it is fitting to honor Senator Heinz in this manner.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The world has witnessed a staggering level and pace of change since the first national park was created at Yellowstone over 100 years ago. But the parks endure and continue to grow in importance, especially for those that provide to that change. Noting this rapid change, Frederick Law Olmstead long ago observed that there were no place like national parks,; there would be nothing against which to measure change. Today the complexity and speed of this change is mirrored in the National Park System which is now comprised of 357 areas, encompassing nearly 80 million acres, in 49 States and the District of Columbia. The areas range in size and character from the immense roadless wilderness of Gates of the Arctic National Park in Alaska to the small Federal Hall National Memorial in lower Manhattan. Visitation exceeded 336 million in 1990.

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation enacted, 1991</th>
<th>$876,699,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget estimate, 1992</td>
<td>$970,526,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended, 1992</td>
<td>$968,747,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation, 1991</td>
<td>+$92,488,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget estimate, 1992</td>
<td>-$1,779,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget proposed for the Operation of the National Park System is another step forward in the recovery of the parks. At the hearing on the fiscal year 1991 appropriation for the National Park Service, one witness stated that many of the parks are in "intensive care." The Congress responded to that cry for help and provided an appropriation of $876,699,000, an increase of almost $46,000,000 over the request. Even this increase fell significantly short of what individual park superintendents and regional directors identified as needs. The budget proposal for this year builds on the 1991 effort to provide adequate funds for our National Parks.

Again, the budget requested for parks will fall short of the needs this year, individual parks identified needs the budget. Severe budget needs.

The amount recommended compared with the 1990 following table:

Management of pari increase of $977,000 for increases are $230,000 for Alice Ferguson Point the Blackstone River Maritime Commission vided for Lowell NH $102,000 for operation There are two offset for Alaska $1,200,000, requested Alaska subsistence $3,333,000.

The Committee has Douglas Outdoor Ed Monica Mountains Nrf Concessions management capability of th ommends an increases reduction of $250,000
AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND, AS AMENDED THROUGH 1990

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND
- Motor Boat Fuel Tax
- Small Engine Gas Tax
- Excise Tax, Import Duties on Boats, Tackle, Etc.

AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND
- First $70 M of Motorboat Fuel Tax
- 1) Remainder of Motorboat Fuel Tax
- 2) Small Engine Fuel Tax
- 3) Excise/Duties
- 4) Interest

BOATING SAFETY ACCOUNT

SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACCOUNT

COASTAL WETLAND PLANNING, PROTECTION, AND RESTORATION ACT
- 70% Priority Louisiana Wetland Projects
- 15% Coastal Wetland Conservation Grants (coastal states only)
- 15% North American Wetlands Conservation Act (coastal state projects only)

APPORTIONED TO STATES
- at least 10% of SFRA to boat access
- up to 10% of SFRA for Aquatic Resources Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Funds Available</th>
<th>House Request</th>
<th>Loss to State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$3,367,196</td>
<td>$3,075,803</td>
<td>$291,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$10,400,000</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$4,339,237</td>
<td>$3,863,725</td>
<td>$375,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$3,962,526</td>
<td>$3,619,614</td>
<td>$342,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$10,400,000</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$5,133,079</td>
<td>$4,688,871</td>
<td>$444,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$5,133,079</td>
<td>$4,688,871</td>
<td>$444,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$4,028,161</td>
<td>$3,679,571</td>
<td>$348,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$3,414,242</td>
<td>$3,118,778</td>
<td>$295,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$4,335,522</td>
<td>$3,960,333</td>
<td>$375,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$3,176,803</td>
<td>$2,901,887</td>
<td>$274,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$2,821,984</td>
<td>$2,577,774</td>
<td>$244,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$3,045,204</td>
<td>$2,781,676</td>
<td>$263,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$3,341,411</td>
<td>$3,052,251</td>
<td>$289,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$3,209,815</td>
<td>$2,932,042</td>
<td>$277,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$8,282,497</td>
<td>$7,565,742</td>
<td>$716,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$7,709,161</td>
<td>$7,042,023</td>
<td>$667,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$2,785,847</td>
<td>$2,544,763</td>
<td>$241,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$5,516,399</td>
<td>$5,039,019</td>
<td>$477,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$4,770,522</td>
<td>$4,357,688</td>
<td>$412,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$2,692,388</td>
<td>$2,459,394</td>
<td>$232,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$3,142,340</td>
<td>$2,870,406</td>
<td>$271,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$3,832,012</td>
<td>$3,500,396</td>
<td>$331,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$5,563,043</td>
<td>$5,081,626</td>
<td>$481,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>$3,036,929</td>
<td>$2,774,118</td>
<td>$262,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$2,200,118</td>
<td>$2,009,723</td>
<td>$190,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$5,315,275</td>
<td>$4,855,298</td>
<td>$459,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$3,845,702</td>
<td>$3,512,901</td>
<td>$332,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$5,132,573</td>
<td>$4,688,408</td>
<td>$444,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$5,439,075</td>
<td>$4,968,386</td>
<td>$470,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>$2,380,617</td>
<td>$2,174,603</td>
<td>$206,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$2,529,195</td>
<td>$2,306,668</td>
<td>$218,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$3,806,772</td>
<td>$3,477,340</td>
<td>$329,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$10,400,000</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$3,437,683</td>
<td>$3,140,191</td>
<td>$297,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$2,918,693</td>
<td>$2,666,114</td>
<td>$252,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$3,225,022</td>
<td>$4,772,857</td>
<td>$452,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$6,891,826</td>
<td>$6,295,418</td>
<td>$596,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$3,146,868</td>
<td>$2,874,543</td>
<td>$272,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>$693,334</td>
<td>$633,333</td>
<td>$60,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Isl.</td>
<td>$693,334</td>
<td>$633,333</td>
<td>$60,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Samoa</td>
<td>$693,334</td>
<td>$633,333</td>
<td>$60,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana Isl.</td>
<td>$693,334</td>
<td>$633,333</td>
<td>$60,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Col.</td>
<td>$693,334</td>
<td>$633,333</td>
<td>$60,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$190,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 14, 1991

The Honorable Joseph McDade
Ranking Minority Member
House Appropriations Committee
H-218 Capitol Building
Washington DC 20515

Dear Representative McDade:

We need your help to restore two major cuts in fish and wildlife activities made by the House Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. The first action of the Subcommittee that concerns us is the unprecedented action to place a Congressional limitation of $190 million on the amount that can be apportioned to the states from the Sport Fish Restoration Account, commonly referred to as Dingell-Johnson/Wallop-Breaux. This would reduce, by $18 million, the amount otherwise available to the states in FY 1992. This is $6.5 million below the amount apportioned to states in Fiscal Year 1991.

The Sport Fish Restoration Account is entirely financed by fishing and boating users through payment of specific federal excise taxes on fishing and boating equipment and the federal gas tax attributable to boat use. Congress to date has remained faithful to the concept of user benefit/user pay and resisting previous efforts by OMB to divert or cap these user funds. Not only will the lack of such funds be a serious detriment to already strapped state fish restoration programs, but will undoubtedly result in users being disillusioned with user benefit/user pay taxes.

The second major cut by the Subcommittee which concerns us greatly is eliminating entirely the President’s budget request for $15 million to be appropriated for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund. The Subcommittee did leave the $14 million derived from the permanent appropriation (interest on Pittman-Robertson funds).

In Fiscal Year 1991 the President requested, and Congress appropriated, $15 million for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, in addition to the amount available from the permanent appropriation. This initial funding, which is more than matched by private and state contributions, is a start towards reducing the precipitous decline in wetland-associated migratory wildlife populations which have declined by about 50% since the 1970’s.
To arrest this decline, the United States and Canada entered into an historic new agreement called the North American Waterfowl Management Plan in 1986. The Plan established a 15-year goal of habitat restoration and enhancement to reverse the decline and restore the populations of wetland dependent wildlife. A strong bipartisan Coalition in the Congress and President Bush united to pass the historic North American Wetlands Conservation Act in 1989 to provide funding for the Plan. The Federal funding is more than matched by private, state and Canadian funding. To cut this program in half at this time, with the attendant loss of private and state matching funds, would be a serious blow to the vital long-term efforts required to restore waterfowl and other migratory wildlife populations.

In making the request to restore funds for these two programs, we are not unmindful of the serious problem facing the Appropriations Subcommittee and the Congress as a whole in trying to meet tight budget constraints. There are numerous reductions made by the Appropriations Subcommittee that we could take issue with, but we recognize that some reductions must be made. These two reductions are particularly troublesome, both in terms of the precedent set by diverting user fees and the significant impacts of a 50% reduction in funding for the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

We appreciate any help you could give in restoring these cuts.

Sincerely,

R. MAX PETERSON

R. Max Peterson
Executive Vice President
The Honorable Robert C. Byrd  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Interior  
and Related Agencies  
Committee on Appropriations  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C.  20510  

Dear Robert:

Last year a bipartisan group of over a dozen Members sought your support to retain $15 million proposed in the President's budget for implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan. With your leadership, the money was appropriated.

The private sector and state governments more than matched the federal dollars for a total financial commitment of over $38 million. These FY91 funds were used to finance 43 wetlands restoration and enhancement and critical habitat acquisition projects in throughout the nation including projects in the Pacific, Central, Mississippi, and Atlantic Flyways.

Given the tremendous success of this program, the President has once again requested $15 million to be used to create these innovative conservation partnerships between federal and state government and the private sector. It has come to our attention that the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee zeroed out the President's request for funds to enhance the habitat of waterfowl and associated wildlife. If this cut is not restored by the Senate, we will not only lose the $15 million in federal funding, but the $15 million plus that would have been provided in state and private cost sharing monies.
We hope you will support this important program once again. In recent years waterfowl and wildlife populations have declined precipitously largely due to the wholesale elimination of wetlands habitat and nesting cover. Mallard duck populations have fallen by 37 percent, blue winged teal by 28 percent, and pintail duck numbers are down by an alarming 37 percent. As a result of the destruction of habitat, many species are now endangered including the majestic whooping crane and our national symbol, the bald eagle.

This request is strongly supported by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, the National Audubon Society, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, among others. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Dennis De Concini
John Stevens
Judy Kondak
Rob Korral
Dennis Chace
John Breary
Tom Caschle
Jim Domenici
Jim Bond
Paul Wellstone
Dave Dandurand

Lloyd Bentsen

Jim Ingersoll

Alan Cranston

Barbara A. Mikulski

Jack D pastor

Also agreed to sign:

Dole

Gore

Pressler

Chafee

Shelby

Warner
June 10, 1991

The Honorable Don Nickles
Ranking Republican Member
Subcommittee on Interior
and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Don:

Last year a bipartisan group of over a dozen Members sought support to retain $15 million proposed in the President's budget for implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan. You joined in that effort which will help fund the first phase of the Deep Fork Lake project in Oklahoma which is expected to be approved next Tuesday by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. With your help, the money was appropriated.

The private sector and state governments more than matched the federal dollars for a total financial commitment of over $38 million. These FY91 funds were used to finance 43 wetlands restoration and enhancement and critical habitat acquisition projects throughout the nation including projects in the Pacific, Central, Mississippi, and Atlantic Flyways.

Given the tremendous success of this program, the President has once again requested $15 million to be used to create these innovative conservation partnerships between federal and state government and the private sector. It has come to our attention that the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee zeroed out the President's request for funds to enhance the habitat of waterfowl and associated wildlife. If this cut is not restored by the Senate, we will not only lose the $15 million in federal funding, but the $15 million plus that would have been provided in state and private cost sharing monies.
We hope you will support this important program once again. In recent years waterfowl and wildlife populations have declined precipitously largely due to the wholesale elimination of wetlands habitat and nesting cover. Mallard duck populations have fallen by 37 percent, blue winged teal by 28 percent, and pintail duck numbers are down by an alarming 37 percent. As a result of the destruction of habitat, many species are now endangered including the majestic whopping crane and our national symbol, the bald eagle.

This request is strongly supported by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, the National Audubon Society, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, among others. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]
Dan Quayle
Lloyd Bentsen
JimInnes
Alan Cranston
Barbara A. Mikulski
Jack Durfee

Also agreed to sign:
Dole
Gore
Pressler
Chafee
Shelby
Warner
June 24, 1991

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This Statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 2686 — DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1992
(Sponsors: Whitten (D), Mississippi; Yates (D), Illinois)

This Statement of Administration Policy expresses the Administration's views on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 1992, as reported by the Committee.

The Administration has several concerns about the bill. If these concerns are not addressed, the President's senior advisers will recommend that the bill be vetoed. The Secretary of the Interior addressed several of these concerns in more detail in his letter to the Committee of June 18th.

**Firefighting Scorekeeping:**

Although the Committee restored $213 million in discretionary funding for firefighting costs eliminated by the Subcommittee, the Administration strongly objects to the approach taken in the amendment. The bill, as amended, would preclude use of the funds unless the President declares an emergency, thus exempting all expenditures from applicable spending limits. This appears to be a gimmick designed to force the President to declare an emergency for clearly anticipated costs and thereby evade the domestic discretionary caps. As such, it is a violation of the budget agreement.

Because these costs can be reasonably anticipated and funded in advance, the Office of Management and Budget would not recommend to the President that he designate appropriations for this purpose as "emergency requirements." The President's request reflects the average of annual firefighting costs over the past decade. The approach adopted by the Committee is inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the "emergency" exception in the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA).

The Administration urges the House to fund firefighting operations at the level of anticipated firefighting needs and to do so within the domestic discretionary spending limits established by the BEA.
National Parks, Forests, and Wildlife Refuges:

The Administration strongly objects to inadequate funding for recreation, resource protection, treeplanting, and other needed initiatives for our public lands. The House Committee mark is about $150 million below the needed amounts. At a time when visits to our national parks and forests are reaching record levels and placing them under increasing stress, the Administration strongly opposes cuts in funds designed to protect these valuable resources in order to fund low-priority earmarked projects.

The Committee has reduced funding for nationally significant resource protection programs under the Administration's "America the Beautiful" program. These include the President's program to plant one billion trees a year (-$55 million), the new and widely acclaimed program to protect historic Civil War battlefield sites that are threatened with imminent development (-$13 million), the "Targeted Parks" initiative to protect resources in America's "Crown Jewel" National Parks (-$5 million), and Coastal America (-$3 million).

The Committee used these reductions to fund millions of dollars for construction of unrequested facilities such as the Palau water and sewer systems, non-competitive grants to local Washington, D.C., arts and cultural agencies, and repair of non-Federal buildings such as the Chicago Public Library. In addition, the Committee added hundreds of millions of dollars for low-priority or unneeded energy research that has proven to be of little value to the energy industry.

Wallop-Breaux:

The Administration strongly opposes any restrictions on Federal funding for the mandatory Sport Fish Restoration Program, otherwise known as the Wallop-Breaux Program. This program is entirely self-financing -- those who benefit from it are assessed excise taxes and import duties. The Committee bill would cap all spending for restoring and developing fish habitats at $190 million, which is well below the $208 million in anticipated receipts. These funds should be used for the purposes intended -- fish habitat protection and restoration.

Strategic Petroleum Reserve Scoring:

The Administration strongly objects to the transfer of $123 million of the proceeds from the test sale of Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) oil in the SPR Petroleum account to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve account. The Administration believes that the SPR facilities account should be fully funded at the level requested in the President's Budget and that the test sale receipts should be used for the acquisition of oil. Receipts
from the sale are scored as mandatory and should not be used to offset FY 1992 discretionary spending.

Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Moratoria:

The Administration opposes the Committee's continuation of moratoria on all activity in Bristol Bay, Alaska, and on Sale 137 in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. The Administration opposes new moratoria imposed by the Committee on activities associated with Sale 145 in the Atlantic and Sale 151 in the Florida panhandle, both of which are contained in Interior's proposed 1992-1997 leasing plan. The plan's reforms would make the OCS oil and gas program more selective, judicious, and environmentally sound; thus, continued legislative moratoria are inappropriate and unnecessary.

Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Environmental Studies:

The Administration strongly opposes the Committee's elimination of all new funding ($15 million) for environmental studies on the OCS. In the President's June 1990 announcement regarding the OCS activities, the President directed the Department of the Interior to develop adequate scientific and environmental information through additional studies in order to determine whether leasing should occur in a number of environmentally sensitive OCS areas.

By eliminating all new funding for the environmental studies program, the Committee would seriously impair the Minerals Management Service's ability to make sound leasing decisions in a timely fashion.

Grazing Fees:

The Administration opposes the sharp increase in grazing fees included in the Committee bill and in the Synar amendment. The Administration continues to support the Executive Order under which grazing fees are currently set.

Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Management Improvement:

The Administration objects to bill language, and the related omission of funding, that would restrict efforts to improve the management and accountability of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Bill language restricting organizational reforms to the BIA is counterproductive and perpetuates longstanding problems affecting the delivery of services to Indians. The Administration needs the flexibility to implement reforms that have been endorsed by the joint tribal and Federal advisory committee examining the BIA.
Reducing funding that would support improvements in BIA accounting and employee training sends the wrong signal to the BIA and its employees. Converting to a new accounting system -- the Federal Financial System (FFS) -- by October 1991 is the top management improvement priority for the BIA. Less than full support of this effort may jeopardize progress in improving the BIA accounting system and the ability to account properly for more than $1.5 billion in appropriated funds.

The Administration believes that the bill language that would restrict organizational reforms in the BIA should be eliminated, and that full funding ($2 million) for FFS and employee training should be restored.

**BIA Dam Safety:**

The Administration strongly objects to bill language intended to prevent the transfer of technical responsibility for dam safety from the BIA to the Bureau of Reclamation. Lives are at stake while serious and long-standing safety deficiencies go uncorrected at various BIA dams. BIA has failed to correct these deficiencies, so the Administration must be permitted to take reasonable, alternative steps to do so before a tragedy occurs.

On the basis of OMB's initial scoring, the Administration finds that the bill exceeds the House 602(b) budget authority allocation by $170 million and the outlay allocation by $436 million. In aggregate, the House 602(b) allocations are consistent with the statutory limits enacted in the BEA. The Administration strongly objects to the excessive funding levels in the bill.

Additional information concerning the Administration's views on the Committee bill is attached.

Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Increases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- America the Beautiful Natural/Historical Resource Programs:</td>
<td>- Interior Department Construction (much for unneeded new buildings and other facilities): (est.) +230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Treeplanting</td>
<td>- Palau Water and Sewer Systems (+8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- American Battlefield Protection (-13)</td>
<td>- Chicago Public Library Restoration; non-Federal (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resource Protection for &quot;Crown Jewel&quot; National Parks (-5)</td>
<td>- Uneconomic BIA Irrigation Projects (+27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coastal America (zero-funded) (-5)</td>
<td>o Non-Competitive Grants for Local Washington, D.C., Arts and Cultural Organizations: +7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interior and Forest Service Recreation and Wildlife Initiatives (-70)</td>
<td>o Grants for Non-Federal Responsibilities and/or Build-up of Unused Federal Funds: +32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Funding Cap on Wallop-Breaux Sport-Fish Restoration -18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o North American Wetlands Conservation (zero-funded) -15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o OCS Environmental Studies -22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269 (total increase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>